Globethics Repository




# Extending the Frence

This page was generated automatically upon download from the Globethics Repository. More information on Globethics see https://www.globethics.net. Data and content policy of Globethics Repository see https://repository.globethics.net/pages/policy.

| | |
|---|---|
| Item Type | Article |
| Authors | Turley, Phillip |
| Publisher | Scott Christian University School of Theology |
| Rights | With permission of the license/copyright holder |
| Download date | 2026-11-13 21:34:36 |
| Link to Item | http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12424/235487 |

# EXTENDING THE FENCE: SUGGESTIONS FOR THE FUTURE OF TEE IN AFRICA[1]

Phillip Turley

As is well known, one primary value emphasised by theological education by extension (TEE) is that the learner should apply and practice the principles which have been learned. Rather than simply memorising cognitive material for mental safe-keeping, the learner is to be exposed to, to comprehend, and then to utilise biblical principles in life and ministry as a result of TEE study.

Now certainly if those of us who are TEE administrators in Africa expect this type of behaviour from our students, then it is incumbent upon us to model the same process in our own responsibilities. We too need more carefully to apply and practice principles that we have learned as we look to the future of TEE in Africa.

The first ACTEA All-Africa TEE Consultation took place in Nairobi, Kenya, in 1987, jointly sponsored by ACTEA (the Accrediting Council for Theological Education in Africa) and by the TEE coordinator for AEAM (the Association of Evangelicals of Africa and Madagascar). At that time it was our privilege to benefit from the teaching of Dr. James Plueddemann, who stressed the need to integrate cognitive and practical learning. Mr. Kiranga Gatimu described the characteristics of distance education and addressed key problems hindering TEE, including the issue of Africanisation of staff. Rev. George Foxall reviewed the history of TEE and recommended the benefits of continental linkage and support services. Dr. Cornelius Olowola called attention to conflicts between TEE and residential programmes and recommended closer cooperation. Dr. Paul Bowers spoke about accreditation and other methods of establishing academic credibility for TEE. At the end of this first ACTEA All-Africa TEE Consultation, the participants did some brainstorming to identify practical things that could be done cooperatively in support of TEE throughout Africa.

The 1987 TEE consultation has had some notable results. The consultation concluded with the formal launching of ACTEA's TEE services. TEE programmes were for the first time allowed to secure regular "correspondent" status within ACTEA's continental membership. This was a major step

forward in the search for greater cooperation between TEE and residential programmes. In fact, it represented a symbolic integration of TEE into the mainstream of theological education in Africa. Structurally TEE programmes have now become a part of the accrediting community for theological education throughout Africa. We are no longer on the outside looking in, but are members of the fraternity.

ACTEA has also responded to our needs by launching the newsletter *TEE IN AFRICA*, which is now in its fourth year of publication. Last year ACTEA produced the new *Directory of TEE Programmes in Africa*. ACTEA also organised a TEE workshop during the ACTEA All-Africa Theological Educators Conference in Limuru, Kenya, in 1990. TEE administrators participated in that conference on equal footing with staff from residential schools. coordinator a second continental TEE consultation, in sequel to the first.

But there is more, much more, that could be done cooperatively for TEE in Africa through the structures provided for us by ACTEA. Let me, therefore, review some of the challenges given in 1987 which we have not yet sufficiently accomplished in the intervening years. Perhaps the time has now come for TEE personnel in Africa to apply and to practice what we at that time learned together. Perhaps a worthy goal for the second consultation in 1991 would be to find effective ways for cooperative action to flow from the cooperative reflection already achieved.

May I begin by highlighting two particular emphases of the 1987 consultation which seem especially worthy of attention as we look in 1991 to the future of TEE in Africa.

