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Abstract

This study presents a curriculum history of theological field education at Denver’s Roman Catholic seminary, St. John Vianney. The study utilizes archival material and the historical method to construct an educational *historiography* of the evolution and development of theological field curricula from 1910-2010. The research questions focus on two areas: the role of the Catholic Church in shaping seminary curricula and the adaptation and application of these Church guidelines by practitioners in the local context.

The study utilizes the conceptual tools of Kelly Ritter (2009) to analyze the findings in the light of socio-historical forces which shape curricula. According to Ritter’s conceptualization, socio-historical processes have a greater impact on curricula than “theoretical research-based arguments” (p. 19). The role of the Church in providing prescriptive guidelines for curricula in Catholic seminaries and the application and adaption of these prescriptions in the local context “opens the possibility of generating new conceptual frameworks” and “adds an important dimension to curriculum history” (Kliebard, 1992, p. xiii).
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Chapter One: Introduction
The Study of Curriculum History in Denver’s Catholic Seminary

Two years ago in Santa Fe...I came upon a book printed years ago on a country press in Pueblo, Colorado: *The Life of Right Reverend Joseph P. Machebeuf* by a priest who had worked with Fr. Machebeuf in Denver...What I got from Fr. Machebeuf’s letters was... the joyful energy that kept him going...

Willa Cather (1927)
(on her inspiration for the novel: *Death Comes to the Archbishop* regarding Denver’s first Roman Catholic bishop, Joseph Machebeuf)

All over Colorado, the Church founded schools and advanced education…

Thomas Noel (1989)
(on the goals of Bishop Joseph Machebeuf’s episcopacy)

Establishment of a Catholic Diocese in Colorado

The first Europeans to penetrate the American frontier, now known as *Colorado*, were Spanish explorers. These early explorers left a legacy of Spanish culture and language in Colorado including Spanish names of geographical features, for example, mountain ranges: *Sangre de Cristo* (“Blood of Christ”) and *Sierra Mojada* (“Wet Mountains”); notably, they also named (and claimed) the area, *Colorado* (“red”). Juan Archuleta (1664) and Juan Ulibarri (1706) were the first Spanish explorers to enter Colorado. At this time, the area north of Taos, New Mexico was a disputed frontier among the Spanish and French as well as Native American tribes.

In 1706, Captain Juan de Ulibarri led soldiers, settlers, and Native Americans along the lush Wet Mountains to the Arkansas River at Fountain Creek to help secure this area for the Spanish. Juan de Ulibarri documented the expedition in his diary
and officially claimed what is now Colorado for King Philip V of Spain (Hanley, 2011).

Along with language and culture, the Spanish also brought their religious faith.

Traveling with this expedition, a Franciscan friar, Father Domingo de Anza, established the first Catholic mission in Colorado in 1706 thus “planting the root” of what would become the present Catholic Church in Colorado. Almost 300 year later, the historian, Thomas Noel, notes that the unique journey of the Catholic Church in Colorado has “made Denver the hub of Rocky Mountain Catholicism” (1989, p. 60).

Institution of Denver’s Seminary

One key factor in the evolution of the Denver Catholic Church from a pioneer mission to a thriving archdiocese of over half a million members can be traced to the vision for education which was implemented in the form of a Catholic school system (one of the first in the West) by Colorado’s first bishop: Joseph P. Machebeuf (Noel, 1989). This vision was further actualized by another key event which impacted the Colorado diocese: the establishment of one of the few Roman Catholic theological seminaries in the American West.

The goal of opening a Catholic seminary in Denver was realized at the end of the 19th century through Bishop Machebeuf’s successor, Bishop Nicholas Matz, who worked to advance theological education in the Rocky Mountain West. Bishop Matz, the second bishop of Denver, was deeply committed to forming a seminary for theological study and for the training of priests. According to Colorado historian, Thomas Noel (1989), “Bishop Matz yearned for the day when his diocese would have its own seminary” (p. 58). The bishop made arrangements with the Congregation of the Mission
of Priests, commonly referred to as the Vincentians, an order founded in 1617 by St. Vincent de Paul in France. With the agreement of Bishop Matz, the Vincentians bought 59.5 acres of land in what is now southeast Denver (near the University of Denver) for $15,218 on November 10, 1906. The land would house the St. Thomas Aquinas Theological Seminary designated by Bishop Matz as a diocesan seminary. The Vincentian religious order was also interested in acquiring land in Colorado to establish a residence with a “healthy climate” for ailing priests. Initially, St. Thomas Theological Seminary was established with the dual purpose of theological study for Diocese of Denver priests as well as diocesan priests from the Rocky Mountain West. Additionally, Vincentian priests in poor health were allowed to recuperate on the campus (Archdiocese of Denver, 2008).

When St. Thomas Aquinas Theological Seminary opened in the fall of 1908, it became one of seven Catholic seminaries west of the Mississippi. The first edifice, a four-story, red-brick building which stands to the present, opened its doors to the seminarians who gathered in Denver from all over the Rocky Mountain West. The red-brick building housed 12 seminarians who tended to the adjoining farm and embarked on a six-year program to reach ordination (Archdiocese of Denver, 2008).

**First and second expansions.**

By the 1920s, St. Thomas Seminary had become the “seminary of choice” for many states in the West. In 1924, increased enrollment compelled the seminary to expand during the episcopacy of Bishop J. Henry Tihen. Bishop Tihen launched the “Seminary Crusade” which generated $600,000 for the seminary between 1924 and 1926. The funds
were used for new classrooms, dormitory, refectory, and chapel and included an impressive bell tower which was 138 feet high and was later, posthumously, named for Bishop Tihen. Additional expansion led to a new seminary building in 1926 and enrollment grew through the 1930s. In addition to the seminary buildings, the campus still included a working farm. Enrollment was highest in the 1950s and 1960s and three additional buildings were added to accommodate the student population in this period. In 1956, a new library was constructed under the direction of Archbishop Urban Vehr. The seminary continued drawing substantial enrollment through the 1960s (Archdiocese of Denver, 2008).

**Seminary reorganization.**

By the end of the 1970s, seminary enrollment had fallen and this trend continued through the 1980s. In 1995, due to budgetary problems, the Vincentian order announced the closure of St. Thomas Seminary. The facilities and the campus were deemed too large to maintain. Later, in the same year, Archbishop Francis Stafford purchased the St. Thomas campus from the Vincentians with the intent of reopening the seminary (Archdiocese of Denver, 2008).

In 1998, within a year following his installation as the Archbishop of Denver, Archbishop Charles J. Chaput announced plans to found a new diocesan seminary on the site of the former seminary. Beginning with the 1999-2000 academic year, the seminary was reopened under a new name: St. John Vianney Theological Seminary. In 2003, the archdiocese began a five-million-dollar expansion to accommodate growing enrollment encouraged by the leadership of Archbishop Charles Chaput. The expansion was
completed in 2004 to accommodate almost 100 seminarians studying for the priesthood in that year. An additional expansion was completed in 2010 to house students as a result of increasing numbers.

The historical chronology of the seminary’s development as an educational institution was impacted by diverse historical periods; likewise, the educational programs, themselves, reflect a unique historical development. As a member of the faculty of St. John Vianney Seminary, my personal interest in the unique educational history of the institution became the impetus for this study.

**Overview of Theological Field Programs in Seminary Education**

Pastoral formation requires that the seminarian be able to integrate what he has learned through *study* with what he has learned by *experience*.

(St. John Vianney Seminary, 2007, p. 1)

A unique aspect of Christian seminary education has been the development of *theological field programs* in which students study, reflect upon, and practice ministry in various contexts. These programs were forerunners of modern educational pedagogies such as *experiential education, service-learning* and *multicultural education* (Radillo, 2007; Dwyer, 2011). Seminary education and curricula (as well as secular curricula) have been shaped by prevailing historical circumstances (Murphy, 2006). Evolving through time, seminary *pastoral* (pertaining to the duties of a pastor) education programs, designed to prepare students for ministry, have also formed students to make a vital pastoral connections with the *particular* world of their day.
This discipline, historically described under several terms, *pastoral education / field education / practical theology*, is conceptualized as a form of “applied” theological education which utilizes course work as well as field experiences for learning about ministry. In recent decades, new pedagogies have generated programs with greater depth and sophistication such as *contextual education* programs in which curriculum is contextualized for specific settings. The theoretical component of these programs is addressed in academic classrooms but stretches beyond to field settings where service ministry is being practiced (Foundation for Pastoral Education, 2011). These settings include hospitals and health care facilities, educational institutions, children’s facilities, hospices, psychiatric and community facilities, geriatric and rehabilitation centers and faith community settings. However, appropriate settings for ministry have been conceptualized in multiple ways in different historical eras; this aspect has impacted curriculum through time.

**Pastoral Field Programs in Catholic Seminaries in the Modern Era**

In the modern era, the Catholic Church’s Second Vatican Council (1962-1965) called for formalized programs in pastoral education. Walter Abbott (1966) notes, in *Documents of Vatican II*, the Council members requested that “every [seminary] program should be joined with practical implementation and directed toward...a pastoral goal” (p. 442). In 1976, the Conference of Catholic Bishops advocated for comprehensive field education programs in seminaries to provide organized learning experiences and to develop professional knowledge and skills. These programs were to include pastoral training through supervised field experience.
By the 1980s, the Catholic Association for Theological Field Education had been formed. At this point, pastoral goals and guidelines as well as the program’s mission had become well-conceptualized. The National Conference of Catholic Bishops issued a mission statement for pastoral education in 1985: pastoral education programs are committed “to fostering the development of an integrated pastoral person committed to the mission of the Church and to providing the experiential context for ministerial learning” (p. 10). Additional goals and guidelines articulated by the Conference of Catholic Bishops reflect the integration of pastoral service skills and internal formation of the student through pastoral field education:

- To identify and articulate areas of needed personal and professional growth which emerge out of the experience of field ministry
- To foster a grasp of the global mission [of ministry]... and provide ministerial contexts which will expose students to issues of social justice and to the importance of social analysis leading to the development of appropriate ministerial responses
- To provide ministerial contexts which will prepare students for the emerging reality of collaborative ministry...
- To provide ministerial contexts in which students can develop an awareness of and sensitivity to the values of cultural or ethnic groups other than their own...
- To recognize and affirm ...the unique gifts of each student
- To enable students to test the call to ministry, both personal and communal, through the actual experience of ministry… (1985, p. 10)
The parameters and conceptualization of pastoral field education programs broadened as a result of a significant body of *encyclicals* (letters on theological or pastoral topics) written by Pope John Paul II in the 1980s, 1990s, and the first decade of the new millennium. Additionally, the development of 21st century education and contextual education, both influenced by modern educational pedagogies, were integrated in the development of applied theology programs in Catholic institutions. Emily Click (2010) comments on the historical evolution of this curricular area noting that programs on ministerial practice developed from supplementary work programs in the early part of the 20th century into a “crucial integrative” aspect of seminary education.

**Broadening Educational Scholarship through Curriculum History**

One key goal of this historical study is to document the theological field curriculum at St. Thomas Aquinas Seminary / St. John Vianney Seminary during key periods in the last century (1910 to 2010) and to document curricular changes. This study in *curriculum history* also investigates the impact of social and historical context on the evolution of pastoral field curricula in different eras. Changes in curricula, through time, reflect the prescriptive role of the Catholic Church and the role of local context in shaping these field programs, not only through the contextualization of curriculum, but also in the formation of the program, itself. In short, this study explores the unique history and development of pastoral field programs in Catholic seminaries and explores the socio-historical forces shaping these programs.
Following historical and archival methods for educational studies (Wolcott, 2001; Rury, 1993; McCulloch & Richardson, 2000; Hill, 1993), primary archival documents were utilized as data for research in this study. The abundance of historical materials available from the archives of St. Thomas / St. John Vianney Seminary allowed for an in-depth description and analysis of the seminary pastoral field curriculum at different points in time. (This archival collection has had rather limited use in terms of scholarly research.) These primary sources also allowed for an examination of the various social and historical forces that influenced pastoral field curricula including the influence of Church documents from different historical eras.

The study of curriculum history at St. John Vianney Seminary helps to fill an existing gap in the literature regarding Catholic seminary education. A majority of existing studies have focused on Protestant seminaries; there are very few comprehensive examinations of Catholic seminaries, especially in the American West, which differ, to an extent, in structure and curricula from their counterparts; in particular, the influence of Roman authority in establishing goals and guidelines through time constitutes a unique circumstance. This research seeks to contribute to the scholarship in the field of curriculum history through the scholarly examination of a “neglected narrative” of curriculum history, that is: the study of pastoral field curricula in a Catholic seminary in the American West.

**Potential value of this study for educational discourse.**

This research could contribute to the field of curriculum studies in general especially in regard to the multiple influences (such as local context) which impact
curriculum development. Educational theorist, Herbert Kliebard, notes the value of a study which brings “into focus a dimension of curriculum ...that might otherwise not be considered” (1992, p. 214). Such a dimension is found in this study which contends that the historical development of pastoral field curricula at Denver’s Catholic seminary reflects a unique process of integration between the universal Catholic Church (through Church Councils, Congregation of Catholic Education, papal encyclicals), and the local context; specifically, universal prescriptions are applied and adapted in the local context of the Diocese of Denver. Research findings on this dynamic process could be relevant to curriculum development in a variety of educational contexts.

In sum, the focus of this study, the historical development of theological field curriculum, is addressed through the lens of unique realities. First, the Catholic Church has played a significant role in providing prescriptive curriculum directives for the development of theological programs, including field programs, at the level of the local seminary; second, the local practitioners at St. John Vianney Seminary have applied and adapted prescriptive curricular directives in the local context of Denver’s seminary. This dynamic in the historical evolution of seminary field education is investigated through archival materials housed at the Archdiocese of Denver Archives and Special Collections. Specifically, the history of the theological field curriculum is explored in the context of the following research questions:

1. What role did Church history play in the development of theological field education at St. John Vianney Seminary?
2. How did practitioners at St. John Vianney Seminary apply and adapt prescriptive curriculum directives in the local context?

**Unique value of curriculum history scholarship.**

Curriculum theorist, Dwayne Huebner (1975), reflects: “The thread that ran through my questions and my searching was an intuition that an understanding of the nature of time was essential for understanding the nature of education” (p. 239). Huebner emphasizes the importance for educators of living “historically,” that is, taking into account the lived experience in each unique educational context. However, historical dimensions of education can be neglected in scholarship and by practitioners.

In his 1992 collection of essays tracing the history of various curriculums in America, Herbert Kliebard reflects that until recently there was “no such thing as curriculum history as an identified area of scholarship” (1992 p. xi). In educational scholarship, the history of curriculum has generally been addressed as part of the history of education and, subsequently, focused on schooling (Munro-Hendry, 2011). Consequently, the historical and social forces which shape curriculum development have been viewed through a lens which is too broad. Curriculum theorist and historian, Petra Munro-Hendry in her recent work, *Engendering Curriculum History* (2011), warns not to “truncate curriculum history” as this will “sever it from its past” (p. ix). The study of curriculum history allows insight into the context and process of how curriculum was constructed and chosen including the historical and social contexts. Munro-Hendry notes that certain curriculums are “possible and impossible in particular historical moments” and calls this the “conversation between curriculum theory and history” (2011, p. x).
Kliebard (1992) also notes the importance of using historical analysis as a “way of disentangling...” the construction of curriculum. The role of historical context in the development of curriculum and curriculum theories is articulated succinctly by Munro-Hendry: “Why and under what circumstances are certain forms of knowledge validated?” (2011, p. x).

“Excavating” the history of curriculum allows one to uncover and examine the “social, political and cultural dynamics of ‘knowledge’ and ‘learning’” (Munro-Hendry, 2011, p. ix). This excavation allows for scholarly examination of the historical and societal forces which shape curriculum including the values of a particular time as well as the theoretical approaches which guided curriculum development in different periods. Munro-Hendry notes that for the early Greeks: “[history] was not a means to situate events within a temporal framework but to understand the whole process of becoming” (2011, p.15). This Greek worldview can be applied to curriculum history. This process of “becoming” can be seen in the evolution and interplay of multiple forces which shape curriculum. “Declarations of what the curriculum ought to be, whether they are converted directly into practice or not, can become important artifacts...” (Kliebard, 2011, p. xii).

From these, not only can the evolutionary process of curriculum history be traced, but through the “excavation” of these curriculum artifacts “the values of a given society may be assembled” (Kliebard, 2011, p xii.). Kliebard continues: “A proclaimed curriculum is a potent way to validate certain areas of knowledge and belief...it can be extraordinarily revealing about the values a given society (or some segment) cherishes...” (2011, p. xiv).
Relevance of a seminary curriculum history: filling an existing literature gap.

