

Adapting Assessment Tools

Christina R. Zaker¹

It starts with a hunch. You are sitting in the end-of-semester evaluation with one of your students. Others are there as well: the site supervisor, the formator, the theological reflection faculty. Evaluations have been completed, shared, and read by all; this meeting is one of closure. For most students this is a celebration of all they have learned in their placement during the year, the way they have integrated their theological studies with their practical application in a particular ministerial context, and their openness to building a habit of reflection that shapes their ministerial identity. Generally, there is much to celebrate, some insights to focus future learning, and appreciation for hard work.

But sometimes, you sit there with the evaluations in hand, realizing that something has slipped through the cracks. The student has a good heart and has come a long way, but still there is a hesitancy to confirm that he is ready for full-time ministry. The supervisor gives constructive criticism the best she can. The student's formator and faculty member offer their perspectives. Still, you realize in that moment that the tools used for evaluating this student do not help to highlight the delicate nuance of what he lacks in his skill development. I found myself sitting in one of those meetings recently, deciding that we had to offer students better feedback; we had to offer mentors better tools to assist students' growth.

This happens on the other side as well, when there is a student who starts her year with much wisdom to offer and embarks on working with a particular site that really needs her skill set. But even in this case, at the end of the year, I sometimes wonder if we offered her enough runway to grow. Just because you start the year as a wise minister doesn't mean your practicum is not able to take you to another level. So, even for students who bring a lot to the table, their practicum placement assessment tools need to offer the gradation that compels them to keep improving.

Participating in both these types of meetings recently, I had a hunch that we could do better. And so, with this hunch and the gift of a research grant from my institution, Catholic Theological Union (CTU), I set about trying to improve the

¹ Christina R. Zaker, DMin, is Director of Field Education at Catholic Theological Union in Chicago. Email: czaker@ctu.edu

evaluation tool used for our field education program. This article is about the shifts made to the tool used by site supervisors/teaching pastors to assess their students. Other tools that we use, such as the student's self-evaluation, the student's evaluation of their site, and the theological reflection faculty's assessment of the students, are all now on the docket for future revisions.

FIRST STEP: WHAT'S THE BUZZ?!

The tool we have uses the term "evaluation," and yet "assessment" was the buzzword I kept bumping into. As a member of CTU's Committee on Assessment, I have found that regular assessment of our various academic programs is critically important. An attitude that embraces assessment moves us beyond compliance with standards of accreditation to a more holistic approach that carves out space to imagine ways to improve. As Debbie Creamer writes in her article "Reimagining Assessment in Theological Education (via the Appalachian Trail)," "Assessment works when we do it out of love, curiosity, and stewardship—not out of bureaucratic obligation, out of defensiveness, or to appease external audiences."ⁱ My initial explorations got me thinking that the heart of what I was looking for was not something to satisfy accreditation needs or simply to help pass out grades; I was truly curious to see what the best tool might be to help our students grow. I wanted to offer our site supervisors some common language and structure to give students nuanced feedback.

CTU site supervisors confirmed my hunch that the "evaluation" title was not necessarily helpful. If we were looking for a tool to foster growth, then we had to start by renaming the tool. As Susan Starr states in her article "Moving from Evaluation to Assessment," "Evaluations are designed to *document the level of achievement that has been attained*. Assessment, on the other hand, is focused on measuring a performance, work product, or skill in order to offer feedback on strengths and weaknesses and to *provide direction for improving future performance*."ⁱⁱ That offered clarity; we were seeking to measure how students were performing in their ministry to offer them direction for what to work on next. Assessment felt more relationship driven, conversational, and positive.

With the conviction that we would move toward designing an assessment tool, the next set of buzzwords that invited further reflection was to look at the emerging field of competency-based theological education (CBTE). This phrase had been explored at an Association of Theological Field Educators gathering by a wise colleague, Barbara Blodgett. Although I knew CTU was not interested in a complete overhaul of our degree programs, the reality is that field education is a competency-based component of our degrees. It is practice-based and focuses on helping students attain certain competencies that are not often honed within the theological classroom. As Karen Stiller notes, "Competency-based theological education (CBTE) applies the principles of CBE