### 1. Enhancing the TEE Seminar

In the 1987 consultation Dr. Plueddemann introduced the participants to a bi-polar description of values which influence educational philosophy. On one side he set a system of Platonic idealism which stresses the world of ideas and abstract forms; on the opposite side he set a system of Aristotelian realism which stresses sense perception. He then built a paradigm of the resulting educational philosophies using the familiar rail fence model. The rail fence was described as having two horizontal rails with a series of vertical posts connecting them.

> Traditional liberal arts institutions, which primarily teach the intellectual and artistic heritage of the past, are based on a top-rail value system. Bottom-rail educators are more concerned with professionalism, personal relevance, and the needs of society. Top-rail educators are subject-matter centred, while bottom-rail educators are student or society-centred. Academic rationalism is top-rail, while behaviourism and social reconstructionism are examples of

> bottom- rail systems. Top-rail educators value the unchanging ideas of the humanities, while bottom-rail educators value using social science to solve practical problems. Top-rail educators emphasise the study of traditional academic disciplines, logic, great ideas, great books, and the development of the mind. Bottom-rail educators emphasise empirical and experimental study of the world, society, and the individual.
>
> The aims of top-rail education are to teach unchanging ideas and to develop rational thinking in the student. The aims of bottom-rail education are to provide jobs, promote individual self-actualisation or to enhance the quality of society.
>
> Top-rail educational methods challenge the student to wrestle with ideas using the Socratic method of conceptual dialogue. Bottom-rail methods stimulate students to discover their inner selves, to learn skills need to earn a living, or to train for a profession needed by society.[2]

The central contention of Dr. Plueddemann was that both values are legitimate and that the two must be properly integrated in order to achieve an effective educational system. To construct an educational system solely on one model or on the other would be inappropriate. Merely to mix various methods from both systems would also be deficient. There must be a true *integration* of the models. Thus it is not sufficient that students study theology in the classroom during the weekdays, and then have ministry experiences on the weekend. Rather, theological study must inform ministry experience and ministry experience must inform theological study. A dynamic dialogue must take place as the student compares his theological studies and his experiences. Each must be designed to "dove-tail" into the other. This dynamic dialogue represents the posts which link the rails in the rail fence paradigm. The posts connect the cognitive and the experimental emphases of education, providing true integration of the respective values.

> Theology must inform pastoring skills. The Word and the Spirit do not work without each other. Absolutes of special revelation do not contradict the specifics of general revelation. All Scripture is not only *God-breathed* (top- rail), but is also *useful* (bottom-rail), "for teaching, rebuking, correcting and training in righteousness, so that the man of God may be thoroughly equipped for every good work" (2 Tim 3:16,17).
>
> The two rails must not be separated. The two rails are parts of the same system, and must be intentionally held together in fruitful tension. Theory and practice are parts of the same bigger picture, but because of our limited understanding, they are often in tension

> with each other. Good theory corrects faulty practice, and healthy practice gives a better understanding of incomplete theory. While there is an inevitable tension between theory and practice, there is nothing as practical as good theory; and reflective practice will modify and strengthen theory.[3]

In discussing this rail fence paradigm, Dr. Plueddemann provides us with a very useful statement of the aim of theological education: "The aim of theological education is to develop leaders to build and strengthen the church. Leaders are developed as they interact (the fence post) with the Word of God (the top-rail), and with the needs of the church (the bottom- rail), in such a way that God is glorified."[4] Therefore, Dr Plueddemann contends, our theological educational methods must accomplish three things: "They must teach important knowledge, stimulate quality experience, and compel critical interaction between knowledge and experience."[5]

In Dr. Plueddemann's application of this paradigm to TEE, he stated that the TEE learning materials provide the cognitive or theoretical input, represented by the top-rail. The TEE in- service component provides experimental practice, represented by the bottom-rail. And it is the TEE seminars which provide the necessary interaction between theory and practice, represented by the fence posts. His challenge to us was that, in light of his paradigm, we must emphasise the strategic integrative role of the *TEE seminar* within the larger TEE process, and that we must enhance our training for seminar leaders.