Postmodern scholars note that what is told in a historical narrative is a “theoretical construct.” Historians such as Hayden White (1978) maintain that history “constructs” meaning from a “mosaic of sources” that are available from the past. These theoretical issues in the discipline of history are also reflected in curriculum history. Munro-Hendry (2011) warns that (like history) there are “narratives of curriculum history which have been refused and identity” (2011, p. xi). One such “neglected narrative” of curriculum history is seen in the understudied area of American Catholic theological seminaries, in particular, the evolution of pastoral field curricula in these seminaries. The dearth of research on significant areas of Catholic education has “distorted the history of education by neglecting one of the longest surviving continuous educational institutions in the United States” (Munro-Hendry, p.126).

Munro-Hendry (2011) further notes that, originally, religious beliefs deeply shaped American colonialism. However, when Enlightenment philosophies were brought to the New World, they “radically altered foundational ideas about the nature of education” (p. 129). Munro-Hendry observes: “no longer would moral or spiritual goals shape education, but a secular view of education for good ‘citizenship’ would come to dominate educational discourses” (2011, p. 129). From this historical turning point, the focus of American education shifts from religious institutions to secular institutions. This shift in focus to secular institutions impacted the scholarly discourse of education in America. Consequently, “the narrative of curriculum history” produced by theological seminaries was largely omitted; this narrative was “refused an identity” (Munro-Hendry,
2011, p. 13). Even in the present day, the lack of scholarly focus on seminary education and curricula creates a “gap” in the literature on the history of curriculum as well as in the history of education.

By including the scholarly presentation of understudied cases, such as seminary curricula, a new dimension is added to the field of curriculum history. Herbert Kliebard sees unique studies in curriculum history as valuable: “individual case studies of curriculum and studies of the evolution of particular subjects...add an important new dimension to curriculum history” (1992, p. xiii). Kliebard also believes that tracing the history of an individual curriculum “opens up the possibility of generating new conceptual frameworks for understanding the reasons why the curriculum in fact took the twists and turns that it did over any period of time” (1992, p. xiv). In addition to “generating new conceptual frameworks” for understanding curriculum history, Kliebard (1992) also sees unique cases as exposing hidden dimensions in the development and history of curriculum. Finally, Kliebard emphasizes the value of a unique case study as it “serves the function of bringing into focus a dimension of curriculum ...that might otherwise not be considered” (1992, p. 214).

Tracing the curriculum history of a seminary theological field program “opens up the possibility of generating new conceptual frameworks for understanding the reasons why the curriculum took the twists and turns that it did over any period of time” (Kliebold, 1992, p. xiv). Research findings of this understudied area encourage the exploration of similar dynamics in other curriculum histories; additionally, this research offers historical examples and insights regarding curriculum development and adaptation,
especially, the significant role which context plays in the formation, development and evolution of educational programs.

**Organization of this Study**

The first chapter of this study presents an introduction to the research topic: a field curriculum history of St. John Vianney Seminary; the study focuses on the Roman Catholic Church’s role in the development of seminary education and the application and adaption of Church guidelines in the local context of the individual seminary. In the second chapter of this study, the academic literature is reviewed covering the history and development of seminary field education. The third chapter summarizes the basic tenets of historical research, particularly, strategies and methods for archival research. The fourth chapter presents the research findings based on archival materials and the analysis of these findings. The findings are presented in an educational historiography, that is, a narrative presentation of history focused on critical examination of primary sources. The final chapter summarizes the research, addresses implications for prescriptive curriculum programs and suggests potential areas for further research.
Chapter Two: Literature Review
Historical & Theoretical Influences on Theological Field Education in Catholic Seminaries

Seminary formation includes the acquisition of an extensive and clear knowledge of the actual world on both the local and universal levels. A global vision would be unrealistic without this knowledge and understanding of local realities which are that part of humanity directly entrusted to the priest...(Synod of Bishops, 1989, p. 28)

Seminary education (including curricula) has been shaped by prevailing historical circumstances (Murphy, 2006, p. 8). This fascinating evolution is especially seen in the development of theological field education in which students practice ministry within an educational framework. Such programs utilize interdisciplinary curricula and field education to prepare students to make a vital pastoral connection with the world. Today, these types of applied theology programs in seminaries are often influenced by the pedagogy of contextual education in which curriculum is designed for a specific experiential setting; learning takes place not exclusively in academic classrooms but also in field settings where service ministry is being practiced (Foundation for Pastoral Education, 2011). These settings include hospitals and health care facilities, educational institutions, children’s facilities, hospices, psychiatric and community facilities, geriatric and rehabilitation centers, faith community settings and international settings. Through time, the theological field curriculum in seminaries has been conceptualized in multiple ways and impacted by local contexts, universal ecclesial contexts and different historical eras. This study seeks to explore how universal ecclesial directives were adapted in the
local context of St. John Vianney Seminary by focusing on the historical evolution of theological field education.

Due to the limited amount of scholarly literature in the area of seminary education, particularly in Catholic seminary education, a well-rounded perspective and thorough historical understanding of this area is still incomplete. Even so, important themes, insights and processes emerge in the review of scholarly work on the history of seminary education and the development of seminary curricular programs. In this study, the development of theological field programs or *pastoral field programs* (as these are often termed in Catholic seminaries) constitute the focus of this study: these experiential programs are designed to develop skills for ministry to “foster the development of an integrated person…and provide the experiential context for ministerial learning” (Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2006).

A historical survey of scholarly literature traces developments in Catholic seminary education which shaped the evolution of theological field programs; currently, such programs often embrace contextual theological education and 21st century education (Bastedo, 2005; Click, 2010). The scholarly literature in this curriculum history primarily focuses on education through the lens of historical change and reveals how changing climates and contexts shaped seminaries and their curricula. The historical literature ranges from the analysis of the Council of Trent (convened to implement church reforms in 1545) which influenced seminary education for centuries to recent historical studies which capture the current climate in seminary education. Such studies include the impact of the Second Vatican Council in the 20th century (focusing on the church in the modern
world) and the call for a 21st century global vision in the *new evangelization* of Pope John Paul II. These changing historical contexts influenced seminary education including curricular changes. For example, the historical period influenced by the Second Vatican Council, marked the implementation of formal field education curriculum as part of the seminary program of studies.

**From 1563: Historical Roots of Catholic Seminary Education**

Priest and scholar, Charles Murphy (2006), notes as do other church historians (Schreiter, 2004; White, 1989; Ellis, 1967) that the pivotal period for the development of seminary education is the sixteenth century. At this time, the Catholic Church was transitioning from the Medieval Period (500-1450 AD) to the Modern Era which dates to the beginning of the sixteenth century. In the middle of the sixteenth century, the Council of Trent (1545 AD) was convened by the Catholic Church to respond to challenges of the day. Of the many issues addressed, Murphy (2006) notes: “One of the most influential, enduring achievements of that Council was the creation of the *seminary*” (p. 13). The idea of a *seminary* (derived from the Latin “seed bed”) was not a completely new concept. Its roots can be traced to St. Augustine (354-430 AD) who gathered a community of priests and candidates together as the candidates prepared to be ordained as priests (Brown, 1969). Later, during the Medieval Period, *cathedral schools* were formed for the education of future clerics. Local priests taught various subjects. In addition, there was a tradition of required service centered around the cathedral itself. Students did various chores related to the upkeep of the cathedral and helped with the liturgies.
Though early forms of preparation for clerics existed, church historian, Joseph White (1989), notes that, before the Council of Trent there was not a formal concept of a seminary for training priests; that is, there was no set of universal practices for this endeavor. In the final session of the Council of Trent (1563), the seminary decree issued by the Council advanced the concept that, in preparation for ordination to the priesthood, “there should be professional and moral training for the tasks of ministry” (White, 1989, p. 1).

Hubert Jedin (1957) notes that the theme of the work of the Council of Trent was articulated by Cardinal Giovanni del Monte: “The aim of our reforms is the revival of pastoral ministry, the care of souls” (p. 356). This theme gave shape to the idea of founding formal institutions (seminaries) to educate and train priests to serve the community well. The decrees of Trent regarding seminary education reflected the previous historical tradition in which students undertook both study and service. It is from here, in the Council of Trent documents, that the seminal formation of the seminary program was shaped; academic study and “apprenticeship for ministry” formally begins in theological seminary education (O’Donahoe, 1957, p. 171). The Council of Trent’s legislation on the creation of seminaries has long been considered among Church historians as “the most important creation of the Council” and “among the most fruitful of its undertakings” (Ellis, 1967, p. 40).

The actual implementation of the decree on seminaries of the Council of Trent is first seen in the work of Charles Borromeo (1534-1584) recognized by the Catholic Church as a saint. Borromeo was prompt to implement the decrees of Trent and “the first
to march in behalf of priestly education” (Ellis, 1967, p. 42). In December 1564, he opened in Milan the first of several seminaries. Borromeo established degree-granting institutions and recruited educated Jesuits to staff these new seminaries. Additionally, Borromeo established what would be referred to today as “pastoral field experiences” in these seminaries. Students would be given assignments in local church parishes and conduct missions throughout the diocese (Murphy, 2006, p. 20). Charles Murphy (2006) notes that the vision shaping Borromeo’s conception of the seminary was the care of souls. Thus, for the ideal seminarian, prayer, renunciation of self, and penitential asceticism were not particular individual exercises but “practices and energies placed at the service of pastoral ministry” (Headly, 1988, p. 25). According to Borromeo, himself, one of the primary duties of the priest was “to be present to his people in the parish...” (Borromeo, ca. 1566). This sense of the priesthood emphasized pastoral concern (pertaining to charitable duties of a pastor) for the people such as visiting the sick. Borromeo was known for his ministerial presence and practice of charity; during a plague in Milan, he ministered to the sick and ordered all the draperies in his episcopal rectory to be cut up and given to the poor for clothing. Among Borromeo’s lasting legacies was the establishment of the Tridentine (derived from Trent) seminary, “giving it a particular shape and vision which would influence seminary education for centuries to come” (Murphy, 2006, p. 21).

Historical studies on this topic note the unevenness of seminary development at this time including variations in the success of newly founded seminaries as well as variations in seminary life in different local contexts (Ellis, 1967, p. 2004; White, 1989).
One such example is the variation in the speed of implementation of Trent’s decree on establishing seminary education; unlike the Italian states, the implementation of seminary education was realized more slowly in the various countries of Europe. In France, in 1611, Bishop Richleau of Lucon began plans for a seminary which opened in 1612 when the bishop purchased a building near the cathedral with his own money (Ellis, 1967). According to Ellis (1967) and White (1989), the establishment of seminary education in France was furthered by a group of priests dedicated to clerical reform through “a systematic program of preparation for the priesthood” (p. 49). Termed as “France’s 17th Century Seminary Movement,” this focus on seminary education was led by Vincent de Paul and Jean-Marie Eudes (both recognized as Catholic saints) as well as Jean Olier, founder of the Sulpicians (a religious order). Ellis (1967) notes that the mid-1600s proved to be an especially fruitful decade for French seminary education. The establishment of the famous Seminary of Saint Sulpice in 1642 allowed its founder, Fr. Olier, to implement a broad vision of seminary education. Ellis (1967) notes the connection between the seminary and the local community:

Fr. Olier always placed high value on this relationship [between seminarians and the local parish] since he felt it was important for candidates for the priesthood to be associated as closely as possible with parochial activities which would occupy so great a part of their later lives. (p. 54)

Paul Broutin (1957) cites another innovative seminary model of a French clergyman, Adrien Bourdoise. Fr. Bourdoise developed a system in which seminarians received training in the practical aspects of ministry under the direction of a local parish priest. Seminarians actually lived in a community at a local parish. Fr. Bourdoise established similar communities of seminarians in other cities; each group was autonomous but with
the common model of pastoral formation in a parish (Broutin, 1957). A modified version of this French model is in place, currently, in seminaries in the United States including St. John Vianney Seminary in Denver (Dwyer, personal communication, 2011).

The movement in France to establish formal seminaries according to the decree of the Council of Trent was successful and produced numerous seminary locations in the second half of the seventeenth and the early part of the eighteenth centuries (Broutin, 1957). Recognizable in these early seminaries, in its seminal form, is the pastoral field training which would eventually evolve into field education programs in later centuries. At this time such activity was conceptualized as an *apprenticeship*.

In the latter half of the eighteenth century, the changing political and cultural history stifled the growth of seminary education not only in France during the turmoil of the French Revolution, but elsewhere in Europe. Subsequent years of European warfare closed diocesan seminaries. Political circumstances also affected seminaries in Germany; a bishop’s right to operate a seminary was not recognized (Ellis, 1867). During the nineteenth century, smaller numbers of episcopal seminaries survived. As Europe’s seminary growth came to a halt, the Catholic community in the United States was beginning its formal organization including the founding of seminaries (White, 1989).

**European Influence on Seminary Education in the United States: 18th & 19th Centuries**

The work of Church historian, Joseph White, reflects a scholarly trend in the 1980s focused on preserving the history of American seminaries. Joseph White’s landmark
study constitutes one of the few comprehensive surveys of diocesan seminaries in the United States. A study with a similar theme was compiled through the Catholic Seminary History Project which held meetings in the 1980s in order to compile seminary histories. Other local seminary histories were preserved in archives of dioceses, universities, seminaries and religious orders.

Most studies of American seminary education are embedded in scholarly studies of the history of seminaries or as a theme in American Catholic history studies. The first American Catholic seminary was founded in Maryland in 1791; the early development of seminary education can be discerned through scholarly historical accounts of the Catholic Church in the United States and Europe at this time.

The inauguration of American seminary education in the late 1700s arose as a result of the French Revolution. Amid arrests and killings of clergy in France, an emissary from Rome advocated for the establishment of an American seminary which would be staffed by French priests. John Carroll, Bishop of Baltimore, supported the proposal for the establishment of a seminary on American soil (Ellis, 1967).

In 1791, four priests, and a superior arrived from France and landed in Baltimore. The superior, Fr. Nagot, purchased what was known as “One Mile Tavern” and four adjoining acres of land. Ellis (1967) notes it was “here, St. Mary’s Seminary, the mother seminary of the United States, had its humble beginnings” (p. 63).

As a result of the immigration of French priests, American Catholic seminary education was impacted by the history of seminary education in France, particularly, by reforms for clergy and pastoral work experiences put in place by religious orders.
The Sulpicians and Vincentians had particular importance in the development of Catholic seminary education in the United States (Broutin, 1957). St Thomas Aquinas Seminary (St. John Vianney Seminary) in Denver was founded by the French order of Vincent de Paul: the Vincentians. For many years, the Seminary of St. Mary’s in Baltimore remained the principal center for the education of candidates for ministerial priesthood (Morris, 1932).

However, as the 18th century moved into the 19th century, immigrants from Europe flooded the American Catholic Church (White, 1989). Through this century of growth, the Catholic Church opened seminaries in many local settings. However, these seminaries depended heavily on priests recruited from Europe for faculty. White (1989) notes, at the same time, local bishops “established seminaries in response to local needs and interests across the country…[and] following different institutional models” (p. 26). Ellis (1967) cites the positive relationship which the European seminary faculty enjoyed with local American communities. According to the Catholic Directory (1868), by the time the Civil War had ended, the Catholic community in the United States had established 50 institutions for the education of clergy for ministry.

**Turn of the Century: the Americanist Era in Catholic Seminary Education**

By the late nineteenth century, the American Catholic community was over a generation removed from the massive European immigration that took place earlier in the century. The Catholic population had expanded significantly and at the turn of the century it had passed the 12 million mark (Catholic Directory, 1910). Clearly there was a need for increased establishment of seminaries in order to serve the burgeoning
Catholic population. By 1900, seminaries of the 1860s had more than doubled. A large number of these new seminaries were still run by religious congregations or orders. Among these were the Vincentians, Benedictines, Redemptorists and Jesuits (Broutin, 1957). These religious group established pioneer houses in the United States and in time added theological seminaries (Ellis, 1989). The American Church followed the tradition outlined in the Council of Trent that assigned the program and content of clerical training to local bishops (White, 1989). As a result, there was an emphasis on providing education appropriate for the local church. The Benedictine seminaries founded at the turn of the century educated diocesan candidates in the context of local parish ministry that even included farm work. Church historians (White, 1989; Ellis, 1967) note that there was a new interest in articulating skills “appropriate for the United States” (p. 163). This point of view was shared by “Americanist” churchmen such as Cardinal James Gibbons, Archbishop John Ireland, Bishop Bernard McQuaid, Bishop Camillus Maes, and Rev. John Talbot Smith. The Americanists left a body of writings that envisioned the “model” priest for America schooled in a range of professional skills (White, 1989).