[competency-based education] to a ministry setting, where character traits and qualities and other personality-related “soft” competencies are just as important to a seminarian’s success in a vocation or ministry role as academic knowledge, skills, and abilities.”ⁱⁱⁱ This focus on various competencies, both “hard” like understanding Christology or exegesis and “soft” like relating well to people across religious denominations, gave helpful direction to the growing list of hoped-for outcomes for our redesign project. Another aspect that is a part of CBTE is that as Stiller notes, “mentors are a critical part of the program. Faculty members, pastors, field education supervisors, and other ministry leaders, who often work in small teams assigned to each student, work closely with students and interact with them in the student’s context.”^{iv} Our process already included surrounding our students with wise mentors as site supervisors and theological reflection faculty who are trained and eager to accompany them on their journey. It felt like a natural development to be shifting the language to assessment to reflect that the student is given holistic feedback from those able to observe them in their ministry and from those who hear their integration in classroom reflections. Building a tool that highlighted the mentors’ awareness of the student’s competencies and growth would be most effective.

Grade schools and high schools have also been exploring more holistic approaches to education. New developments in the United States on a national scale have provided Common Core State Standards that are supported by a partnership focused on “21st-century skills.” This partnership advocates “integrating core academic knowledge, critical thinking, and social skills in teaching and learning to help students master the multi-dimensional abilities that are required in the 21st century.”^v The twenty-first-century skills hoped for in this effort are designed to be interdisciplinary and to emphasize “deep understanding rather than shallow knowledge.”^{vi} The buzz at the grade school and high school levels confirms that an educational paradigm shift is taking place across all levels of education. The focus is on multidimensional competencies to foster student growth and success not just in terms of academic requirements but with an integrated and holistic approach to support future success. The Association of Theological Schools (ATS) has also offered further insight into CBTE and possible parameters that might be helpful in this project to redefine our assessment tools. While CTU’s overall program is based on credit hours, it is still intriguing to consider the underlying CBTE philosophy that ATS encourages of “developing a coherent set of competencies related to knowledge, skills, and behaviors that prepare graduates for particular professions.”^{vii} In their accreditation materials, ATS identifies ten factors in evaluating CBTE programs to help schools that are transitioning to a CBTE model. Two of these factors offer inroads for the work ahead:

2. *A list of clearly articulated competencies . . . which align with the expectations of the applicable degree program standards.*

8. *Due attention to formation* . . . as well as how any required supervised ministry experiences will be provided and evaluated.^{viii}

Both these factors offered insights for the journey at CTU. Factor 2 encourages us to make sure the competencies are clearly articulated and aligned with our degree program outcomes. Plus, like Stiller's focus on mentors, Factor 8 affirms the developing understanding of formation within the world of theological education. Formation takes seriously the role of mentors. Students are formed spiritually, intellectually, pastorally, and humanly in their ministry practicum settings by mentors who apprentice them and encourage them. Developing this tool with both students and mentors in mind helped to focus the language we used as well as the outcomes we named.

SECOND STEP: CONFIRM THE HUNCH

With this widening understanding of the language and current developments in the educational landscape, I decided to see if my hunch about the need for a better tool was correct. At the end of fall semester evaluations, I asked site supervisors whether they liked the tool we were using or if they felt it could be improved. Many had a critique or suggestion. Several confirmed that the current tool gave them plenty of room to write what they needed, but they always felt like they needed to only address what the student did right as it didn't give them the type of questions that asked for tougher feedback. Some mentioned that "evaluation" felt too harsh and judgmental and they wanted a tool that was more focused on mentoring. Because our program offers the opportunity for a mid-year and end-of-the-year evaluation, the concept of an assessment that would give guidance for improvement seemed an appropriate direction. With that anecdotal feedback in hand, I set out to formalize the process.

STEP THREE: ONE LARGE FOCUS GROUP

Each semester CTU offers a Site Supervisor Morning of Reflection. These are designed to build community among the various sites, allowing site supervisors the space for networking and shared support. They are also meant as regular training for site supervisors where we share resources or encourage them in their ministry of student supervision. In the spring semester of 2023, I invited our site supervisors to a morning of reflection to gather their feedback on our evaluation tools. Because I wanted to have multiple voices involved in this process, our theological reflection faculty and formators were also invited. This group included several alumni, so I felt that the student voice would be included in this process.