Seminar leaders must be equipped to guide the students in analysing both the input from the book and their experiences in ministry and life. The seminar leaders must help their students to see relationships and to build principles by which to live and serve that are both biblical and realistic.

I am delighted that progress has been made on the point of Dr. Plueddemann's challenge. Miss Margaret Thornton, formerly with the TEE programme of the Church of the Province of Kenya (Anglican), last year edited a new book titled *Training T.E.E. Leaders* (Nairobi: Evangel, 1990). The book is a syllabus which can be used in the classroom portion of a training course for seminar leaders. It provides useful information and guidance to anyone wishing to start, or to enhance, such a course for seminar leaders. It is based upon such courses offered at Daystar University College in Kenya, and includes material from several individuals who helped to teach those courses.

A substantive beginning is being made in emphasising the importance of providing adequate training for TEE seminar leaders. Those of us who are TEE administrators must look critically at our programmes and at the way that we treat the seminar leaders. Are we choosing the right people who are gifted for the work? Have we provided enough initial training to give them a good start in their work? Have they enjoyed supervision that both encourages them and helps them to discover weaknesses to be improved? Do we provide

continuing support, assistance and training? Are we offering motivation for them to do a good job? Do they know when they have done a good job and when they have done a poor job? We must take the practical materials and ideas presented at this consultation and seek ways of implementing them in our individual programmes.

### 2. Cultivating Cooperative Relationships

As we reflect on the future of TEE in Africa, we must also not neglect the warning which Dr. Olowola delivered in 1987. Dr. Olowola warned TEE leaders that if we intentionally divorce our programmes from the mainstream of theological education, then all of theological education, including TEE, will suffer.[6] He was not the first to sound this danger signal, but I fear that it needs sounding amongst us again.

The seeds of calamity were sown at the time of TEE's birth. It was common in the early years of TEE for enthusiasts to promote TEE through attack. Residential Bible schools and seminaries were routinely accused of weaknesses and failures in an effort to advance the TEE model. For instance, in Ross Kinsler's book, *The Extension Movement in Theological Education*, he makes the following statements:

> But a few have suggested that our seminaries and Bible institutes are not even appropriate places in which to carry out theological education. They may in fact damage, thwart, and stifle the churches' natural capacity to grow and develop their own leaders and carry out a dynamic ministry to their own members and to society. The movement called theological education by extension has come on the horizon at this particular moment of history as an alternative model to the traditional schools of the past 150 years.[7]

"Damage, thwart, and stifle" are very strong words. They certainly are not the type of words with which to "win friends or influence enemies!" Yet these are the words used to describe the work of our co-labourers in theological education. In the process of building the case for TEE, residential ministry training is routinely characterised as elitist, cognitive- oriented, and self defeating. Can we be surprised then that the result has been a cold—even hostile—reception of TEE by the traditional world of theological educators.

Even in Margaret Thornton's new book, TEE is explained by comparing it with residential Bible schools. While Thornton is careful to say that both forms of education are valid, in the comparison they are set off against one another[8]. It may seem innocent and harmless to describe TEE by means of comparisons with residential schools. In fact, is that not a common method of definition: to describe the unknown through comparisons with the known? Yet the lack of even-handedness in the way we routinely carry out this comparison of the

overcome. TEE and residential theological schools, therefore, have been viewed by many as separate entities. It is as though they are two separate trees rather than two branches of the same tree; or two competing ball teams rather than two members of the same team.

If TEE programmes in Africa today wish to move forward, many of them will need to move backward first. They will have to abandon their isolationist stance and rejoin the larger family of theological education. They will need to repair damaged relationships. TEE must acknowledge that it is not an alternative to residential theological schools, but an auxiliary of such schools. TEE together with residential schools, with correspondence courses, and with short term seminar programmes are all complementary facets of theological education.