The vision of Church leaders of the early 20th century reflected the development of seminary education designed for the local context. Pope/Saint Pius X influenced the development of seminaries in America. In his encyclical (a letter to the Church) of 1903, Pope Pius X urged the bishops of the world to focus their attention on the importance of the seminary: “Your greatest diligence therefore, will be directed toward the right government and ordering of your seminaries so that they may flourish…” (1903, p. 9). American clergy such as Bishop Bernard McQuaid, saw this task in terms of promoting
a break from the past. McQuaid (1897) commented in an article in *American Ecclesiastical Review* that he did not see any justifiable reason why Church authorities in America should be hampered by the customs of older countries, where innovations are considered to be almost sacrileges. Bishop McQuaid (1899) articulated his vision for American seminaries in annual letters and journal articles on the importance of training priests. He saw the need for integration in the context of America:

> To meet the difficulties of such an age, the church needs that her clergy be equipped with depth and broadness of knowledge…We cannot shut our eyes to what is going on in the world, and in preparing our young men for the ministry, it is a duty to prepare them for the world as it is today. (p. 214)

Americanist ideas of the new “model priest” informed the programs of seminary life and learning. For example, new textbooks of pastoral theology were published to aid the priest’s ongoing learning and professional skills (Jedin, 1957). Pastoral training was gaining an educational dimension through seminary curriculum development. White (1989) notes that the practical and professional qualities needed in priestly ministry were treated systematically and were appropriate for seminary instruction in the two manuals of pastoral theology that appeared in the period: “These were the first textbooks on the subject arising from the American experience of ministry” (p. 214). They included basic instruction but “within the context of national customs” (p.214). Additionally, these texts addressed the priest’s expanding pastoral activities in the American parish. The first manual, *Pastoral Theology* by William Stang appeared in 1896; Stang’s text stressed the importance of adjusting to American culture in pastoral work. The second work, *Manual of Pastoral Theology*, by Frederick Schulze (a professor at Milwaukee’s St. Francis Seminary) was published in 1899. The development of
seminary education with reference to the local American context began to shape seminary programs including pastoral training into the forms they would take in the future.

Scholarship on seminaries of the period also focus on several influential Catholic prelates at the turn of the century: Cardinal James Gibbons of Baltimore and Archbishop John Ireland of St. Paul, Minnesota. Cardinal, Bishop Camillus Maes of and Rev. John Talbot Smith of New York (White, 1989; Ellis, 1967; Jedin, 1957). Cardinal Gibbons saw the importance of developing seminaries with an American character. Speaking about the value of a native priesthood, he notes:

If the Church is to take deep root in the country and to flourish, it must be sustained by men of the soil, educated at home, breathing the spirit of the country, growing with its growth and in harmony with its civil and political institutions. (Sinclair, 1922, p. 530)

Archbishop John Ireland was also a proponent of the American seminary; he emphasized an open and broad approach on the part of clergy to the world in which they lived (Sinclair, 1922). Ireland opened a seminary in St. Paul, Minnesota and elaborated his Americanist views in talks to students of St. Paul’s Seminary. Bishop Ireland believed in addressing the particular pastoral needs of the United States (White, 1989).

Bishop Camillus Maes echoed the visions of Gibbons and Ireland in a series of articles in *American Ecclesiastical Review* (1896). He developed the vision of an American seminary by outlining a model seminary program. Bishop Maes saw the seminary existing in close collaboration with local churches and instructors as mentors
actually modeling ministerial skills. Bishop Maes noted that, in this way, the seminarians would have “the opportunity of taking their first steps in the work of ministry under the vigilant eye of their teachers” (p. 437).

Father John Talbot Smith, although not a seminary educator himself, contributed to the discourse on American seminary education during this period at the turn of the century. Fr. Smith (1896) presented in his book, *Our Seminaries: An Essay on Clerical Training*, a program for reform of seminary education which included the importance of considering the American context for the formation of diocesan priests: “In considering the seminary, Fr. Smith first looks to the American context in which the priest practices ministry” (White, 1989, p. 218). Fr. Smith thought the priest should be prepared to interact with “the entire American nation” (p. 218). In addition, Fr. Smith believed that seminary education should prepare a student for local ministry including the study of his surroundings, his people and the ways and means to reach and help them. Fr. Smith (1899) contended that seminary curriculum rarely recognized anything but philosophy and theology and “these often isolated from present conditions and without practical application” (p. 100).

Smith’s writing on seminary education influenced churchmen in charge of seminaries. The rector of St. Paul Seminary reported to Smith that his book was read aloud at meals (White, 1989). In this same period, Rector J. Conaty of Catholic University of America organized a conference on seminary education at Saint Joseph’s Seminary in New York. In addressing the assembled rectors from other seminaries Conaty (1898) noted: “Our young cleric...must also be prepared to enter in the field of
social and economic reform...” (p. 401). He was not the only seminary educator who saw a need for broader education for clergy. The years before and after the turn of the century had been a time of significant growth and development in which the American seminary had achieved a new importance and visibility in American Catholic life (White, 1989). The views of Cardinal Gibbons, Bishops Ireland, McQuaid and Maes and the educational reform and curriculum work presented by Fr. John Talbot Smith and William Stang reflected a similar theme: The education system needed to produce effective priests engaged in the “practical tasks of ministry” in the United States. White (1989) notes that the call for integration into the American context broadened the concept of the development professional skills for future priests. This pastoral issue subsequently inspired new developments in America’s seminaries especially in Boston, New York and St. Paul.

Although pastoral field training was not seen as an education program, the Americanist seminaries implemented pastoral field experiences to help seminary students develop professional skills. These seminaries sought to provide pastoral experiences in various ways. At St. Mary’s Seminary, a program of visiting hospitals and poor houses one afternoon each week began in 1894 and was organized as a charitable society under the name Association of St. Camillus. In these visits, described by Anthony Vieban (1905), seminarians sought “by friendly conversations and kindly acts to acquire over the individual such a strong personal influence as may be exerted for his or her real good and happiness” (p. 249). These were non-denominational institutions and seminarians made no attempt to proselytize or to overtake the work of chaplains. The value of this pastoral
experience lay in teaching the student “how to console, cheer, and judiciously aid the needy; it enkindles within his breast love for the poor and ready sympathy for the afflicted” (Vieban, 1905, p. 249). This type of pastoral experience was also established in other places. New York seminarians participated in a program of visits to charitable institutions which also included catechetical instruction (Vieban, 1905). The seminaries of the period reflected a new interest in “enlarging” clerical learning.

This view was eventually expressed formally by an American church council: the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore articulated the need for future priests to possess the professional skills appropriate for the tasks of ministry in the United States (White, 1989). Based on the work of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, a committee produced a Plan of Studies for seminaries. The document gave detailed attention to the curricula and texts of seminary courses, making recommendations for the program of studies (Hogan, 1898). A record of curriculum change influenced by the Third Council of Baltimore can be seen in the form of course catalogs and program descriptions. St. Mary’s Seminary in Baltimore produced its first printed catalog for the school year of 1894-95. Along with the standard seminary program of studies, records show inclusion of studies in natural sciences, geography, political conditions, and renewal of Scripture studies curricula. Hogan (1898) notes a pastoral course was offered in the final year before ordination; the course consisted in practical pastoral functions. William Stang’s text, Pastoral Theology, was recommended.

Church historians (White, 1989; Ellis, 1967) mention the active discourse at this time as new standards of seminary learning impacted active seminary educators. Through
the transitional period spanning the years before and after the turn of the century, the *American Ecclesiastical Review* and seminary conferences provided for a public discussion of seminary issues. This rise in discourse through articles and printed addresses of conferences “disseminated new ideas concerning the organization of seminary life and learning” (White, 1989, p. 244). An overarching educational and historical theme during this pivotal period was the new vision of seminary educators who had stressed the importance of “wide learning” as necessary for the priest in the modern world. This call for more integration into the outside world was implemented first in local contexts.

**First Half of the Twentieth Century: Implementing Roman Direction**

The 20th century stands out for the significant proliferation of theological seminaries in the American Catholic Church (and other denominations as well). At the same time seminary education expanded, Roman authority increased its influence in seminary education (White, 1989). The first part of the 20th century was marked by juridical reorganization…and centralized direction of all aspects of Catholic life. In 1915, the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities was created under Pope Benedict XV. Through Church decrees, *encyclicals* (letters), or *exhortations* (guidelines) Rome began to have an impact directing the intellectual content of seminary curriculum (White, 1989). This was a new development in Church history, as since the Council of Trent, the local bishops had been the key figures in determining the program of the diocesan seminary. However in the next 50 years, Roman authority, through the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities called for guidelines in the development
of seminary programs (Ellis, 1967). The role of local context also played a part in the implementation of these guidelines. Joseph White (1989) notes: “In the United States, universal ideals met the realities of local applications” (p. 266).

Roman direction was reflected in the reigns of Popes Benedict XV, Pius XI, Pius XII and John XXIII through authoritative statements that “informed the content of seminary learning…” (White, 1989, p. 268). Pope Benedict XV in *Cum Novum Juris* (1917) prescribed a new Code of Canon Law which included Canons 1364 and 1366 which treated academic issues in seminaries. Contained in these was prescribed a course in pastoral work which included teaching catechetics, visiting the sick and attending to the dying (White, 1989). Pope Benedict the XV also issued the encyclical *Humani Generis* which stressed importance of the priest’s role and skill in the modern world. By the 1920s, several Roman directives prescribed more specific guidelines for seminary curriculum including Latin, Greek, moral theology, scriptural studies, church history, canon law, liturgy, homiletics, music, natural science. Regarding pastoral training, Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities issued a letter requiring a course in teaching pedagogy for catechetical instruction including practical exercises for seminary students (White, 1989). Sociologist, Philip Murnion’s (1978) contemporary examination of priests trained at St. Joseph’s Seminary in New York in the 1920s provides an overview of seminary education in the 1920s and its relation to ministry. Through questionnaires and interviews, Murnion’s study found that the aspects of ministry given great stress in the seminary did not correspond to the realities of their activities in the parish. The alumni of St Joseph Seminary pointed to the need for
development of ministerial skills such as “attending the sick, administering the sacraments, working with schoolchildren and…youth” (Murnion, 1978, pp. 113-114).

In the decade of the 1930’s, significant need caused by the Depression impacted practices and training in seminary education. Developments in charitable extra-curricular and co-curricular areas in the 1930’s took seminarians beyond the seminary… “to the life of the local church and to practical training for the tasks of ministry” (White, 1989, p. 345). In association with seminary programs, much of the practical training for ministry was done through diocesan or national Catholic agencies in the 1930s and subsequent decades. For example, Catholic bodies such as the St. Vincent de Paul Society provided food, clothing and shelter to many during the Great Depression and seminarians assisted in this charitable work.

In the 1940s and 50s, courses in catechetics and teaching pedagogy were needed in seminaries; seminarians engaged in a variety of teaching activities outside the seminary in accordance with local needs and arrangements. Although not officially seminary programs, these partnerships in practical training enabled seminarians to practice skills before ordination and “enlarged their perspective to the wider activities of pastoral life beyond the seminary” (White, 1989, p. 347). The impact of this experiential work in teaching eventually impacted the curricula of seminaries and by the 1950’s courses in catechesis and pedagogy were part of the program of studies in conjunction with field experiences in teaching. White (1989) notes field education had not yet been implemented as a seminary program, however, training for pastoral tasks represented a movement toward preparation of seminarians for church life beyond the seminary.
Papal encyclicals issued to the worldwide Church continued to impact and alter approaches to the priesthood and seminary. A call for social reform was issued in the encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno* by Pope Pius the XI in 1931. In the encyclical, Pope Pius XI called for a program of bringing the ideals of Christian social and political reform to society; the encyclical emphasized the mutual responsibility of all to care for those in need. By the end of the decade, precepts in this encyclical were implemented in the academic program of St. Mary’s of the Lake Seminary in Chicago. A course was introduced on social problems to prepare seminarians in their last year of study of ministry. The course included guest speakers who were contemporary activists. The course “gave equal prominence to vital questions of the day with speakers who lived out the theoretical premises of the church’s social teachings” (White, 1989, p. 352). Speakers included Dorothy Day, founder of the Catholic Worker movement, social justice leader, Catherine de Hueck, Rev. John LaFarge, an influential Jesuit on inter-racial issues, and Bishop Robert Lucy who spoke on labor issues in the American Southwest. Although field training was not part of the course, the exposure to these leaders involved in social issues helped to form priests with a desire to act on social issues (Avella, 1982).

This call to social reform was gaining ground elsewhere and, in the 1940s, several local reform movements were formalized into the Catholic Action Movement (Wuenschel, 1948). A key component of this movement was the goal to deal with the *immediate* and the *local*. In 1942, the Seminarian’s Catholic Action Movement was established. A basic text, *Theology of Catholic Action* by Theodore Hesburgh was provided for study groups. By the end of the 1940’s, the Catholic Action Movement was
established in 60 seminaries and with Rome’s official blessing was integrated into the
seminary curriculum of the period (Wuenschel, 1948). This included integrating Catholic
Action themes explicitly in courses on social encyclicals, pastoral theology and
apologetics; additionally, 19 seminaries offered a course on Catholic Action (Ellis,
1967).

Another envisioning of the training needed for ministry was implemented in the
1950s-60s with the addition of sociology and psychology courses in America seminaries.
In this period, Jesuit sociologist, Joseph Fichter, produced several studies of American
Catholic parishes in the South. These new sociological studies on parish life inspired
concern among Catholic sociologists as to how to promote the study of sociology in
seminaries. As one Catholic sociologist suggested: “Surely... a seminarian preparing to be
a priest...should know as much as possible about the human heart and mind, the human
environment and social milieu in which humans are born, mature, marry, raise a family,
grow old and die” (Schuyler, 1959, p. 56). Subsequently, the American Catholic
Sociological Society formed a committee to promote the teaching of sociology in
American seminaries. By the end of the decade, numerous seminaries had established a
sociology courses in the curriculum (White, 1989). This process was encouraged
by the work of a Jesuit, Joseph Schuyler, who sought to advance the movement to
establish sociology as part of the seminary curriculum, gathering and citing statements of
recent popes on the importance of formal preparation for the church’s social mission
(Schuyler, 1959). Schuyler also endorsed sociological studies because of their direct
relevance to effective pastoral work.
By the end of the 1950s, seminarians’ involvement in pastoral work outside the seminary began to suggest the need for academic preparation for this work. The more integrated connection between seminary and community was addressed in the encyclical of Pope Pius the XII, *Menti Nostrae* (1950), in which he emphasizes the need to “diminish...with due prudence the separation between the people and the future priest in order that when he... begins his ministry he will not feel himself disoriented [or] injure the efficacy of his work” (p. 95).

An awareness of the dichotomy between spiritual formation and professional preparation was emerging by the early 1960s (Schreiter, 2004; White, 1989). Pope Pius XII’s, *Menti Nostrae*, in the previous decade presented a basis for seminary reform. In the following years, the work of Second Vatican Council allowed for educational reform in the organization of seminary studies.

**New Directions in Seminary Education: Second Vatican Council (1962)**

In the early 1960s, American Catholic seminaries reached their zenith in terms of numbers with 500-600 seminaries operating in the United States (Ellis, 1967). At the same time, in the fall of 1962, Pope John XXIII opened the Second Vatican Council, a historical gathering for which 2500 bishops from around the world assembled at the Vatican. In annual meetings for the next four years, the participants in Vatican II (as the Council came to be known) set the course of a period of church renewal (including seminaries) prescribed in the documents produced by the Second Vatican Council. In the subsequent decades of the 20th century after Vatican II, significant reform continued to take place in seminary education supported by the vision of Pope John XXIII and Pope
Paul VI who called for renewal “in the sphere of thought and word, in prayer and methods of education...” (Schreiter, 2004, p. 174).