In February 2023, I sent an invitation to site supervisors, faculty, and formators to a morning we called Exploring the Evaluation Tools for Ministry Practicum Students:

It has been over ten years since the tools we use for evaluation of students in their ministry practicum have been designed. I'd love your feedback on how they might be improved and updated. Site Supervisors, Formators and Theological Reflection Faculty are all invited since each of you participate in the final 4-way Evaluation meetings.

This will be an interactive "workshopping" experience where we will mingle prayer and discussion around what we look for in our students when we mentor them in ministry.

We'll ask questions such as "What are the competencies we want to assess?" "How is formation evident in their ministry experiences?" or "What questions have you wanted to answer, but were not on the current forms?" We'll even look at ways we might improve and update the process and protocols for evaluation. Your feedback will help me rework the system for next academic year.

Thirty-five of the invited fifty participants were able to participate, and our discussion and lunch together was quite productive. We discussed the current tool and what we might look for in a new tool. Everyone resonated with the move from "evaluation" to "assessment," and that seemed to give us permission to start from scratch and build the tool in the ways we felt were critical. We were ready for a full-scale scrap and rebuild, not just a tweak, and that seemed to energize us all. The conversation took place in two parts—one focused on the logistics of the tool itself and one focused on the language of outcomes and nuance.

When focused on the logistics of the tool, it became apparent that people wanted a Likert scale for the assessment that also offered the opportunity to provide written responses. The decision was made to also make the tool accessible as an online survey to improve not only the method of feedback but also data collection for CTU's underlying annual degree program assessment.

The larger discussion came as we discussed the language, outcomes, and questions we might use. Small groups were each asked to look at a tool developed in another context to note questions they appreciated, outcomes that resonated with them, etc. Some of the documents considered were the *Program for Priestly Formation*,^{ix} with its benchmarks for the vocational synthesis stage, ATS standards, field education handbooks from other schools such as Regis^x and Baylor,^{xi} the code of ethics for the National Association of Catholic Chaplains,^{xii} and resources recently developed by Fr. Andrew Turner at Saint Mary Seminary in Cleveland for his Lilly Endowment Pathways Grant titled Program for Parish Formation.^{xiii}

The first discussion focused on the question of developing an appropriate rating scale. If we were to use a Likert scale for a large portion of the tool, we felt the rating scale was critical. First, we decided that a five-point scale was important to offer various points of incremental growth. No one was very fond of the basic progression of "unsatisfactory – satisfactory – average – above average" that populated some of the

tools already in use at CTU. We also had a great discussion around the meaning of the term “mastery.” ATS states in Factor 4 that assessment needs to be coherent, “with the expectation that students will demonstrate a pre-determined level of achievement (mastery) of all competencies”^{xiv} Our site supervisors discussed the reality that even seasoned ministers do not feel that they have mastery over the practice of ministry at times. It’s interesting to note that perhaps even ATS was exploring a similar conversation; their guidelines on CBTE factors shifted language between its first post, effective July 2020, which was what we looked at when reviewing our assessment tools, and their most recent post, which was revised in 2024. The initial document listed Factor 4 as “an expectation that students will demonstrate a high level of achievement (mastery) of all competencies,” but the revised document instead names “a pre-determined level of achievement (mastery) of all competencies.”^{xv} This reflects an ongoing conversation of what mastery looks like, similar to ours at CTU, and how we determine what is the proper level a student should reach before being granted a degree. It was good to note that the revisions that ATS set in place in subsequent months mirrored our own wrestling with the term “mastery.”

Within our CTU conversation, we began to lay out a spectrum offering nuance that would allow site supervisors and students to understand where they saw room for growth. The categories and benchmarks that were discussed came from many different sources, with folks looking at not only the materials provided in our discussion groups but also searching online and considering different rating scales offered by multiple sources. We considered Bloom’s taxonomy of cognitive objectives^{xvi} and wondered how we might translate that to a taxonomy of pastoral objectives. Discussion centered around how we know when someone has developed a skill. In pastoral practice, it seemed that the best way to assess this through observation of how naturally and consistently a student demonstrates a particular skill. We decided that the hoped-for outcome for each skill is that the student consistently shows integration of knowledge and pastoral presence. The language we decided on for assessment through a Likert scale format is as follows:

Basic - Competency is just beginning to be demonstrated. Student is establishing a beginning skill level and basic integration of knowledge.

Advancing - Competency is achieved occasionally and student shows increasing progress in skill and integration of knowledge.