But the blame does not lie solely at the feet of TEE promoters either. From the beginning the proponents of TEE have suffered heavy opposition from established residential programmes. Tradition has always been a cherished term within scholarly circles. To break with tradition and think of variant forms of educational method has been anathema. Often schools have concentrated on looking at the academic calibre of their graduates and have neglected to reexamine the current state of the church and its leadership needs.

A process has begun, however, in which residential programmes have had to acknowledge that training for ministry involves the acquisition of skills which must be practised, and not just acquisition of knowledge to be retained. They are coming to accept that education cannot be static or it will become irrelevant. It must take into account the pressures and concerns of the day as well as the traditions of the past. Our modern institutions, while they teach "timeless truths", must also reflect the realities of the cultures and economies within which they function. Many schools today have restructured their curricula to include such practical innovations as "term out" programmes and ongoing student ministry (in-service training). The influence of TEE ideology has been salutary.

Extension programmes, like residential programmes, represent merely one of many educational techniques open to us. Between these two models and beyond them is a spectrum of variations. As we look at the training needs of the church, it is inappropriate to ask, "Should we build a residential school or establish an extension programme?" Rather we must ask what kind of educational models can we construct to meet the specific leadership needs of our particular church group. Perhaps none of the forms so far deployed in Africa will be appropriate for a given church. A hybrid of several educational forms may be required. What works in Guatemala may not necessarily work in Kenya; and what works in Kenya may not necessarily work in Mozambique. What works for the Anglican churches may not work for the indigenous

What works for the Anglican churches may not work for the indigenous churches. And perhaps even within one church group *several* educational models will need to be employed in order to train the variety of peoples needed for ministry within that structure and setting.

The future for theological education in Africa lies in cooperation and innovation. Many TEE and residential schools have benefited from relationships that provide mutual enhancement. Most TEE administrators are products of residential schools. Residential schools have provided venues for training TEE seminar leaders. TEE programmes in turn have provided sensitive and ministry-oriented pastors whom residential schools can use as supervisors for their term-out students. I personally have worked within both models and have found that TEE has enhanced my ability to design productive courses and to communicate with students effectively in the residential setting.

The time has come for us to seek even greater opportunities of cooperation. Indeed, it is time for TEE to return to the fold. Not that TEE must drop its emphases; rather it must lose its biases. Theological educators of every background must begin together to examine anew the challenges that confront the training of men and women to serve their Saviour effectively. This means we must do several things.

(a) We need to integrate our educational reflection. Both TEE programmes and residential schools need to search aggressively together for educational methods which are *effective* in producing the desired goals, and also *efficient* in utilising the local resources, both cultural and financial. We cannot say that we have already arrived. Perhaps, we have achieved a step in the journey, but there is a great distance yet to climb in cooperative reflection.

TEE directors should regularly scheduled times of reflection for their TEE staff; not just business meetings or training sessions in TEE method, but open thinking and analysis. ACTEA's *TEE IN AFRICA* newsletter should be actively used by all TEE directors to communicate ideas and methods which have worked or failed in their own programmes, and to keep in touch with wider horizons. TEE directors need also to read broadly in the area of educational theory and practice. Our reading must not be limited to TEE only. We must participate in other educational programmes of various styles. We can do this by attending such events as the ACTEA All-Africa Theological Educators Conference. Staff of residential schools and TEE programmes could share in research projects to evaluate the needs of the church and the best methods of meeting those needs.

(b) We also need to integrate our educational structures and processes. We must search for ways to build bridges between TEE and residential schools. It is good to share instructors between programmes so that teachers from a residential school also teach TEE classes, and vice versa. The TEE programme with which I was previously involved conducted an annual

teacher's conference. This conference followed a rota system of meeting at our denomination's various residential schools and utilising staff from them to speak in the conference. If your programme is an institution independent from any residential school, then include a school principal as a part of your governing board. A TEE programme can introduce variety and also help in bridge building by offering special seminar courses taught by staff of a residential school. Because relationships and situations differ so greatly from one group to another, it is important that each of us uses creativity in discovering appropriate bridges for our particular setting; my "bridges" may not be long enough for your gaps!