Church historians (Ellis, 1967; White, 1989) note that in the wake of Vatican II, there transpired a reconsideration of every aspect of seminary education. This included reform of seminary curricula and programs and implementation of new pedagogies such as field-based education. John Ellis (1967) cites a flood of scholarly work in Catholic journals calling for renewal and reform “all offered in the belief and hope they will improve and strengthen seminaries” (p. 175). Ellis, writing in the 1960s, noted: “a candid reappraisal of the seminary’s aims and methods in the light of contemporary conditions will assist the priests of the future” (p. 176). Church historian, Charles Davis (1963) also writing in the period, noted: “matters of great pastoral importance are comparatively neglected” (p 198). Church leader, Patrick Riordon, Archbishop of San Francisco expressed concern that students were not trained for the ministry they would exercise day to day in their respective diocese. Bishop Riordan noted that almost all students would be employed in the active ministry of parish work (Ellis, 1967). Contributing to discourse on seminary reform, Ellis noted that after the Vatican II, there was a need for more broadly educated priests in order to prepare them for the “varied and complex problems of contemporary society” (p. 253). Ellis wrote:

the Church stands in desperate need of the most highly trained and skilled priests whose expert knowledge in a variety of fields will help others to illume the intricate problems of their lives and to heal deep wounds, whether of a personal or social nature, with which so many souls are now afflicted. (p. 254)

A Vincentian priest, Stafford Poole, published a book calling for more integrated and less isolated seminary education. Poole (1966) contended that: “if the seminary
is to keep abreast of the modern world, it is going to have to be reunited organically with lay (public) education” (p. 14). Another key call to reform was a collection of essays *Seminary Education in a Time of Change* (1965). Most of the contributors were active seminary educators. Another edited volume, by Maryknoll priests, James Keller and Richard Armstrong (1964), noted the “weak relationship between the content of formal seminary learning and the themes appropriate for the priest’s pastoral role…” (p. 96).

As a result of the work of Vatican II on the subject of educational reform in seminaries, Pope Paul VI appointed Archbishop Gabriel Garrone to oversee seminary matters. In 1966, Garrone issued a letter authorizing seminaries to undertake educational reform; this letter inaugurated the formal process of seminary renewal (White, 1989). Following the guidelines of the Second Vatican Council, the U.S. bishops established the Committee of Priestly Formation.

This committee began work to issue guidelines for the various programs of American seminaries and these guidelines were approved in 1969 by the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops and were used through 1976 (White, 1989). White (1989) notes academic programs were also addressed in the guidelines including directives to implement field education programs. Contemporary church historian, John Paver (2006), notes that a movement to place some kind of field-based learning in the curricula of seminaries took place from the 1950s. However, this was the first time field education was formally integrated into the seminary education program. White (1989) cites the guidelines specifically:
The program of pastoral formation proposes that every seminary have a field education program under a priest who is a member of the faculty. Field education is to be integrated with spiritual and academic aspects of the seminary. The experience of the seminary [includes] parish work…work in religious education, hospitals, charity and community organizations…(p. 418)

The development of field education programs was strongly influenced by the work of Charles Feilding’s (1966) article, “Education for Ministry” published in the journal, *Theological Education*. In his article, Feilding provided a clear articulation of the educational value of field work and also signaled the need for a stronger theoretical base to support pastoral training. Through Feilding’s work, the theological education community gained a greater understanding of the value of field-based education. Paver (2006) notes that Feilding advocated for professional models of field education: “the most important and immediate task for seminaries was to direct their concerted efforts toward a professional model of education of which field education could be an important component” (p. 13).

Models for field education became the topic of conferences and discourse; Paver (2006) cites a 1969 conference as the beginning of a search for quality models. In terms of formal programs and curriculum models, Paver considers the work of James and Evelyn Whitehead (1975) as the first to recognize and develop a systematic approach to field education and the connection between supervision and theological reflection (p. 15). The Whiteheads articulated various conceptual components of field education: first, field education consists in the application of theology to the practice of ministry; second, field education entails the acquisition and development of ministerial skills; third, field education is the locus of pastoral theology (Whitehead & Whitehead,
This was groundbreaking work for the future of field education as the themes of supervision and theological reflection became core concepts (Paver, 2006). For the next 20 years, the Whiteheads developed their ideas on the integration of theology with the practice of ministry and published *Method in Ministry* (1995) in the 1990s.

**Influence of Contextual Approaches in Field Education: Moving to the 21st Century**

As a formal emphasis increased, both Catholic and Protestant seminaries in the United States developed supervised field education programs for ministry (Brelsford, 2008). Students served as interns in field assignments under the direction of a priest or minister in churches or other settings for community ministry. Additionally, standards were established for these programs.

In the 1970s, due to the rise of multicultural population in the U.S. and the growth of diverse congregations in Christian churches, ministry in specific *cultural contexts* began to be addressed more formally. In 1979, Catholic theologian, Karl Rahner called the attention of the theological community to an important dynamic: the dramatic growth of the Christian community in Latin America, Africa, Asia during the 20th century. For Rahner, this shift in population also meant a shift into a new era characterized by diverse worldviews and “pastoral needs unprecedented in Christian history” (Rahner, 1979, p.716). In the same year, Pope John Paul II in *Catechesi Trandendae* (1979) wrote about the importance of culture in *catechesis*, i.e., religious instruction. He cited the importance of seeking “to know cultures and their essential components” and the importance of “helping them to bring forth from their own living traditions original expressions of life, celebration and thought” (p. 53). Out of these pastoral needs, there began to be
developed new models of theological field education among Catholic seminaries (as well as seminaries of other denominations) which came to be termed: *contextual theological education* (Click, 2010).

Theoretical influences, relating to broader shifts in general education, further influenced applied theology entering the 1980s (Click, p. 2010). Foremost, among these educational theories, was the work of Paolo Freire (1970) who pointed to the role of *praxis* in education. Emily Click (2010) cites Freire’s work and notes:

> His development of these epistemological understandings has strengthened the ability of field educators to make the case for the crucial importance of engaging students in work that generates mutually informative interactions between theoretical and contextualized learning experiences. (p. 12)

Rev. Robert Schreiter (1985), a professor at Catholic Theological Union, reflected upon the movement to integrate Freire’s work in theological endeavors: “The concept of *praxis* reaches beyond mere action to include the *reflection* upon that action…” Schreitier (1985) cited “Christian performance” as more than “mere action” which also “moves beyond an intellectual formulation…” (p. 119).

Freire (1970) established that all learning is contextual in that *practice in context* is shaped by and also informs theoretical work. The work of Freire (1970) impacted the evolution of field education in seminaries as his theories informed the development of these applied programs. Field education programs explored new pedagogical approaches which aimed at integrating theological learning in authentic settings. Click (2010) notes that, influenced by Freire’s ideas, pastoral field education programs utilized the approach of contextualizing, within active ministry, the learning gained in
theological academic programs in order to effectively prepare students for ministerial work. Currently, contextual learning has been appropriated and adapted even further for theological field education (Click, 2010).

Beginning in the 1980s, the election and scholarly work of a respected Polish Cardinal, Karol Wojtyla, who took the name Pope John Paul II, had a significant impact on the development of Catholic programs in seminaries. Pope John Paul II’s pontificate initiated visitations (1981) of seminaries with the collaboration of local bishops. Roman feedback from these visitations included a recommendation which shifted the emphasis from that of long periods of field experience to the reformulation of practical training to include *theological reflection* (White, 1989). The transformative theme found in Freire’s theoretical work was also developed in ecclesial writings in later decades.

The reflective component of current field education curricula is cited by numerous seminary educators (e.g., Click, 2010; Bellinger, Dash & Jones, 2010; Bryan, Docampo, Hughes & Spann, 2010). This reflective component was influenced by Freire’s concept of *praxis* and further developed by seminary educators as well as Church guidelines; this curricular component integrates the important connection between action and reflection: “The practice of ministry simply cannot be separated from the practice of reflection. Those in ministry are called to be practical theologians, what Donald Schon calls *reflective practitioners*” (Mahan, Troxel & Allen, 1993, p. 75). Emily Click (2010) notes that contextual forms of field education have “inculcated” reflection. She cites the important work of Donald Schon (1987) advocating intentional strategies and pedagogies for reflection which further shaped field curricula. Moreover, Click(2010) points out that
one of the main curricular objectives in contextual field education is “to teach ministerial reflection” (p.14). According to Click, this process encompasses theological reflection, skill-building and the growth of self-understanding.

Click (2010), reflecting upon the evolution of theological field education, notes that contextual elements of field education may have been present in the past informally; however, she notes that current models are based on structured pedagogies arising from theological and educational scholarship. As a result of the theoretical and pedagogical transformation of field education by contextual approaches, the discourse has broadened and allowed deeper analysis of the effectiveness and purpose of these seminary programs.

The scholarship of current seminary educators (Jenkins & Rogers, 2010) views the implementation of contextual approaches in pastoral field programs as having a crucial role in the preparation of seminary students for ministry. Mary Mullino Moore (2010) observes that contextual approaches to field education have developed greatly since the 1980s when they first appeared in seminary curricula. Moore notes the deeper development of contextual programs in terms of pedagogy. She cites discourse around issues such as engagement as well as curricular expansion into areas such as historical traditions, theoretical constructs and social analyses.

Moore (2010) has also advocated the inclusion 21st century skills as a key part of the curricula for contemporary theological field education programs including: emotional discernment, multiple interpretive and analytical abilities (e.g., cultural competence) and skills related to effective crisis response. She contends that specialized
21st century competencies are needed to prepare students for the social service ministry, clinical ministry, educational ministry and ecclesial ministry of the future. Alice Rogers (2010), in reflecting on the most recent decade of theological field education, sees an overarching trend in the curricula as moving toward competencies reflected in 21st century education. She sees this as vital for seminary students who must learn, for the future, how to engage in ministry in emerging contexts.

Another body of scholarship focuses on intercultural competencies as a key component of theological field education (Tortorici, 2010; Daniel, 2008; Lindstrom, 2011). Tortorici (2010) sees intercultural competency as a crucial feature of 21st century contextual pedagogy: “Intercultural competencies include the skills, attitudes and behaviors that enable us to be effective in our ministry across cultural contexts” (p. 55). Tortorici (2010) also sees intercultural experiences as transformational and as an example of Freire’s praxis:

This [intercultural curricula within contextual approaches] is transformational when students become aware of the limitations of their own culture, integrate this awareness into a new self-understanding and then make informed choices based on the integrated information. (p. 49)

The scholarly work of seminary educators also influenced current field curricula. In the case of Catholic seminaries, the work of Pope John Paul II was integrated into the development of field education (and other) programs. John Paul II was an advocate of key competencies called for by the challenges of ministry in the 21st century. In 1999, John Paul II’s encyclical Ut Unum Sint (“That All May Be One”) called for the advancement of peace education with the particular emphasis of skills in dialogue and intercultural competencies:
Dialogue is an indispensable step along the path toward human self-realization…of each individual and of every human community…Although the concept of ‘dialogue’ might appear to give priority to the cognitive dimension…it involves the human person in his or her entirety… (p. 11)

Reflecting the influence of ecumenical exchange, Walter Brueggemann (2010) of Columbia Theological Seminary also writes on the importance of dialogical exchange in *practical theology*. He writes: “Practical theology of this sort is intensely dialogical…it refers to an engagement with the other whereby one is put at risk, impacted and likely changed” (p. xii).

Michael Bastedo (2005,) educational theorist, points to the role of context in his work on curriculum change in the 21st century: “Social movements can be a key mechanism for curricular change” (p.479). Additionally, Bastedo notes: “value-based visions can create new content and produce new organizational structures in the curriculum” (p. 479). This type of “value-based vision” identified by Bastedo can be seen impacting the development of applied theological curricula in American seminaries including St. John Vianney Seminary. The *Program of Priestly Formation* (2006), describes the Roman Catholic Church’s vision for ordained ministers: “an abiding priestly identity, a cooperative priestly ministry and an integrated priestly spirituality” (p.1.). The realization of this vision requires self-reflective, contextual and integrated theological field education to prepare students for ministry and service “lived out” in local faith communities.

A final, specialized body of scholarship in educational historiography makes use of archival materials to investigate (or revise) the history of various educational topics including curricula. Kelly Ritter (2009) uses archival materials from Harvard and Yale to
trace basic writing curriculum in a socio-historical context. Based on her research, Ritter proposes conceptual labels for a number of socio-historical processes which she believes play a formative role in the evolution of a particular curriculum such as the (symbolic) location of a curriculum and the tradition of an educational institution. Ritter focuses her study on the 20th century. Ritter’s (2009) study will be utilized as a conceptual tool to address the research questions in this study:

1. What role did Church history play in the development of theological field education at St. John Vianney Seminary?

2. How did practitioners at St. John Vianney Seminary apply and adapt prescriptive curricular directives in the local context?

David Gold (2008) also utilizes archival materials to “examine rhetorical education at three institutions previously neglected by historical study” all founded to serve disenfranchised communities (p. x). Gold sees each institution as representing an important source of information regarding the development of higher education in the United States. Gold focuses his study on the late 19th century and the first half of the 20th century. Other scholars investigating curriculum through archival research include a 2005 study of 19th century textbooks in Archives of Instruction (Carr & Carr, Schultz) which notes the tendency for scholars to treat this period dismissively. The work of these scholars seeks to “recover and preserve teaching practices from the past” as well as “to account for the political, economic, educational and other forces” that have affected curriculum and instruction (North, 2000, pp. 66-67).
Chapter Three: Methods
Historical and Archival Research Methods in Education

Anchor events in meaningful moments.


It is a mistake to leave historical analyses of the social sciences to professional historians…In order to recover our own disciplinary history and advance our intellectual understanding of past events, scholars in the social sciences must learn to use the materials that historians have staked out traditionally as their own.

Michael Hill (1993)

Rationale for Historical Research in Education

Research methods that permit the study of events “at a distance” greatly increase the range of questions that can be investigated. One such historical method is archival research which uses records, artifacts and documents as a source of data; thus, the research is one step removed from actual observation. Archival methods allow the study of research questions from earlier times in history as well as studies which take place across long time spans (Peterson et al., 2004).

Archival research uses “archival data” which is comprised of data already collected by someone and which is contained in a variety of sources: manuscripts, educational records, service records, documents. correspondence, newspaper clippings, administrative records, material artifacts, books, photographs, etc. (McCulloch, 2004).

Barbara Craig (1996) writes about the importance of fostering archival research
in educational studies. She sees archival research as especially valuable in longitudinal studies and in comparative studies (1996, p. 105). McCulloch (2004) further articulates the value of archival research noting its “immense importance for educational…research” regarding both the past and the present: “It is crucial for our understanding of the past, but is also potentially significant for contemporary research and for demonstrating the development of issues over time” (p. 73). Archival research, then, is an appropriate methodology for curriculum history studies; in this study, historical and archival methods of inquiry are used to describe and interpret the history and context of curriculum development at St. John Vianney Theological Seminary through key phases in the seminary’s history from the early 20th century through the initial decade of the 21st century in order to trace the impact of social and historical influences on curriculum during this period.

Historical and archival research methods are designated as qualitative approaches to educational research. Historical method has a long tradition of use within the field of education. Harry Wolcott’s (2001) definitive text on qualitative research includes a chapter on historical method. J. Rury (1993), educational historian, suggests that historical research served as the seminal form of qualitative inquiry (p. 247). Michael Hill (1993) contends that historical research offers particular value to social sciences including the study of education. Examples of the use of historical method in educational studies include research surrounding the development of educational institutions over time, the origin and development of current educational systems, educational structures and practices and their development and the evolution and history
of curricula (Cohen et al., 2007). Additionally, historical research adds the dimension of context for educational inquiry. Such research can shed light on numerous aspects of education which are “historical creations…that have much to do with their cultural surroundings” (McCulloch & Richardson, 2000, p. 6).

Historical research in the service of educational inquiry provides background, insight, and context for current issues in education. McCulloch and Richardson (2000) conclude that “historical research is an important means of understanding and addressing contemporary concerns” (p. 5). McCulloch (2004) further stresses the value of historical studies in education, especially the ways in which this history relates to current issues, contemporary problems and policies. McCulloch (2004) notes:

In linking the past to the present [though research]…They [historical sources] are a significant medium through which to understand…and to find ways of reconciling the historical with the contemporary. (p. 7)

McCulloch especially emphasizes that the value of documentary research lies in its ability to establish relationships between the past and the present. Michael Hill (1993), historian of social science and archival scholar, contends that it is a mistake to leave historical analyses of the social sciences to historians. He notes that historians typically are not familiar with the intellectual inquiry and organization of projects of social science (including education). In particular, historical analysis questions are framed differently; thus, many core issues in the social sciences are not addressed adequately. Hill concludes, “social scientists must learn to use the
materials that historians have staked out traditionally as their own” (1993, p. 4). Hill contends that “excavating the unknown, the unwritten or the unrecognized” (p. 5) in the history of education requires reversing the conventional wisdom of social research. Hill (1993) also emphasizes, in his volume on strategies for archival research, that archival projects are embedded in standing institutional patterns and practices and therefore the social scientists (including educators) are well-positioned to recognize the social context of archives and make theoretical sense of archival activities.