Proficient - Competency is demonstrated regularly with advancing integration of knowledge of theological concepts and pastoral presence.

Excelling - Competency is demonstrated consistently; this is an area of strength for the student.

Integration - The student consistently demonstrates a capacity for excellence in this skill and integrates theological concepts and pastoral presence in an authentic way to his or her own ministerial identity.

N/A - Not yet addressed/No opportunity for observation of the student in this category.

After some discussion, we also offered a final category, N/E (not evident), that covered skills that the site supervisor would have liked to see but did not see evidenced in the student's pastoral practice. This is different from the N/A category, which provides an answer for situations where the site does not offer an opportunity to see the student demonstrate this skill so the site supervisors are not able to assess them on it.

The discussion around the rating scale took a lot of the morning. When considering all the feedback from these various tools, it became obvious that having 35 people wordsmithing specific questions together would take too much time. However, each small group had highlighted important goals, questions, and language they appreciated. With their highlighted packets and the ample notes I had taken throughout the morning, I had plenty to guide me in my summer task of formulating the questions and integrating them with our degree program outcomes.

The morning was a tremendous success, and everyone appreciated the opportunity to reimagine our assessment tools. We already were laughing about the fact that this was only one tool and yet it now opened us to the reality that all of the evaluation tools we were using needed to be reworked. I promised them that they would all be on the docket, but not this year. I had much work to do in order to get the assessment tool ready for the following fall.

STEP FOUR: SUMMER RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

My summer research began with exploring what types of questions are important to ask. Resources around cognitive, behavioral, and affective outcomes and ones focused on questions to promote deeper thinking were all important to consider as I began formulating and rewriting.^{xvii} I also wanted to weave three particular points of contact into the development process. It was important to have each question tied to the CTU degree program outcomes. It would also be helpful to sync some questions to the annual Graduating Student Questionnaire (GSQ) that ATS compiles every year. Because our student participation on the GSQ is high, we would have an opportunity to track growth as the tool we were working on would be completed midway through the current students' program and the GSQ is administered at graduation. The ministry practicum is also a key part of a CTU student's formative development, so I wanted to structure the questions in categories that matched the categories of Intellectual, Pastoral, Spiritual, and Human formation that are the predominant categories in Catholic formation in both the *Program for Priestly Formation* and the document on lay ministry,

Co-Workers in the Vineyard of the Lord.^{xviii} The effort to categorize and formulate the language of each question can be summed up in the image of over 200 little slips of paper, each with a potential question spread across the dining room table, that I was slowly sorting into piles.

In the end the assessment tool includes 27 Likert scale questions in three broad categories of “theological formation,” “pastoral formation” and “formation of the person.” The theological formation section covers questions around ministerial application of theology, inter-cultural and inter-religious dialogue, and social justice. An example of the change in this category is that in the past the tool asked to “comment on the student’s performance” and one of the nine categories was “social justice competencies.” Because this was in a list of nine different possible areas of focus, many site supervisors never even addressed this. However, since this is a critical part of our degree program outcomes, it was important that there were specific questions around this. An example of one of the three new questions around social justice is: “*The student accurately identifies effects of injustice that impact the ministry site and is active in communal discussions of ways to respond.*” We also tied our questions around inter-religious/inter-cultural competencies to the GSQ questions that CTU has added to the larger GSQ survey. An example of one is: “*Appreciation for and nuanced understanding of faith traditions and the variety of ways people orient themselves toward their most deeply held beliefs.*”

The pastoral formation section includes practical, pastoral and spiritual competencies. In this area we cover basic skill levels such as dependability and awareness of boundaries and more advanced level skills such as “*Deals appropriately with conflict and stress. Identifies problems and suggests solutions.*” and Spiritual competencies with questions such as, “*Demonstrates pastoral sensitivity in accompanying others on their spiritual journey.*” Finally, formation of the person focuses on the supervisory relationship, reflection competencies and vocational awareness. Questions around appropriately relating to authority and utilizing supervision well are important here, as are vocational questions. An example from this section is: “*Student appropriately balances compassion, courage, integrity, and humility in engaging with self and others at the site.*” There are additional demographic questions and spots in each section for site supervisors to write responses that offer explanations of their choices or anecdotal examples.