(c) ACTEA also should play a greater role in building cooperation. I beg ACTEA to be sensitive to the effects that pursuing accreditation has on residential schools. Whenever the staff of a school begin to consider accreditation, they suddenly become very conservative about educational cooperation. More than once, prospective joint ventures between TEE and residential schools have died due to a fear by residential schools that such ventures might compromise chances of accreditation. These fears may be falsely based, but they affect relationships all the same. The accreditation process for residential schools needs to include a challenge to the school to evidence sensitivity to the variety of training needs and to the resource limitations of the local church. Schools should be required to demonstrate during the accreditation process that their programme is taking its milieu into consideration and has a dynamic relationship both to the church it serves and to other relevant programmes for church- leadership training, including the non-traditional programmes. Connected to this should be an indication that the school is involved in creative review of educational methods open to it. If residential schools know that ACTEA has adopted a set of standards for TEE, and if they know that ACTEA will hold them accountable for progress in the development of appropriate educational methodologies responsive to contextual needs, then they will cease to fear joint relationships with TEE. More than just tolerating innovation, ACTEA should be rewarding it. ACTEA's encouragement for theological education to experiment in developing productive teaching methods appropriate to the African context will prove important for the future of the church.

(d) Above all, relationships of mutual respect must be cultivated. TEE should seek to complement and enhance the overall programme of theological education in our denominations, not to divide and polarise. We must be wise in our descriptions of TEE and in our manner of promoting it. We must look for opportunities to refer potential students to the residential schools. We must speak highly and honestly of the merits of residential schools when the occasion arises. We must look for opportunities to build personal relationships that could open doors to more cooperative professional relationships.

I have concentrated on two challenges from the 1987 TEE consultation which I believe deserve our special attention as we face the future of TEE in Africa. It is not possible to do justice to all of the other concepts presented during the 1987 consultation, nor to all the recommendations which were shared during that consultation's closing discussion. However, I would like to suggest several additional ways in which we might consider moving forward in the enhancement of TEE in Africa.

### 3. Accreditation and Credibility

In 1987 a paper was given on the topic of accreditation for TEE. It is an area of major concern for many programmes, and has been raised on several occasions. As new and varied TEE programmes spring up, the scene has become even more confused. The problem includes questions as simple as definitions and equivalence of terms. But it also includes issues as difficult as measuring student progress and the transfer of credits among TEE programmes and between TEE programmes and residential programmes.

Let me recommend that we should first explore the issue of standards for TEE. After a document laying out standards is produced, then we could address the second stage of defining the accreditation process. I would suggest that a committee on standards should be commissioned, and that they be given adequate time to do individual research before coming together as a group to compile and discuss their findings. Then a draft document could be prepared for evaluation at the next TEE Consultation, and presented to ACTEA for consideration and action. Following adoption of these standards by ACTEA, the committee could then be charged with addressing the accreditation procedures through a similar process.

### 4. TEE Consultancy

TEE programmes involve great complexity of methods and relationships. Many TEE programmes have begun and died because the initiators were unaware of the potential points of conflict between the system they chose and the setting in which they worked. Often those who start TEE programmes are not fully aware of the variety of materials and methods available to them. As a result, they begin a style or level of programme that is not best for their situation. They don't know where to go for help. At other times an established TEE programme is faltering and the director wants help—fast—to understand and hopefully correct whatever is ailing the programme. But where can one turn for such help?

I believe that TEE in Africa would be *greatly* served if ACTEA could provided one or more individuals who, together with a few TEE directors, could serve as a TEE Consultancy Team. In a fashion similar to the ACTEA accreditation teams that visit and evaluate schools, the TEE Consultancy Team could visit

and evaluate ailing TEE programmes, or provide advice to churches and schools wishing to start TEE. The team would be a library of information and experience from which others could draw.