**Historical Method as Qualitative Inquiry**

The historical method is similar to other qualitative methods of research with its focus on collecting, interpreting and reporting data. Like most qualitative forms of inquiry, historical method follows an inductive process where the themes and insights of research emerge as the study is conducted and are not predetermined (Jordanova, 2006). A key distinction regarding historical research is the fact that such research relies on pre-existing finite sources or data that must be discovered by the researcher. These sources can be fragmentary and contain arbitrary gaps in information which makes the interpretation of sources immensely complicated. Rury (2006) explains that unlike other qualitative social science researchers “historians cannot gather evidence up to the point that they feel important questions have been addressed” (p. 325). Instead, they must interpret and must construct meaning from the sources that have survived.

Although there is much diversity in methodological approaches in historical research (Jordanova, 2006; McCulloch, 2004), there are still basic procedures in historical research and method prescribed in the discipline. The scholarly literature
describes the historical method as a three-part process (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007). The stages of this process summarized by Jordanova (2006) consist in: first, identifying and gathering primary sources; second, evaluating, analyzing and interpreting these sources; third, constructing written arguments using the sources. Primary sources are key elements of traditional historical research and they are defined as “original documents produced at the time one is studying and the implication is that these bear direct witness” (Jordanova, 2006, p. 95).

Historians also rely on the secondary sources which pertain to their topics. These secondary sources are described as “the writings of other scholars not necessarily historians, but anyone who has commented on a historical situation, possibly using primary sources without being a participant” (Jordanova, 2006). McCulloch & Richardson (2000) note that, though secondary sources rely on existing scholarship, they often suggest new perspectives which broaden former understandings. Scholars use secondary sources to shape and focus their research questions and to provide context for their studies.

The scholarship on historical method calls for interpretations based on multiple types of sources and data. Additionally, historical interpretations should be considered provisional and open to new interpretation of the evidence (Jordanova, 2006). As Rury (1993) notes, conducting historical research involves a constant interplay between evidence and interpretation (p. 259). McCulloch (2004) points to the importance of understanding historical documents in relation to their milieu, in other words, “to relate the text to its context” (p. 6). McCulloch elaborates further that effective
historical research investigates the circumstances from which the document was produced as well as the effect or reception of the document. McCulloch contends: “Documents are social and historical constructs and to examine them without considering this [context] misses the point” (2004, p. 6).

Elements of Effective Historical and Archival Method

As previously noted (Jordanova, 2006), the historical research process centers around three phases: identifying and gathering primary and secondary sources; evaluating, analyzing and interpreting these sources; ultimately, constructing a written account of the research findings and analysis using these sources (presented in Chapter Four of this study). As noted earlier, primary sources play a key role in historical research despite the fact that a limited number of primary sources survive through time.

John Creswell (2009), in his guidelines on qualitative research, offers a number of key strategies that qualitative research (including historical method) can use to strengthen the credibility of findings; these qualitative research strategies are applied in the archival research done for this study. First, Creswell suggests multiple sources should be utilized to support claims in the research. The literature on historical method emphasizes the need to provide multiple examples and to corroborate information using several types of sources. Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2007) advocate comparing information from primary sources with the information available through secondary sources to gain greater context. Creswell (2009) notes the importance of spending a significant amount of time in the field thus enabling the researcher to develop “an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon under study” (p. 192). This can be applied
to an archival study as researchers need to spend adequate time in archives locating and organizing relevant sources as well as exploring and analyzing the specific contexts of sources and their relationship to one another (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007). A thorough understanding of primary sources utilized for research allows for a deeper and more accurate interpretation of archival materials (McCulloch, 2004).

**Primary Source Materials**

Primary source materials are the focus of traditional research methods in the discipline of history. Rury (1993) notes that “the quality of the documentation… will determine to a certain extent the value of the insights one can achieve” (p. 267). McCulloch (2004) notes the notion, in historical research, of a hierarchy of documentary sources which operates in the category of primary sources:

- Manuscript materials held in archives and private collections would occupy the first level of the hierarchy…unpublished and relatively inaccessible documents appear to carry greater intrinsic worth to the historical researcher… (p. 31)

Due to the fundamental importance of sources, historical method stresses the need to critically analyze and evaluate sources. For archival research (used in this study of St. John Vianney Seminary), the primary sources are mainly two-dimensional documents. According to historical method, the first level of analysis involves establishing the authenticity of primary source documents to ensure they are authentic (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007). The next level of analysis involves placing and understanding documents in their historical context. Jordanova (2006) notes that
documents are complex and multi-leveled and require researchers to move beyond the surface of the content to understand their meanings. Cohen, Manion and Morrison note that documents are “social products, located in specific contexts, and as such have to be interrogated and interpreted rather than simply accepted” (p. 203).

Important interpretive issues that should be addressed in analyzing documents for historical research deal with questions surrounding their context; this includes questions about the production, consumption and content of documents as well as questions about their author, purpose and context (Prior, 2003; Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007). Cohen, Manion & Morrison (2007) offer a list of key questions to allow the researcher to begin to develop the context surrounding the documents. Each question may open a variety of subsequent questions; in such cases annotations can be made for each question:

- Who wrote the document?
- What can be established/inferred about the writer?
- What was the status/position of the author?
- When was the document written?
- What type of document is it?
- What was the original intention/purpose of the document?
- What were the political and social contexts surrounding the document?
- What were the intended outcomes of the document? (p. 202)

Additionally, Cohen, Manion & Morrison (2007) offer questions for the historical researcher which address deeper research issues including implicit or latent purposes
of the document, how the document should be read, the meaning of exclusions in the document, and the place of the document in the overall research project.

Limitations of primary source materials.

Jordanova (2006) points out the importance of considering the limitations of documents in research. She notes the main limitation is the fact that there is an element of serendipity and chance regarding the particular documents which were preserved in archives. For such reasons, historical researchers must assess whether or not the archival primary source materials are truly representative or sufficient to address the research question. To address this limitation, McCulloch (2004) suggests that a range of archival sources should be utilized including a variety of primary source material including visual sources such as photographs, paintings, sketches. McCulloch notes: “There is an important sense…in which methodological pluralism can be attained through the use of different types of documentary sources” (p. 129).

McCulloch and Richardson (2000) note that unpublished primary sources tend to be less accessible than other primary source documents. This is due to the fact that unpublished primary source documents are kept, according to standard practice, in restricted areas of public archives or many times are part of private collections. Those categories of unpublished primary sources most often used in educational research consist of: unpublished documents relating to educational policy and administration, unpublished documents of individual educational institutions such as schools and universities, personal papers of administrators, teachers, educational reformers, and others whose work touched education in some way (McCulloch & Richardson, 2000).
Research on specific educational institutions such as schools, colleges and universities as well as informal agencies of education such as libraries and churches can be initiated through primary documents located and stored in the institution, itself (McCulloch & Richardson, 2000). This type of archival material is not always available as it may have been lost or destroyed due to a geographical move, closure of an institution or due to unsuitable storage conditions. In some cases, these primary sources have been donated to another repository such as a county records office (McCulloch & Richardson, 2000).

If material has survived and is available for study at the institution, conditions of access may vary and it is important to research limitations regarding access. Primary sources on educational institutions which are commonly more accessible include magazines, log books, student records, handbooks, schedules and minutes from a variety of meetings (McCulloch & Richardson, 2000). Magazines, brochures, yearbooks and publications for special occasions produced by an institution often give insight into a wide variety of issues related to the institution and student life including the ‘culture’ of the institution. Log books also may shed light on issues not specifically academic in nature (McCulloch & Richardson, 2000).

**Institutional materials.**

Student records consist in two types: the data recorded by the educational institution on the student population and records left by the students themselves. The records left by the students themselves are also important for providing insight into education from an experiential perspective. Student work “often demonstrates
a wide difference between the official curriculum represented by the textbook and the lived curriculum encountered by the student” (Richardson & McCulloch, 2000, p. 103).

The administrative records of educational institutions can be important primary sources in historical research of educational institutions. Richardson & McCulloch (2000) note that, in some cases, it is possible to find records of informal meetings relating to curriculum or a department or a special program which “can shed light upon educational aims and practices within the institution” (p. 104). Administrative correspondence of the institution is another type of primary source material that can yield much valuable research data (McCulloch, 2004).

Historical case studies of educational institutions often make extensive use of a range of institutional records. The use of such records involves ethical considerations for which it is most important for the researcher to observe at all times. Specifically, where records “identify people who are still alive, it is important for the researcher to be sensitive about their possible use, maintaining anonymity in cases where identification may cause embarrassment or offence for either personal or professional reasons” (Richardson & McCulloch, 2000, p. 104).

Personal materials.

The records left by particular individuals, whether prominent or obscure, can also be of significance for historical researchers (McCulloch, 2004). Personal papers and records may contain a wealth of information “about the personal experiences of an individual and also regarding the wider relationships and the context in which they worked” (Richardson & McCulloch, 2000, p. 107). McCulloch and Richardson (2000)
again warn that it is especially important to observe ethical considerations regarding access and use of personal documents for historical research.

**Visual sources.**

Another kind of documentary evidence is *visual sources* which have attracted growing attention from social and historical researchers over recent decades (Prosser, 1998; Unwin, 1983). Often utilized as supporting evidence to illustrate themes and historical arguments, visual sources can often form the basis of historical analysis in their own right (Unwin, 1983). Examples of two-dimensional visual sources utilized in relation to education include paintings, plans, photographs, cartoons and sketches (Richardson & McCulloch, 2000). Along with such two-dimensional sources, it is important also to recognize the potential role of physical artifacts of education such as school desks and buildings. Thus, unpublished, archival and visual sources may be examined as potential source material for historical research in education. Artifacts, photographs and the various types of other primary source materials have strengths and weaknesses in relation to the type of research being done. Richardson & McCulloch (2000) note that research designs “must always be informed by the research question that is being addressed” (p. 119).

**Archival sedimentation of sources.**

Another important concept in the consideration of effective historical method is attentiveness to *archival sedimentation*. This term refers to the “routes” by which historical materials come to rest in an archival collection. Michael Hill (1993) notes that researchers often encounter a type of “fragmentation” in archival collections due to
the “sedimentation” of archival collections. Hill notes that this lack of systematically organized collections “lies in the myriad routes and conditions under which materials are donated to archives” (p. 9). The organization’s (or individual’s) materials and documents which are deposited in an archive have gone through a primary “vetting” process in which some materials are saved for posterity and some are discarded: this is termed, primary sedimentation, by archivists. There is also a socio-cultural component to archival collections because what is saved is what is determined to be important or significant. These initial collections also may be impacted by erosion; that is, mishaps such as flood, fire or various types of accidents may destroy or wreak havoc on paper records.

Michael Hill (1993) notes a related process impacting archival collections termed, secondary sedimentation. This process refers to archival donations regarding a primary collection which come from individuals other than the original donor. Hill (1993) observes that notes, memos, and documents may accumulate in many disparate places and may increase both the complexity and richness of archival sedimentation. A third type of sedimentation affecting historical archival collections is termed, tertiary sedimentation, and refers to sorting, arrangement, erosion and discarding of materials in the archive, itself. When materials are designated for deposition in an archive, they come into the province of the archivist responsible for the collection. Hill (1993) observes: “Archivists typically accept donations contingent on having discretion to discard or return materials they deem unimportant or not appropriate to the mission of the archive” (p.16). Thus, tertiary sedimentation occurs when archivists accept or
reject materials according to the priorities of the organizations for which they work. Hill cautions: “Archival priorities and organizational practices directly influence what materials researchers find in archives and the condition in which they find them” (p. 17).

The priorities that archivists use to accept donations and the schemes that archivists use to organize and index specific collections are key features of tertiary sedimentation. One example of archival arrangement affecting research is the fact the collections are primarily organized chronologically rather than by topic area or subject matter. This organizational system may “hide” from the researcher important or crucial documents as these are organized primarily by a date. Additionally, non-manuscript items, such as photographs, may be separated from the regular collection and separately arranged thus obscuring for the researcher relevant archival information.

Thus, through the process of primary, secondary and tertiary sedimentation, historical materials come to rest in archival repositories. Hill (1993) reflects on the historical preservation of these collections noting that they are “filtered by the combined imprint of personal machinations...organizational mandates, archival tradition, natural accidents and human error” (p. 19). Even so, Hill concludes that the diligent researcher may find in this authentic historical material the “data from which to make sense of individuals, organizations, social movements, or socio-historical processes” (1993, p. 19).

Archival Research Methodology for an Educational Study

Velody (1998) underscores the importance of archival research in historical Method: “As the backdrop to all scholarly research stands the archive. Appeals to truth, adequacy and plausibility in the work of the humanities and social sciences rest on
archival presuppositions” (1998, p. 1). Creswell (2009) suggests that the focus of historical research in education should be “purposefully selected.” The selection of St. John Vianney Theological Seminary as the focus of this research study provides a historical perspective through archival research on one of the few Catholic seminaries in the American West in the 20th century and at the beginning of the 21st century.

**Accessing primary sources for this study.**

The majority of archival documents used in this study as well as photographs are located in the Archdiocese of Denver Archives and Special Collections. Additional archival documents are housed at DePaul University in Chicago, Illinois in the Vincentians Special Collections. Access to the collections at DePaul University is available through formal requests for limited copies. The Colorado Historical Society is another archival repository that contains material related to St. Thomas Aquinas / St John Vianney Seminary. Types of sources housed in the archives for St. John Vianney Seminary (formerly, St. Thomas Aquinas Seminary) represent standard university archival material: course catalogs, yearbooks, student publications, newspaper articles, brochures, handbooks, administrative documents and personal papers of administrators, faculty and students as well as photographs. Access to these sources is obtained through appointments with the Archdiocese of Denver archivist.

According to Creswell (2009), one of the most important strategies for strengthening qualitative research (including historical method) is to include a detailed presentation of the research process in which all the data is described and addressed. The research plan for this study centers around the Archdiocese of Denver Archives and
Special Collections of St. Thomas Aquinas / St. John Vianney Seminary located at the John Paul II Center for the New Evangelization in Denver. The preliminary phase of research involved surveying relevant primary sources available for the study and logging these in different eras of the seminary’s history; the log for primary sources was kept on USB flash drives. Creswell (2009) recommends an electronic format for the organization of notes in any type of qualitative research.

**Taxonomic approach for archival research.**

The primary systematic methodology for this research follows the work of archival scholar, Michael Hill (1989, 1993). Hill’s work on archival methodology uses a *taxonomic approach* (Graban, 2010) to structure archival research. Hill’s specific methodology utilizes the conceptual categories of research “targets and tool kits” (p. 27). Hill (1993) outlines a strategy for archival research and discovery which utilizes named “targets” for the research question and archival “tool kits” which supplement and aid the research.

Hill’s systematic process for archival research requires the initial identification and naming of “targets” for the research topic; these targets guide the collection of data for the research question. In Hill’s words: “The targets you select guide your search for repositories” (1993, p. 26). Hill also notes that it is not unusual to shift focus as a research project unfolds thus expanding the search process to any number of new targets. Hill delineates several types of “target searches” in an archival collection such as “a primary name-oriented search” which is often the most useful (1993, p. 27). Hill (1993) also outlines two other types of target searches: “topical searches” related to the research
question and “local searches” which utilize the “named holdings” of an archival collection to guide the search for relevant repositories. Hill notes that proper names (people, programs, publications, organizations) are guiding elements in the construction of most archival collections. Hill further notes that target-oriented searches are especially appropriate for “government agencies, professional societies, academic organizations and formal associations” (1993, p. 27).

Hill (1993) acknowledges that “a major puzzle in archival research is how to find archives and collections useful to one’s investigation” (p. 33). The target-oriented research strategy is a key method to locate archival deposits relevant to the research question. Hill (1993) recommends the compilation of a “master list of targets” which would include his prescribed categories of targets: proper names, key research topics and relevant named holdings in an archive. Sub-topics and related research topics could also be recorded as part of the master list. The compilation of the “master list” is the first step in building a taxonomy of specific research targets. Hill (1993) recommends that the master list of targets be logged on index cards or arranged in a computer file. This study utilized coded flash drives.