Once I had a solid rough draft of the questions built into a working Google form, I was able to test it out with a sampling of site supervisors. I asked my longest-serving site supervisor to work out the tech side of things since she claims to be a tech disaster. After just a few setting changes, we were able to get it to work smoothly for her. Others in the sampling were very helpful in their feedback on the wording of some questions and the overall look of the survey. One supervisor told me, “This is the best tool I have seen for assessment; I am going to start using this with all of my staff.”^{xix} With that

feedback in hand, I ended the summer by making another round of adjustments to the wording of a few questions and looked forward to implementing the tool in the new school year.

STEP FIVE: ROLLOUT AND FURTHER REVISIONS

In the fall semester, we gathered once again with the full group of site supervisors, formators, and theological reflection faculty to share the new tool and receive one more round of suggestions for improvement. The revisions were made, and the final version was ready for rollout at the December assessment meetings. Only two folks had a hard time with the tech side of it, but we were able to adjust it for them. We utilized the same tool for the end-of-the-year assessments in May. Generally, the feedback from everyone has been that they like the new tool much better. The questions give them more to discuss with their students, and they can see some distinctions between how they responded in the fall and at the end of the year. It also offers a nice checklist of sorts for site supervisors to consider what else they might address with their students in a second semester.

One Master of Divinity student, Luz Diaz, offered some perspectives after having worked with the tool at both the mid-year and end of the year assessment: "The evaluation tool served as a helpful barometer to understand the areas I excelled in and the ones in which I needed to grow more. It also provided a boost of confidence in my abilities as a minister/chaplain especially because the jail was a new area of ministry I had never been exposed to before. The tool also allowed me to ponder theologically on those areas where I feel challenged as a minister because of preconceived notions and biases I had."^{xx} This type of feedback from students was exactly what was hoped for in this process. As Luz notes, it gave her confidence, helped her to understand her strengths and weaknesses, but also took her deeper into exploring her own biases and preconceived notions. Being able to explore the tool throughout the year offers points for growth and continued challenge.

In addition to collecting the data for students to read, the data is also collected for the annual field education report to our CTU Committee on Assessment (COA). At the September meeting, the discussion focused on what data we wanted to capture. Our old COA tool had seven questions and was a separate tool from the evaluation write-up that the supervisors gave to students. The new tool is both the assessment tool for student feedback and is also used as the tool for COA reports. With over 27 different data points, there is almost too much data for the purposes of COA. The committee spent time with the tool itself and the data collected from the first year and ended up highlighting one question in each of the nine sections that would be the data points to capture for the annual COA report. They were intrigued by the ability to note factors such as how students moved closer (or not) to the level of integration. For example, in

the question under pastoral competencies: *Student exhibits respect for and authentic presence to others in pastoral settings (specifically, across race, gender, culture, identity, religion, age.)* In the fall semester, 43 percent of students were marked at the level of integration, whereas in the spring semester that number had moved up to 66 percent. However, in the question on vocational awareness—*Student articulates qualities of a minister and accurately assess those qualities at which they excel and those that may need further development*—21 percent of students in the fall and 22 percent in the spring had not achieved integration. Being able to note that type of movement, or lack thereof, over the course of several years will give greater insight into areas for improvement in the program overall.

STEP SIX: ACTION, REFLECTION, ACTION

As I look back over this whole process, I find that my initial hunch was correct. The tool we were using needed an overhaul. The nuance this new tool provides is critical. It is also quite helpful to get data sets at two different points in the year. A student can see where they were in the fall and again at the end of the year. This gives them insight into their areas of competence and which areas could use a little more focused development. Nothing takes the place of the individual conversations that offer students feedback, but this new tool provides a useful focus for these conversations. It is also helpful to see the data over time; tracing the questions that line up with the GSQ will be helpful as we continue to assess the field education program as a whole. It has made me consider the fact that the site supervisor fills out the tool, but the student fills out the GSQ. It might be important for the students' self-assessment to utilize similar questions so that when we track the GSQ questions it is their own self-assessment both times. They can see the tool the site supervisors use, so they have a sense ahead of time of the level of competency we are looking for in the course, but it might also be helpful for the two tools to be similar.