### 5. Education as a Curricular Course

One great failure in theological education as a whole is that educational philosophy and method are seldom taught within the curricula of our theological schools. Yet it is the very products of our theological institutions which return to *teach* in those institutions. They have learned theology and homiletics, but they often lack the educational theory and skills to pass on that knowledge effectively. ACTEA should require that theological institutions include courses on education which would cover a range of teaching methods, including TEE. This would strengthen all of our programmes.

In fact, education falls within the category of communication. Graduates of theological institutions are responsible not only to know good theology, but to communicate good theology effectively to their people. Those graduates must have more exposure and training in the use of communication methods. Communicating in an educational setting (whether residential or extension) requires good training. Let us begin to concentrate more in this area and be sure that our students are aware that there are many methods of teaching open to them.

### 6. Non-denominational TEE Programmes

There exist in Africa a plethora of small church denominations, many of which could be characterised as African indigenous or independent churches. These churches often have lacked resources for maintaining residential schools. In addition, they sometimes are not even aware of the options for theological study. It has been recognised before that these churches, more than most others, could benefit from TEE programmes, and yet they do not.

I would recommend that non-denominational schools, which often have the reputation which secures academic credibility but lack the denominational ties that offend, become involved much more aggressively in providing extension courses and programmes for this part of the African Christian community. For instance, Daystar University College in Nairobi, Kenya, belongs to no denomination while serving many denominations. Their programme of study is held in high regard. If they were to offer their biblical studies (or other courses) by extension, many small, independent churches would benefit. For a large and credible school such as Daystar to begin an extension programme would also give greater credibility to extension as an educational method. Other schools would be encouraged to follow the example of a continental leader.

### 7. Centralised Administrative Services

Those TEE programmes that are small face great difficulty in the attempt to survive from day to day. Many small programmes in particular lack the resources to provide effective administration. There is no money for a secretary or for office expenses. Sometimes even the director is on a part-time basis. These programmes are unable to issue course certificates on time, maintain up-to-date and accurate student records, or respond quickly to inquiries from prospective students. In the end the students become discouraged and drop out, thereby eroding further the programme's ability to survive. Usually, the programmes are small because the denominations they serve are also small. Other factors may enter into the reason, but the result is the same—small programmes have a special problem in maintaining adequate administration.

If the resources of many small programmes could be pooled through a fee system, then a central office could provide administrative services to each of them. While the individual programmes could maintain their distinctives and set their own policy, the central office would process their paper work, issuing student certificates and providing regular reports. Some of the services that could be provided would include:

(a) Furnishing all forms necessary to register students and to report their performance.
(b) Maintaining a permanent student record file for each programme.
(c) Issuing certificates with each programme's name on it and according to the standards they establish.
(d) Issuing progress reports and statistics to each programme director at regular intervals.

There are several ways in which this central administration service could be organised. AEAM could establish this as a service through its TEE department. Or a major publisher of TEE learning materials, such as Evangel Publishing House in Nairobi, could provide this as an auxiliary service. In the case of the latter, book ordering could also be incorporated as part of the service. Or perhaps a TEE association, or a major, well- established TEE programme, could provide such a service.

### 8. Administration Training Courses

The process of TEE staff nationalisation often falters at the point of handing over administration. The new director has perhaps studied and even taught numerous TEE courses, but he has never been an administrator. He knows little about administration. Many programmes never make it as far as nationalisation, because the expatriate who started the TEE programme also lacked administrative skills. In one recent case known to me, an embarrassing decline in student enrolment was reversed in a very short time by the simple

expedient of reorganising and upgrading the administrative processes of the programme.

An intensive course on the subject of TEE administration should be a prerequisite for anyone appointed to serve as a TEE director. The course should be practical and detailed. Such a course could be offered on a short-term basis by a school such as Daystar University College in Nairobi, or by AEAM or ACTEA, or by one of the TEE associations, or by several of these acting in concert.