In the case of studying an organization, Hill (1993) suggests that the master list of proper-name targets could contain: names of leaders in the institution or other administrative heads, agencies or associations to which the institution belongs, or other institutions with shared objectives similar to the target organization. Hill also suggests listing any type of publication sponsored by the institution. In short, the master target list should be used to locate potentially useful archival repositories.
The topical targets contained in the master target list can be used to identify archival materials in a specific subject area (Hill, 1993). Topical targets can be established in order to explore an institutional sphere of interest to the researcher. For example, the topic area “pastoral field programs” in this study could be used to identify some archival materials through cross-referencing in the St. John Vianney material in the Archdiocese of Denver Archives. However, the collection (at this point) is not completely indexed. Consequently, this research process followed Hill’s recommendation:

Where indexing is superficial or nonexistent, there is no sound alternative but to visit potentially relevant archives and read diligently through likely collections in the hope of finding pertinent documents. (1993, p. 35)

The final type of target, a “local search” target, is utilized through a survey of the actual named holdings of Archdiocese of Denver Archives (Hill, 1993). Hill & Deegan (1991) recommend that researchers use logical relationships to determine which named archival holdings may provide the most useful information for the research and this recommendation was followed for this study.

**Archival tool kits.**

Along with the selection and naming of research targets, Hill (1993) utilizes the concept of archival “tool kits.” These research aids organize and supplement the archival research process. One such tool is comprised of bibliographies the researcher constructs on historical data related to the research question, especially, published studies on the specific topic of the research: “It is useful to know what other researches have
discovered, if anything, about designated archival targets” (Hill, 1993, p. 29). A targeted
literature review on the research topic provides a foundation for the archival research.

Another tool kit for archival research is found in directories and indexes of
archival collections. For example, *Directories of Archives and Manuscript Repositories
in the United States* (1998) gives information on archival repositories to help researchers
identify potential archival locations. Some archival collections also have names holdings
available electronically.

A final archival tool is found in the professional knowledge of the archivist.
Contact with the archival curator of a collection allows the researcher to determine
how much relevant information is contained in an archive, any related historical
collections and relevant research aids for use in examining the archives. Additionally,
professional archivists can usually provide the names of scholars or other researchers
working with a particular or similar collections who may be open to conferring about
their work. Finally, professional archivists are often able to guide researchers to specific
archival materials on the basis of a direct request and can make recommendations to
facilitate the research process.

Research aids in the archives, themselves, included electronic notes on a
“lap-top” computer: Microsoft Office research charts were utilized for notes.
Wolcott (2001) suggests using informal notes to address conceptualization and
interpretation of the research material, new topics informed by and arising from
the research and the outline of the study in general. A copy machine in the
archives served as a useful tool in order to cite resource material accurately.
Gathering of archival sources involved organizing material through the master list and identifying themes related to research questions. Source material was also sorted according to historical periods (Creswell, 2009). Themes arising from the source material were organized chronologically as well. The manifestation of initial themes allowed a more directed focus as the research progressed as noted by Jordanova (2006): “Generally, the conceptual framework chosen exercises a large measure of influence over the sources used and vice versa” (p. 97).

**Interpretation of source material in archival research.**

Michael Hill (1993) contends that archival records are embedded in standing institutional patterns and practices; therefore, “social scientists are well-positioned to recognize the social context of archives and make theoretical sense of archival activity” (1993, p. 5). Interpretation of research source material consists in “close, critical reading…to allow a source to yield up its riches” (Jordanova, 2006, p. 159). Jordanova suggests that archival material can be analyzed somewhat in the manner of a literary critic with special attention paid to language, organization, use of metaphor including historical resonances. According to Jordanova (2006), this close reading allows the researcher to move from texts to contexts. According to Jordanova (2006), a text must be set in its context of production, that is, the historical and socio-cultural context which “gave birth to them” (p.160).

Rury (1993) suggests that the researcher is ready to construct arguments and present these in written form at the point of arriving at an “interpretive stance” within a research project. Jordanova (2006) notes that, in historical research, the goal of
“completeness” is simply impractical explaining that this type of research must be evaluated in terms of the researcher’s goals and the limited data selected for the study. Thus, utilizing historical interpretation to construct the written findings guided by research questions requires the researcher to use:

- historical [source] materials and ideas in a coherent argument,
- showing their significance. making convincing plausible claims
- based on research findings, and employing theories and frameworks appropriately. (p. 161)

Jordanova (2006) also cites as important the ability to make connections, to see patterns and links while integrating different types of materials in a cohesive whole. McCulloch (2004) advises utilizing “the established precepts of working historians which can be applied more broadly to educational and social research” (p. 29). The use of these guidelines for historical method was applied in this study of curriculum history.

The archival data used in this study consists primarily of existing documentary materials of St. Thomas Aquinas Seminary / St. John Vianney Seminary in Denver, Colorado. These materials included seminary course catalogs, course schedules, flyers, registrar’s materials, memorandums, handbooks, spiritual guides, annual publications, daily schedules, guides for student formation, accreditation documents, administrative documents, public relations documents, committee meetings, annual reports, photographs, course bulletins, supplemental bulletins and letters. Archival information relevant to the research questions was logged on flash drives.
Use of the Historical Method to Address Research Questions in this Study

As noted earlier, the three basic steps for historical research include identifying and gathering primary sources, evaluating, analyzing and interpreting these sources, and constructing written findings using these sources. Seminary curriculum at St. John Vianney Theological Seminary was chosen as the focus of the research in this curriculum history. This study explores the dynamics of curriculum development (as documented in archival materials) in a seminary in the American West (which is an understudied area).

To initiate the research process, primary sources were gathered relevant to the research questions which focus on the evolution of theological field curricula through time. The research questions explore the impact of local context on field curriculum development and the impact of ecclesial directives on field curriculum development in Denver’s Catholic seminary, specifically:

1. What role did Church history play in the development of theological field education at St. John Vianney Seminary?

2. How did practitioners at St. John Vianney Seminary apply and adapt prescriptive curricular directives in the local context?

Using archival material for analysis.

The archival materials acquired in this study are important sources for documenting seminary programs, standard curricula, and evolution of the curricula through time. For example, seminary course catalogs provided evidence to chart changes in seminary curriculum. Nash (2005) notes that descriptions of courses, programs and curricula are very valuable sources of data. Archival materials were preserved which
described field curriculum at St. John Vianney (St. Thomas Aquinas) Seminary in the early 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century. Collections of materials were analyzed (based on availability) to better understand how field curriculum reflected historical trends and debates regarding the best seminary curriculum for future priests and members of religious congregations. Archival data was also used to examine changing historical and local values reflected in the development of field curricula in seminary education.

In addition to documents from the Seminary, local and universal Church documents from the archives and Seminary library were utilized to better understand the Seminary’s role as part of the Catholic Archdiocese of Denver (geographically, the northern half of Colorado) as well as its membership in the universal Catholic Church. Such materials provided insight regarding the Seminary’s context in the local community and provided information regarding the universal dimension of the Seminary as part of the Catholic Church.

**Implementation of a taxonomic research strategy in this study.**

Following the archival research techniques based on the work of Michael Hill (1993), a *taxonomic approach* was utilized to structure the research design. Hill’s systematic process for archival research requires the identification of targets to guide the collection of data for the research questions. The three types of targets cited by Hill (1993) were utilized in this study for preliminary archival research. The first conceptual research target as described by Hill (1993) consists in the examination of “named holdings.” The named holdings of St. John Vianney Seminary archival
materials are titled by year (e.g., “1959”). Although such named holdings contained a certain amount of archival material unrelated to this study, surveying “topical targets” and “proper name targets” within a particular year yielded useful research data; other documents in each named year did provide some overall historical context for educational trends at the Seminary.

The second type of target search was basically a topic search. For this study, this was the most fruitful search as the St John Vianney archives are cross-referenced by year and topic. Examples of materials relating to “topical targets” included: field program handbooks, course catalogues, field program bulletins, program descriptions, seminary publications, yearbooks and other related archival material.

Hill’s (1993) third type of target consists of “proper-name” searches in the archives. These proper-name searches included particular named individuals, particular programs, and particular projects related to pastoral field programs at the seminary. The information obtained from the proper-name searches of individuals related to pastoral field programs was not as fruitful as other searches. The archivist (K. Klein, personal communication, 2012) thought that some of this personal information could be housed in the DePaul Archives. However, archival information regarding named programs and projects was accessible and shed light on the evolution of ministerial field experiences through time. For example, “St. Thomas Seminary Annual Carnival” and “Motor Missions” provided useful archival material discovered through proper-name archival searches.
Organizational strategy for archival data collection.

In this study, for each category of archival targets, a master list was compiled according to Hill (1993). Utilizing the master list, archival documents were located, reviewed and hand-sorted in the Archdiocese of Denver Archives from 2012-2013. Documents of interest were photo-copied with the help of the Archdiocese of Denver Archivist. Photo-copied materials were organized in folders according to specific years.

As the focus of this study is the history of seminary field curriculum evolving within the changing context of local needs, archival data on the curricula of field programs was organized by key time periods for analysis. Several colored-coded flash drives were used to house electronic notes: Each time period (e.g., 1950s) included summarized information on the contents of archival sources utilizing Microsoft Office electronic research charts. These charts were formatted with a specific year (of the archival material), provenance of document (date, type of document, purpose, creator of document, document’s audience), context of document and contents of the document. The electronic charts allowed for an efficient method of reviewing and organizing data and noting initial interpretations. Emerging interpretations related to the research questions as well as key themes emerging in the curriculum history of each time period were also housed on each flash drive with the electronic charts. Additionally, archival citations for the material utilized in each time period were kept in “footnote” form on the electronic charts. The electronic charts (on archival documents) and electronic notes (for each time period) enabled efficient and organized access to the data in constructing the written findings.
In addition to Hill’s “conceptual targets,” Hill’s (1993) “conceptual tool kits” were utilized for this study. Hill’s first tool kit is comprised of a bibliography of published works related to the specific topic of the research. Hill notes: “it is useful to know what other researchers have discovered, if anything, about designated research targets” (1993, p. 29). Hill (1993) notes that such targeted literature reviews on the research topic provide a foundation for the archival research. In the case of this study, very little has been published about the specific topic of the research: theological field education at St. John Vianney Seminary.

The second tool kit cited by Hill (2003) is comprised of directories and indexes of other archival collections. In this study, Directories of Archives and Manuscript Repositories in the United States (1998) led to the discovery of additional archival material from St. Thomas Seminary (St. John Vianney Seminary) located at DePaul University in Chicago and available electronically. However, there are limitations in place regarding the access of this material.

The final archival tool cited by Hill is the professional knowledge of the archivist. In this study, the Archdiocese of Denver Archivist provided valuable assistance in locating specific collections and in directing the research toward relevant repositories. Additionally, as the archival material in the seminary archives has not been completely indexed, the specific knowledge of the archivist enabled more efficient research.

**Parameters of this study.**

As noted in the literature cited in this chapter, historical studies are limited by the range of existing sources available. Consequently, this study focused on selected
years from which sufficient materials were preserved to arrive at an “interpretive stance and a degree of description which seems adequate” (Rury, 1993, p. 268). Regarding the research data, the Seminary archives revealed a plethora of materials from certain time periods (e.g., the 1950s). Consequently, the research questions were addressed within the parameters of the known available sources. As noted previously, Jordanova (2006) warns against the “crippling ideal” of comprehensiveness in a historical study (pp. 96-97).

**Limits and Rewards of Archival Research**

Even with the utilization of sound archival research methods (in this study, based on Hill’s (1993) conceptual taxonomic strategy), Hill emphasizes that success depends upon not only a combination of “systematic work, and persistence but serendipity” (1993, p. 34). Despite this inherent difficulty with historical archival research, Hill concludes: “a social scientist who looks archivally toward the past… can give us new understandings of our society and our disciplines that will take us with greater clarity …into our collective future” (1993, p. 7). As Hill notes, research utilizing historical method is limited by the sources that have survived through time. The scope of this research is designed and modified so as to address available sources. Even with such limitations, this study could contribute to the research in curriculum history, seminary education, and unique educational contexts such as seminary programs in the American West.
Chapter Four: Findings & Analysis


Couch both archival materials and your analyses within political, social, economic, educational, religious, or institutional histories of the time…

Lynee Lewis-Gaillet (2010) on archival research

Emily Click (2010) of Harvard Divinity School, in reflecting upon the evolution of theological field education in the last century, notes: “Field education has developed from a marginalized supplementary work program into a crucial integrative aspect of the degree…” (p. 12). This general trend in seminary field education is visible in the curriculum history of St. John Vianney Seminary. However, the particular path of curriculum development at St. John Vianney has been impacted by unique practices of the Catholic Church. First, prescriptive Church directives have guided the development of field curriculum: this reality is one focus of the research in this study. Second, the interpretation and adaption of these directives in the local socio-historical context of St. John Vianney Seminary has shaped the field curriculum according to a unique dynamic: the investigation of this process is another focus of this study. Specifically, the research in this study is guided by two questions:

1. What role did Church history play in the development of theological field education at St. John Vianney Seminary?
2. How did practitioners at St. John Vianney Seminary apply and adapt prescriptive curriculum directives in the local context?

The conceptual tools utilized for the analysis of the findings in this study are derived from the work of Kelly Ritter (2009) cited in the preceding literature review. From her work was developed the framework from which the socio-historical interpretation of the findings will be viewed. Kelly Ritter (2009), in her historical study of basic writing curricula at Harvard and Yale, explores socio-historical forces that shape curriculum. Ritter (2009) proposes conceptual labels for a number socio-historical processes which she believes may be easily overlooked but which of play a formative role in the evolution of a particular curriculum. Three of these concepts, location, tradition and definition, provide a framework for the analysis of the findings in this study. The first socio-historical force is location. This describes the local context in terms of geographic location of the educational institution as well as the location of the curriculum in the overall structure of the program of studies in an educational institution. Second, the concept of tradition addresses particular aspects of a curricular program which have a long institutional history. Finally, the conception of definition addresses the particular parameters and content definition of a curricular program in an educational institution. Ritter’s theoretical concepts are utilized as tools for analysis of this study’s findings which are presented chronologically in the form of a historiography of education.
Early Proto-types of Seminary Field Education: 1920s & 1930s

As Click (2010) and others (Paver, 2006) have noted, early “field experiences” in theological seminaries constituted organized work programs that benefited the seminary, itself, as well as various charitable organizations. An early Seminary handbook notes: “Since the priest who serves in a Western diocese should know how to care for his own rectory and church, the student preparing for such ministry will find excellent training in work of that nature available about the seminary…[such as] outdoor work on the grounds…” (St. Thomas Seminary, [ca. 1930s], p. 26). According to the Seminary handbook, “Norms, Rules and Customs of St. Thomas Seminary,” the seminarian should accomplish this work with alacrity, diligence, and good will.

Work programs in the early years of St. John Vianney Seminary and other American Catholic seminaries were seen as having a particular value as emphasized in a document of the Church, Rerum Novarum, which was issued near the turn of the century by Pope Leo XIII. The document in the form of an encyclical (letter) states:

God has given the earth for the use and enjoyment of the whole human race… Moreover, the earth, ceases not thereby to minister to the needs of all, in as much as there is not one who does not sustain life from what the land produces…hence, …Whoever has received from the divine bounty…has received…as the steward of God’s providence for the benefit of others. (Pope Leo XIII, 1899, art. 8, art. 17)

Papal encyclicals and exhortations were types of letters and recommendations distributed, worldwide, to the Catholic Church: They expressed universal directives or guidelines regarding significant and timely issues in the Church or world. Rerum Novarum emphasized social justice, the value and dignity of work, the gifts of the earth for all and the responsibility to practice charity to those in need. Work programs in
seminaries, reflecting the principles of *Rerum Novarum* were seen to benefit the students themselves as well as the institution and those in need.

During the first decades of the Seminary ("St. Thomas Seminary" at that time), students operated a sizable farm as part of a required work program. These work programs were seen as having intrinsic value in forming character and the "fruits of labor" were doubly beneficial: Agricultural work not only helped to support the Seminary but also enabled contributions of food to local orphanages such as Mt. St. Vincent’s Home. Alfalfa “covered the land as far as the eye could see” and potatoes and other crops were grown to supply food; during harvest time, students (and even faculty) “got their knees dirty and palms blistered in helping out…” (Hartmann, 1981, p. 11). There was a pig sty and cow barn located near the seminary building itself. Notably, the skills seminarians acquired in the working farm gave them a practical foundation for life at the time in Colorado where more of the population lived in the country than in urban areas (Wyckoff, 1999). Utilizing such skills, “the priest working in a Western diocese” could help support himself and his flock.