It has also been extremely helpful to have a tool that is digitally collected. This has made the whole process easier, not just for supervisors but for our office on the data collection end. In the past, we had site supervisors complete two different tools—the evaluation for students and the COA data form—and often site supervisors forgot to fill out the COA form. Now it is one integrated tool, and thus we get 100 percent participation for the COA data as well. Inviting everyone into the conversation throughout the process has also resulted in all participants having more enthusiasm for the process of assessment and the important role it plays not only in the development of our students but also in the ongoing creative improvement of the field education program at CTU. Revising the assessment was an extremely valuable process. I am sure I will be tweaking the tool along the way, rewording a question or two and continuing to make the tech run smoothly. But it was well worth the effort.

One tool down, three to go! We are planning to revise our student self-assessments, theological reflection faculty's assessment of students, and students' evaluation of sites. Although some of the questions might remain the same, the process will include key stakeholders, creativity, and openness to where the field of assessment can take us next. If assessment has had you in avoidance mode, perhaps this article gives a step-by-step guide to following your own hunch for adapting your assessment tools.

NOTES

Debbie Creamer, "Reimagining Assessment Language in Theological Education (via the Appalachian Trail)," *Theological Education* 52, no. 1 (2018): 3, <https://www.ats.edu/files/galleries/creamers-te-article.pdf>.

ⁱⁱ Susan Starr, "Moving from Evaluation to Assessment," *Journal of the Medical Library Association* 102, no. 4 (2014): 227, <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4188047/>.

ⁱⁱⁱ Karen Stiller, "Competency-Based Theological Education: Two Schools, Learning Lessons along the Way," *In Trust* (Spring 2020): 13, <https://www.intrust.org/in-trust-magazine/issues/spring-2020/competency-based-theological-education>.

^{iv} Stiller, "Competency-Based Theological Education," 14.

^v Halah Ahmed Alismail and Patrick McGuire, "21st Century Standards and Curriculum: Current Research and Practice," *Journal of Education and Practice* 6, no. 6 (2015): 150, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/322616880_21st_century_standards_and_curriculum_Current_research_and_practice.

^{vi} Alismail and McGuire, "21st Century Standards," 151.

^{vii} ATS Board of Commissioners, "Guidelines on Competency-Based Theological Education (CBTE)," revised June 2024, <https://www.ats.edu/files/galleries/guidelines-for-cbte-programs.pdf>.

^{viii} ATS Board of Commissioners, "Guidelines."

^{ix} United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, *The Program for Priestly Formation*, 6th ed. (Washington, DC: 2022).

^x Regis College, *Theological Field Education* (n.d.), see especially 32–36, <https://regiscollege.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Theological-Field-Education-Handbook-2021.pdf>.

^{xi} Larry Parsley, *Mentoring Handbook* (Waco, TX: George W. Truett Theological Seminary, 2023), see especially 30–35. <https://truettseminary.baylor.edu/sites/g/files/ecbvkj631/files/2023-04/Mentoring%20Handbook%20Revision%202023.pdf>.

^{xii} National Association of Catholic Chaplains, *Code of Ethics and Qualifications and Competencies for Certification and Renewal of Certification* (Milwaukee: 2022), <https://naocc.sharefile.com/share/view/s7eb171bf372245f1b0e9d808198cf1ff>.

^{xiii} See Steve Chambers et al., "Pathway Possibilities: The Lilly Endowment's Pathways for Tomorrow Initiative," *Reflective Practice: Formation and Supervision in Ministry* 43 (2023): 162–63, <https://journals.sfu.ca/rpfs/index.php/rpfs/article/view/1375/v43>

^{xiv} ATS Board of Commissioners, "Guidelines."

^{xv} ATS Board of Commissioners, "Guidelines."

^{xvi} Patricia Armstrong, "Bloom's Taxonomy," Vanderbilt University Center for Teaching, 2010, <https://cft.vanderbilt.edu/guides-sub-pages/blooms-taxonomy/>.

^{xvii} On deeper thinking, see "Questions That Promote Deeper Thinking," On Course, n.d., <https://oncourseworkshop.com/life-long-learning/questions-promote-deeper-thinking/>.

^{xviii} United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, *Co-Workers in the Vineyard of the Lord: A Resource for Guiding the Development of Lay Ecclesia Ministry* (Washington, DC: 2005).

^{xix} Personal conversation with site supervisor Bob Kolatorowicz at Old St. Patrick's Church in Chicago, summer 2023.

^{xx} Personal email from Luz Diaz dated January 11, 2025