### 9. Fearless Finances

During the 1987 TEE Consultation, Kiranga Gatimu commented that "Ninety per cent of the programmes rely on overseas financing."[9] Finances are supposed to be one of the advantages of TEE. TEE is touted as a cheaper alternative to residential schools. However, as we have all discovered, while TEE is perhaps cheaper, it is not cheap. Finances have been a problem for most of the TEE programmes in Africa. Yet, is it really the finances which are the main problem? Is it perhaps really a fear of finances?

I have often observed that while our students complain about the cost of the book, the serious students almost always pay it. Expatriates seem particularly susceptible to these complaints about cost. They often hold down charges by paying expenses from personal or mission funds. But is this fear of finance justified? I discovered in our TEE programme that it was not. We nearly tripled the cost of our programme through higher course fees and higher book costs during a very short period. Yet student enrolment increased rather than decreased. The programme has not yet reached the point of total self-subsistence, but it is much closer than a few years ago.

I would challenge TEE directors to make honest assessments of the genuine cost of running a programme. Begin to move charges closer to reality without apologising. If TEE is really the educational method for Africa, allow it to prove itself honestly. If students and the church value what they are receiving, then they will find a way to pay for it. If it is not valuable enough for them to pay that amount, then maybe we have the wrong programme.

### 10. Residential-based Extension Programmes

Residential Bible schools in Africa do not always share all of the weaknesses of western schools. In fact, many of them are strong discipling communities. Often ministry involvement is an integral part of the school's programme. They sometimes demonstrate other strengths as well. Credibility from scores of successful graduates is not one of the least of these. A faculty of well educated individuals with a breadth of expertise is more often to be found in a residential programme than in an extension programme. And the resources of an extensive library should not be underestimated.

I believe that extension programmes in Africa should be built from a position of strength rather than one of weakness. Starting an independent institution is difficult under any circumstances. Beginning a free-standing TEE programme without any connections to existing and recognised institutions is needless frustration. A church planning to begin an extension programme would do well to ask their existing residential school to develop an extension division of its current programme. Obviously the church will need to make a commitment to expand the financial and personnel resources of the school, but the start-up cost will be less than otherwise. Such an extension programme would be able to draw upon the strengths of the existing staff, library, and administration. Then the extension programme will be seen not as competitive but as complementary.

## Conclusion

Many TEE programmes in Africa have taken the bold step of trying something new. Others have not. Those who reach beyond the traditions, the habits, the "tried and true" will usually prosper and grow. Stagnation is first of all a disease of the mind and secondly, a paralysis of method. Some of the ideas I have presented here will not work in your situation; others may. But, most of all, it is my prayer that the thinking of TEE administrators in Africa will be stimulated, that they will review the needs of their church constituency anew, and that they will stretch themselves to find better ways of meeting those needs. In this way we may have good hope for the future of TEE in Africa.

## ENDNOTES

[1]Adapted from a keynote paper given at the ACTEA Second All Africa TEE Consultation, held in Jos, Nigeria, 3-8 June 1991.

[2]James E. Plueddemann, "The Challenge of Excellence in Theological Education" (unpublished paper presented to the Nairobi Fellowship of Theological Colleges in Nairobi, Kenya, 10 July 1987) p. 4.

[3]Ibid., p. 7.

[4]Ibid., p. 10.

[5]Ibid., p. 11.

[6]Ray Davidson, "Report: ACTEA All-Africa TEE Consultation," (unpublished report of the ACTEA All-Africa TEE Consultation held in Nairobi, Kenya, 15-18 July 1987), p. 2.

[7]F. Ross Kinsler, *The Extension Movement in Theological Education* (Pasadena: William Carey Library, 1981) pp. 41-42.

[8]Margaret Thornton, ed. *Training T.E.E. Leaders* (Nairobi: Evangel Publishing House, 1990), pp.14-15.

[9]Ray Davidson, "Report", p.3.