In the decade of the 1930s, activities described as “extra-curricular” took the seminarian beyond the seminary. Through extra-curricular programs, much of the practical training for ministry was done through local diocesan or national Catholic agencies. In the 1930s, Colorado, as well as the rest of the nation, experienced the devastation of the Great Depression. Historian, Tom Noel (1989) notes that the State of Colorado and the City of Denver balked at funding depression-relief programs; subsequently, the burden fell on the federal government and private agencies such as
churches including the Catholic Church. To address the crisis, Denver’s newly appointed Bishop Vehr expanded the existing charity programs in the diocese and exhorted:

“Charity and generosity of spirit must be the guides of man’s life…” (Vehr, 1933, [document to parish priests]). Considering the great need in Colorado during the Depression, seminarians were encouraged to be involved in charitable work. Although these were not formal practices, such ministerial work experiences were outlined in an early Seminary handbook, “Norms, Rules and Customs for St. Thomas Seminary,” under the heading of “Extra-curricular Activities.” One such extra-curricular activity which provided an array of ministerial experiences was the St. Vincent de Paul Society.

Participation in the St. Vincent de Paul Society was listed as one of the recommended activities (as was Christmas Seals Charity) in an early Seminary handbook under “St. Vincent de Paul Society.” The St. Vincent de Paul Society, a charitable organization, was promoted in the Denver diocese and the bishop celebrated annual Masses with the students of St. Thomas Seminary and members of the Society’s Denver Chapter: “After the Mass, breakfast is served in the students’ dining hall. Following breakfast, the St. Vincent de Paul Society holds a meeting in the refectory which the students attend… (St. Thomas Seminary, [ca. 1930s], p. 23). Noel (1989) describes numerous charitable programs sponsored by the St. Vincent de Paul Society during the 1930s including clothing programs, hospital visitations, Big Brothers Program and Denver Shelter House that in 1932 provided over 23,000 free meals.
1940s and 1950s: Field Experiences in Evangelization and Education

When the United States entered World War II in 1941, the hardships of the Depression subsided. From the turn of the century through the 1930s, Colorado had experienced relatively slow economic and population growth. Post-war population growth in Colorado was triggered by substantial increase in many new federal jobs; additionally, Colorado came to be a recreational destination for visitors from other states. Denver grew from a quiet city of 300,000 in 1940 to a metropolis of over a million by the 1960s (Noel, 1989). The number of Catholics in Colorado also grew substantially and tripled in this same period of time (Jones, 1955).

Near the end of World War II, the growing diocese of Denver was elevated to an archdiocese by Pope Pius XII. Denver, which had previously been in the province of the Archdiocese of Santa Fe, New Mexico was now its own archdiocese (Archdiocese of Denver, 1941). Governor of Colorado, Ralph C. Carr, honored the new archdiocese in a civil ceremony at the Denver Municipal Auditorium. Simultaneously, with the creation of the Denver archdiocese, the Vatican split Colorado in half by creating the Diocese of Pueblo. The restructured Denver diocese now included northern Colorado with 87,907 Catholics, while the new Pueblo Diocese consisted of Southern Colorado with a Catholic population of 78,373 (Archdiocese of Denver, 1941). As the only archdiocese between Iowa and California, Denver lead the Rocky Mountain West area of over 200,000 Catholics (Noel, 1989).

Much of this area also looked to Denver for the theological education for future priests and St. Thomas Seminary continued to grow. In a letter asking the people of the
archdiocese for more support, Archbishop Vehr noted that St. Thomas Seminary, a center in the West for training priests “is taxed beyond capacity” (Vehr, 1922, [letter to the diocese]). Vehr pointed out that facilities at St. Thomas were built for 140 students but were forced to house 220; subsequently, the Seminary was forced to turn away students each year owing to a lack of space. In this letter to the archdiocese, Archbishop Vehr announced a campaign to expand the seminary and asked each of the parishes to do its “fair share.” The seminary flourished during the 1940s reaching an enrollment of 200 students by the arrival of 1950 (Jones, 1955).

In the 1940s and 1950s, relevant messages for the times were issued by the Apostolic See (the governing body of the Catholic Church) under the guidance of the newly elected pope: Pope Pius XII. Papal encyclicals were issued to the entire Church with particular themes: messages directed toward seminary preparation impacted and altered approaches to seminary training. In the year, 1941, Pope Pius XII, issued one of his first encyclicals to the American Church written on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the installation of America’s first bishop. Pope Pius encouraged those in ministry in the American Church to broaden their religious education and “procure for themselves a treasure of religious knowledge…” for the purposes of instruction and assistance (1941, art.11). In the 1940s and 50s, the encyclicals of Pope Pius XII were well circulated in the Seminary (encyclical literally means “circulating letter”) and a column, “The Popes Speak,” was included regularly in the official seminary publication, Ambassador of Christ. An important encyclical for seminaries was Pope Pius XII’s Menti
“A Message to Clergy” which called for increased preparation for active ministry:

The passage from the sheltered…life of the seminary to the active ministry may be dangerous for the priest…if he has not been prudently prepared for the new life …young priests may fail if they are not gradually introduced to the work, wisely observed and paternally guided in the first steps of ministry. (1950, art. 102)

In response to such directives from the Apostolic See including papal writings, seminary programs were modified or supplemented. At St. Thomas Seminary, the call of Pope Pius XII to “paternally guide future priests in the steps of ministry” was answered through the development and integration of apostolates (“missions of service”) in the pastoral preparation of seminarians for active ministry.

**Evangelization Apostolates: Motor Missions**

One robust example of these service apostolates in the Seminary was the “Outdoor Apostolate” of the 1940s and 1950s: the Motor Mission. Motor Mission work or *street-preaching* as it was informally called, constituted “the preaching of the doctrine of Jesus Christ with the proper ecclesiastical approval” on the street corners or local parks:

Every age has had its St. Paul walking the highways of the world to preach the word of God. Motor mission work is the 20th century version of this traditional work of the Church. In recent years it has been taken up by priests and seminarians. Now… this Outdoor Apostolate is being conducted [in our area]… in Oklahoma, Kansas and Colorado. (Seivers, 1954, p. 8)

Historically, street-preaching in the United States was practiced by many denominations; it was inaugurated in Colorado as an initiative of Rev. Joseph Lilly, a professor at St. Thomas Seminary. This *evangelization apostolate* was conducted every summer; however, the activities were curtailed in the war years due to gas rationing.
Msgr. Gregory Smith (1977) recalled, for an oral history project, the role seminarians played in these traveling catechetical programs in the 1940s which were often held in smaller towns: “We’d get a loud speaker and play popular music on records to attract a crowd. Fr. Joseph Lilly, the scripture scholar at St. Thomas Seminary would get up and introduce seminarian speakers…” (Smith, 1977-1979, interview by Sr. Elizabeth Skiff, [tape recording and typescript]). Fr. Richard Gieselman took over the program in the 1950s focusing on Colorado destinations. Students traveled to various towns in Colorado and set up broadcast equipment in the city park or a vacant lot and proceeded “to present the teaching of Christ to all who would listen” (Seivers, 1954, p.7).

The tremendous influx of new people into Colorado, the emphasis on religious education by Pope Pius XII and the socio-historical climate influenced the development of the Motor Mission evangelization apostolate:

At present, the conditions for such evangelization are most favorable. The throes of insecurity and the devastation of war have knocked the foundation from [secular] philosophies. Truly, the amount of church attendance and the number of Church buildings of all denominations that are springing up throughout the country, attest to a great surge of religious interest in the past few years. (Seivers, 1954, p. 8)

The Motor Mission program’s primary aim was to “spread the truths of Christ in the United States.” The general themes included: to worship God, to pray and to follow the dictates of conscience.

The field education dimension of the Motor Mission apostolate dealt with methods of evangelization of which students were instructed (though outside the regular academic program) according to the director of the apostolate, Fr. Gieselman (1954). This instruction had both academic and pastoral components: Seminarians were taught to
give a “rational, intelligent and unemotional exposition of the doctrines of Jesus Christ.”
based on their academic program. Pastorally, seminarians were instructed to present a
“gentlemanly manner” as: “The motor mission method excludes shouting. There is not
intolerance of others and no disparaging remarks about other sects” (Gieselman, 1954, p.
9). Questions were expected to be answered in a “friendly, courteous and refined
manner” (p. 9). Through the Motor Missions, ministerial field skills were taught though
not through formal curriculum.

The Motor Missions also included a great deal of preliminary preparation which
allowed students to develop managerial skills. Students were trained in the organizational
component of the Motor Mission. These tasks were listed in an official publication of the
Seminary as part of the Motor Mission apostolate: First, permission was to be secured
from civil and ecclesiastical authorities of the locality. Next, equipment was to be
procured for the mission. Finally, various forms of advertising should preceded the visit
of the seminarians into the community; advertising announced the time and place of the
lectures. In the 1950s, Fr. Gieselman and the seminarians arrived on the scheduled date
for a six-might series of lectures and questions from the crowd.

The Motor Mission also followed a pre-determined agenda for which the
seminarians rehearsed. According to an official description of the apostolate: the music
was played until the Mission opened. Next, short lectures by seminarians were given.
Afterwards, a question and answer period was held. The program closed with the Lord’s
Prayer and when feasible a short movie was shown. Free literature was also distributed.
The Motor Missions had a number of ministerial goals: catechetical teaching for Catholic members, evangelization for the “unchurched” and an ecumenical goal of improving understanding between Catholics and non-Catholics and thus “the establishment of good will.” This ecumenical goal is described in the instruction for the Motor Mission:

All members of the community Catholic, Protestant and Jew – are asked to unite in the fundamentals of religion; to pray, to act conscientiously, to worship God, and to do always what they believe is right. (Seivers, 1954, p. 9)

These goals for the Motor Mission ministry were progressive for the time presaging the type of formal field education which would be instituted after the seminary reforms of the Second Vatican Council. The Motor Mission also encouraged a reflective element: one seminarian noted that the Motor Mission reaches people who will never come to a Catholic Church. The fact that these people “listen to the street-preacher allows the very power of the Gospel…to do its work with the grace of God” (Gieselman, 1954, p. 35).

**Education Apostolates: “All…are to be teachers…”**

In the Seminary archival material of the late 1940s and 1950s, there is a proliferation of photographs of students in teaching situations; one includes the caption: “Whatever he does or wherever he is the Priest is a teacher” (1956). Another photograph captures a display commemorating 100 years of Catholicism in Colorado; the Scriptural theme proclaims: “Go, therefore and make disciples of all peoples…teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you” (Matthew, 28:19).
When Archbishop Vehr was ordained as the new bishop of Denver in the early 1940s, Rev. John Doyle predicted “The chief love of our newly-ordained bishop will be the schools of Colorado and … St. Thomas Seminary” (Ambassador, 1956, p. 14). Archbishop Vehr, who had been trained as an educator and administrator, made Catholic education his priority. Bishop Vehr initiated a campaign to build Catholic schools. The World War II “baby boom” filled classrooms as quickly as they could be built. By the mid-1950s, 20 percent of Denver’s school population was in Catholic classrooms. Catholic grade and high schools were overflowing. (Jones, 1955). In the same period, the US Bishops established the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine (CCD) which sponsored catechesis and religious education for students in public schools. “The Colorado efforts of the worldwide CCD program were directed by me [Msgr. Gregory Smith] from their inception until 1960 (Smith, Nov. 2, 1987). The Colorado CCD, according to Msgr. Smith, conducted as many as 160 summer school programs in religious education with over 14,000 students enrolled.

The emphasis on catechetical instruction and religious education in the United States and Archbishop’s Vehr’s episcopal goals regarding education impacted St. Thomas Seminary’s educational programs in the 1940s and 1950s. The need was recognized for courses in teaching pedagogy and methods as seminarians had become involved in a variety of teaching activities outside the seminary; these field experiences allowed seminarians to practice skills for their teaching role before they were formally ordained.
The seminarians’ increasing experiential work in education initiated formal changes in the curricula of the seminary in the 1940s. In the “Catalogue for Scholastic Year” (1947-1948) a Psychology of Education course was added in the second as well as third year of study taught by Fr. McHugh using the text *Educational Psychology* by Kelly. This text focused on a basic pedagogy of instruction. In the final year of theology, a course was also added in catechetics (the teaching of doctrine). Ten years earlier, the “Bulletin for Scholastic Year” (1937-38) shows the Seminary’s curricular program contained only a History and Philosophy of Education course using the text, *History of Education*, by Kange. Comparatively, the courses established in the curriculum in the 1940s were directed toward students engaging in teaching field experiences.

Although academic courses were added to the curriculum, theological field experiences were still non-formal and continued to be addressed under the category of *apostolates*. A variety of *teaching apostolates* were promoted during the 1950s and they constituted the bulk of theological field experiences at the time. Teaching was considered to be appropriate and efficacious for seminarians (Witte, 1948). The official publication of the seminary: *Ambassador of Christ* noted that “all …are to be teachers…our job of teaching is with us at all times” (1953, p. 3).

One such example of a teaching apostolate was found in the Catholic Camp Movement. The Catholic Camp Movement was a *summer apostolate* and one in four seminarians worked in the Catholic Camp Movement in the 1950s and early 60s. The Archdiocese of Denver utilized Camp Santa Maria near Bailey and Camp St. Malo in Allenspark to give children summer experiences in the mountain as well as “wholesome
food, classes in catechism and crafts.” Noel (1989) notes that these summer camps were also available for under-privileged children of all creeds. Seminarians worked as camp counselors, catechism instructors and supervised sports activities. A Seminary report on Catholic camps notes:

[Seminarians] experience to some degree the joys of spiritual accomplishment that later will be the essence of their lives as priests…however he might participate in camp work, he will certainly come away feeling that his priesthood will be richer and fuller for having engaged in this unique and modern apostolate. (St. Thomas Seminary, 1962, [report])

Through the 1950s, seminarians were involved in more traditional teaching apostolates in the Denver Catholic school system. These apostolates included religious education in the elementary and high schools as well as field trips to the Seminary, competitions and speech meets for the Catholic schools, and school projects designed to support missionary activity: “On Sunday, April 28th, we seminarians were the happy hosts of some 250 young men for the Archdiocese of Denver Field Day” (Gertz, 1957, p. 14). Students from parochial schools in Denver, Cheyenne and Pueblo enjoyed the field day activities, toured the Seminary and joined together in Mass, prayer and a lecture with a question and answer period. Similar Seminary field trips were held in subsequent years with 400 eighth grade boys attending in the spring of 1958. Seminarians worked throughout the school year with Catholic school students giving information and directing participation in missionary projects: “A great number of seminarians spoke to children in 60 Catholic grammar schools throughout the state encouraging them [to do mission projects] for the support and education of children” (Getz, 1958, p. 33).
Seminarians also coached Archdiocesan speech teams and directed and judged speech meets as part of their educational apostolates.

In the later 1950s, a course was added to the program of studies titled: “Parochial Administration.” The purpose of the course was to prepare future priests for the administrative duties of the parish and school; the course was added to the curriculum in the final year of studies. The description of the course dealt primarily with public relations. However, the course also included a component utilizing community members which gave students a greater sense of ministerial realities:

For the first part of the course…fifteen invited guest lecturers will speak to the seminarians on the relationship of the parish priest to the school, the church community and the community in general. (St. Thomas Seminary, 1958)

In the 1950s, field education continued to develop organically; apostolates began to include structured instruction for students though they were not included as part of the formal curricula. Additionally, some apostolates began to offer field ministry experiences in specialized contexts. One such example was the Catholic Rural Life Conference dedicated to the spiritual and material welfare of rural communities. The Rural Conference worked “cooperatively” with St. Thomas Seminary and other seminaries in the West and Mid-West providing institutes on rural ministry and religious education in rural settings. The Catholic Rural Life Conference joined forces with St. Thomas Seminary to offer organized summer catechetical schools for children in rural areas which were taught by seminarians. The Rural Conference created a curriculum as well as instructional materials for these summer schools; this allowed for more structured
pastoral training for seminary students and the numerous catechetical schools across the rural West provided experience in teaching practice in a specialized context.

Additionally, since many of the seminary students would go on to minister in rural areas, St. Thomas Seminary promoted and hosted the Annual Western Seminarians Workshop held annually in the later 1950s. This three-day conference addressed issues related to ministry in a rural context: “Seminarians from Western diocese will take part in lectures and discussions by experts on the opportunities and problems facing priests in rural work” (St. Thomas Seminary, 1958, [official publication] p. 29). Workshops were often held in August and included field trips to better illustrate the issues. This field ministry focused on caring for Catholics living on the land and also extended its work to non-Catholics in cooperation with other groups interested in encouraging rural life.

Another example of a teaching apostolate in a specialized context was directed towards religious education among Spanish speakers and culture: “This past summer was a very productive one for a number of seminarians who worked among Spanish speaking migrant workers in northeastern Colorado” (St. Thomas Seminary, 1957). Apostolates among migrant workers in Colorado became more common in the 1950s as these populations increased. Seminarians took censuses, gave religious instruction in Spanish and did other apostolic work among these workers and their families (St. Thomas Seminary, 1957). Archbishop Vehr also began sending seminarians to summer language apostolates in the later 1950s. Seminarians had the opportunity to take a summer program at Montezuma Seminary of New Mexico which educated seminarians from Mexico as well as American seminarians from New Mexico. Seminarian, Bernard O-Hayre,
recounts his experiences in a *Spanish apostolate* in the summer of 1958. At Archbishop Vehr’s request, three seminarians were sent to Montezuma Seminary in Las Vegas, New Mexico to learn Spanish in order “to establish a common bond between the Denver clergy and the Spanish-speaking people of the archdiocese” (*Ambassador*, 1959, p.12). O’Hayre recalls his first days in New Mexico as “confusing for us because of the language barrier…” despite “a great deal of patience on the part of our [Spanish-speaking] hosts” (1959, p. 12). O’Hayre also describes in detail the program and the field work:

> In the morning, lectures on art through the ages were held…After the *siesta*, languages classes were held…they were followed by a period of work...as always, manual labor is required…some worked on the seminary farm or the shoe shop while others were responsible for the upkeep of the grounds. (1959, p. 13)

O’Hayre and the other Denver seminarians also participated in a teaching apostolate:

> [Spanish-speaking seminarians] are assigned to teach catechism in the missions [churches] around the seminary. Done as part of priestly training, this work is carried out on Thursday and Sunday afternoons…we were allowed to go with the seminarians and were given our own students to teach…This work was a fruitful culmination of our study and labor. (1959, p. 26)

O’Hayre also describes the warm hospitality, beautiful religious festivals and the delicious Mexican cuisine concluding: “Although St. Thomas has the first place in our hearts, there is a special place reserved for our second seminary home, Montezuma” (1959, p. 26).

As the decade of the 1950s drew to a close, the Seminary’s official publication presented a treatise on education by Bishop John Wright of Pittsburgh in 1959. The bishop emphasized the key role of teaching in ministry:
The Council of Trent, St. Augustine, St. Charles Borromeo, St. Pius X, Pope Leo XIII and many others insist that teaching is the chief duty of the episcopal office.

Priests share in this duty… (Wright, 1959, p. 6)

As the next decade began, a required minor in Education was added to the program of study “since the priest is often called to teach formally in the classroom” (St. Thomas Seminary, 1959). Specific courses included in the curriculum were: “History of Education, Philosophy of Education, Psychology of Education and Methodology of Education as well as Educational Guidance (counseling).”

Though the educational apostolates were still not considered formal field curriculum, these experiences in “practical theology” enabled seminarians to develop pastoral skills before ordination and “enlarged their perspective to the wider activities of pastoral service in life beyond the seminary” (White, 1989, p. 347).

Moving Toward Formal Theological Field Education: 1960s

In the fall of 1965, St. Thomas Seminary (currently, St. John Vianney Seminary) reached its zenith in terms of numbers with 273 students attending to prepare for ministry as priests or members of religious communities (Jones, 1955). At the same time, Pope Paul VI was about to close the Second Vatican Council, a historical gathering on Church renewal in which 2500 bishops from around the world assembled at the Vatican. In meetings during the preceding four years, the participants set the course for a period of Church renewal prescribed in the documents produced by the Second Vatican Council. Church historians (Ellis 1967; White, 1989) note that in the wake of the Second Vatican Council, there transpired a reconsideration of every aspect of seminary education. This
included the reform of seminary curricula, programs and implementation of new pedagogies such as field-based theological education. Supported by the vision of Pope John XXIII and Pope Paul VI, seminaries, worldwide, received a letter in 1966 from the Holy See authorizing them to undertake educational reform.

At St. Thomas Seminary, a number of archival documents from the mid to late 1960s reflect the climate of renewal in the sphere of education and priestly formation including the call for more experiential pedagogies of education. Editorials in the official publication of the seminary, *Ambassador of Christ* (1965-66) reflect the spirit of renewal advocated in the Second Vatican Council: “To prepare men to meet the challenge of the call of Christ is the work of the seminary. It is a work of schooling and education; but it is more than that: it is the work of forming the whole man…” (1965, p. 3). There was also a call for education which better prepared students for the priest’s pastoral role: “The seminarian must see the world as the field of his work…The world is the workshop of the priest” (1966, p. 8).

Archival documents from the academic year of 1966-1967, also reflect a change in educational philosophy initiated by the work of the Second Vatican Council, particularly, the document, *Optatam Totius* or “Decree on Priestly Training,” which was released in the fall of 1965. A letter to the seminary community from the Rector, Fr. Patrick O’Brien, in the winter term of 1966 affirms the impact of the Second Vatican Council: “Vatican II is explicit in its direction to seminary administrators. Students and faculty alike hope…that what we do to bring to reality the aims of Vatican II will promote…oneness in Christ” [letter].
In the 1966-67 academic year, the Seminary presented a series of articles which addressed the direction of seminary education as prescribed by documents of the Second Vatican Council. The first article explored “one aspect of the formation of future priests – pastoral training…in the light of some of the documents of the Second Vatican Council” (St. Thomas Seminary, 1967, p. 12). The article emphasized the importance of apostolates (which were already well-developed at the Seminary) and which the “Decree of Priestly Training” (1965) promoted. The article discussed apostolates at St. Thomas as well as examples of seminary apostolates in different sectors of the country. The article also points out that the “Decree on Priestly Training” asserts that “pastoral concern should thoroughly penetrate the entire training of seminarian and attaches special importance to practical application of this training” (1965, p. 19). The discourse at St. Thomas Seminary at the close of the 1960s reflected, at the local level, the widespread discourse on the subject of educational reform in seminaries.

Although the creation of a formal field education program would have to wait until the next decade, the broadening of the concept of field education is apparent at St. Thomas Seminary after the Second Vatican Council. In particular, a pastoral year (an internship of ministerial service) was integrated into the final year of the academic curriculum in the late 1960s. These pastoral years consisted in an extended field placement during the last year of seminary and encompassed a wide range of field ministry including ministry at the State Mental Hospital in Pueblo, ministry for the enlisted at Lowry Air Force Base, ministry for the Colorado Migrant Program, ministry for St. Joseph Hospital in Denver, ministry in an alcoholic’s ward, ministry in a
neighborhood center for youth, ministry in correctional institutions and ministry in religious education at Catholic high schools in Denver. Evolving theological field education was drawing seminarians toward the world as the field of his work.
Part II: Socio-historical Evolution of Field Education: 1970-2010

[Thus] will the universal laws be adapted to the particular circumstances of the times and localities so that the priestly training will always be in tune with the pastoral needs of those regions in which the ministry is to be exercised.

Second Vatican Council: “Decree on Priestly Training” (1965)

From its earliest history, Denver’s Catholic Seminary responded and adapted to changing cultural, social, religious realities of Colorado and the West. For most of the 20th century, this had been an organic process. With the advent of the Catholic Church’s Second Vatican Council in the early 1960s, there came to be a more formal focus on training priests for active ministry in particular contexts. In 1965, the Second Vatican Council released the “Decree on Priestly Training” (Optatam Totius). The document outlined the Council’s vision for seminary education and formation initiating a period of educational reform: one such reform was the Council’s directives on pastoral field formation:

Pastoral concern...ought to permeate thoroughly the entire training of students...since it is necessary for the students to learn the art of exercising the apostolate not only theoretically but practically...they should be initiated into pastoral work, both during the course of studies and also during times of vacation... This should be carried out in accordance with...local conditions… (1965, art. 20)

In order to implement the directives of the Second Vatican Council on seminary reform, the U.S. Bishops established the Committee on Priestly Formation. The committee began to work to issue guidelines for American seminaries and the guidelines were approved in 1969 by the American Conference of Catholic Bishops under the title:
Program of Priestly Formation in use through 1976 when the guidelines were updated. White (1989) notes that this reform of academic programs included specific directives for pastoral education in which was included guidelines for field-based education.

Contemporary church historian, John Paver (2006) notes that a movement to place some kind of field-based learning in the curricula of seminaries had gained momentum in the preceding decades. (At St. Thomas Seminary, field education had been informally developing through the various field apostolates.) However, the guidelines issued in 1969 constituted the first time that field education was formally integrated into the curricular program of Catholic seminaries. White (1989) cites the guideline specifically:

…every seminary should have a field education program under a priest who is a member of the faculty. Field education is to be integrated with spiritual and academic aspects of the seminary. The field experience of the seminary [may include] parish work…work in religious education, hospitals, charity projects and community organizations… (p. 418)

The development of field education guidelines by the American Catholic bishops was strongly influenced at the time by the work of Charles Fielding, particularly the article, “Education for Ministry” (1966) published in the journal, Theological Education. This call for educational reform in seminaries emphasized the educational potential of field experience and was considered by historian, John Paver (2006) as a watershed moment in that Fielding distinguished a curricular area, field education, which previously functioned as work experience or work service (p. 13). In his article, Fielding provided a clear articulation of the educational value of field work and also signaled the need for a stronger theoretical base to support pastoral training. Through Fielding’s work, the
theological community gained a greater understanding of the value of field-based theological education. Paver (2006) notes:

Fielding stated unequivocally that…the most important and immediate task for seminaries was to direct their concerted efforts toward a professional model of education, of which field education could be an important component. (p. 13)

Models for field education became the topic of conferences and discourse among seminary educators. Paver (2006) cites this time as the beginning of a search for quality models.

**Field Education as Part of Formal Curricula: 1970s**

As formal emphasis increased, Catholic seminaries (and other Christian seminaries) in the U.S. developed supervised field education program for ministry. Students served in field assignments under the direction of a priest or minister in churches or other settings for community ministry. Additionally standards were established for these programs (Brelsford, 2008).

St. Thomas Seminary (St. John Vianney) established the institution’s first curricular field education program in 1971. A “Seminary Bulletin Supplement” (1971) [booklet] announced the new curricular program: “The St. Thomas Theological Seminary Field Education program is based on the directives of Vatican II calling for a more pastoral preparation for students in preparation for priesthood and…all students in preparation for [ordained] ministry” (p. 1). The “Bulletin” for 1971 shows a Committee of Field Education was established to develop and oversee the new field curriculum and “organize various apostolic ministries.” The new field education program still utilized the
concept of *apostolate* from previous decades of non-formal field experience. However, as described in the “Bulletin Supplement” (1971) [booklet], there was a conscious effort to develop scope and sequence for the program. The field education program was divided into two levels: The first two years of the program constituted the *Community Service Program* and the last four years constituted the *Special Ministries Program*. Both levels of the program contained a number of apostolates (some from past decades) to which students were assigned.

Building on the tradition and importance of religious education apostolates through previous decades, the first level titled *Community Service* included work with youth and religious education. The first field year involved the students in youth ministry in parish locations and specialized locations such as: Colorado Youth Center, Auraria Community Center, Golden School for Boys and Partners Program (St. Thomas Seminary, 1971, p. 3). In the second year of the first level, students were placed in field teaching assignments: “Students engage in teaching religious education for CCD (Confraternity of Christian Doctrine) in 12 Denver parishes” (p. 3). The teaching apostolate for CCD had existed in the Seminary since 1939 and was finally integrated as part of the formal field education program.

The second level of the field education program was titled *Special Ministries Program*: “Included in this program are a variety of work-areas which aim at giving these seminarians some degree of competency in more specialized activities” (p. 3). Again, the program integrated a number of well-known Denver locations in a variety of service work including chaplain work at Fitzsimmons Army Hospital, Fort Logan Program for
ministry with alcoholics, ministry in Denver area nursing homes and Ministry to the Inner City Child which was part of the Head Start Program at the time (1971, p. 3). The second level of the field program also had a component of ministry in the corrections system, specifically, work with youth offenders at the Federal Youth Center in Lakewood. The program description in the “Bulletin” (1971) emphasizes the value of the work experience gained in the various field assignments: “Besides the competency the seminarian develops when he works in these activities… the over-all aim of these programs is to offer the student the opportunity to work with all types of people…” (1971, p. 4). At the time, there were no formal pedagogies in place to address diversity. The “Bulletin” also noted that the new field program would undergo evaluation in the first year.

By the 1973-1974 academic year, the philosophy and structure of the field program, and the relationship to Catholic directives were more fully conceptualized and enumerated in “Field Education Program of St. Thomas Seminary” (1973-1974, [booklet]). The program rationale quoted the documents of Vatican II: “At the heart of ministry, then, is service – both service to fellow Christians… and service to all… in realizing the transformation of all human reality in God, our Father…” (Second Vatican Council, 1965, art. 2).

Locally, Archbishop James V. Casey, had been installed as the new archbishop of Denver at the end of the 1960s. In response to the social concerns of the time, Archbishop Casey, known for his commitment to social justice, expanded diocesan services through the 1970s. He created many new Offices of Ministry including Family Life Services,

The emphasis on social concerns in the Denver Archdiocese influenced the development of Seminary field ministry; seminarians’ ministerial assignments were often associated with diocesan ministries and the field ministries advocating social justice flourished. The two-level structure of the field program had changed to seven cognate areas which focused on social concerns: Ministry to the Aged, Ministry to Youth, Catechetical (educational) Ministry, Ministry to the Mentally Ill (including imprisoned), Ministry to Sick, Parish Census Apostolate (to determine parish needs). Each cognate area presented ministerial themes addressed through small group sessions. For example, Ministry to the Aged, addressed “dynamics of old age, loneliness, depression, human growth and decline, wisdom, value of human life, giving and receiving in relationships” (St. Thomas Seminary, 1973-1974, p. 15). The “Field Education Program” guide described the cognate areas as interdisciplinary in nature:

The Field Education Program seeks to provide a point of integration for the academic, personal and spiritual through a graduated series of supervised pastoral experiences. (St. Thomas Seminary, 1973-1974, p. 3)

Additionally, the field education guide stresses both personal and communal dimensions:

Though the programs in Field Education seek to offer a basic knowledge of the dynamics involved in the various ministries and some first-hand experience in the exercise of these ministries, the main focus of the program is on the formation of the minister himself…for it is the person of the minister that is at the heart of ministry. (St. Thomas Seminary, 1973-1974 [booklet], p. l)
The courses were also developed with a communal dimension, specifically, addressed in the form of *group process*. Along with the supervisor, peer contributions constituted an important dimension in the Field Program:

As co-learners, the students are able to raise for one another common concerns and questions in the ministry. They are able to speak to common trials and difficulties encountered… Out of their own personal experiences, they are able to share with one another what insights they have gained. This dynamic is given opportunity for expression in group sessions. (St. Thomas Seminary, 1973-1974, p. 6)

The structure of the evaluative and reflective component of the field courses followed *group process* pedagogy which was also presented within the courses of a new curriculum strand in the Seminary program of studies titled “Religious Communication.” The study of group dynamics became a focus of scholarship in social psychology in the 1970s (Kounin, 1970; Borg, 1970; Glasser, 1969) and social sciences were becoming better integrated into seminary education in the 1970s according to guidelines of *Optatam Totius* (1965). Seminary courses were offered on group dynamics titled: “Small Group Strategies for Adults,” “Interpersonal Communication,” “Team Ministry,” “Seminar in Leadership: Group Communication,” which supported the pedagogy used in the field education program. Course descriptions focused on content such as “theoretical views of group interaction, person-to-person transactions, group strategies for adults” (St. Thomas Seminary, 1973-1974, p. 61). An elective course on Carl Rogers also focused on developing empathy and communication in groups which fostered personal emotional maturity, interdependence and awareness.

By the later years of decade, the Field Program had expanded and evolved and the parameters of the program were more defined: “The Field Program begins from the
assumption that we are training...‘general practitioner’ parish priests – not specialists such as psycho-therapists and community development experts” (St. Thomas Seminary, 1976-1977, p. 25). The program design had changed as well from a collection of cognates under the “umbrella” of social ministry to a course sequence based on stages of ministerial competencies. Field Education “Bulletins” from 1977-1979 [booklets] described new program goals and presented an expanded Field Education staff consisting of a full-time dean, training consultant, faculty including a large number of adjunct faculty in specialized areas. By the late 1970s, St. Thomas Seminary was also a member of the Association of Theological Field Education.

By the close of the 1970s, the Seminary’s field program had been further shaped by discourse from the growing field of theological field education including collegial association and participation in professional organizations. There was a growing recognition in Catholic theological education of the need for carefully supervised practiced-based learning:

While emphasis at St. Thomas is still upon a carefully designed program of inner spiritual development, students are also expected to develop and test their spirituality in the real world of human endeavor. This aspect of training is mandated [by the Second Vatican Council] and falls to the Field Education Program. (St. Thomas Seminary, 1979, p. 25)

The program sequence in late 1970s was structured in several levels based on ministerial competency. According to “Seminary Bulletin” (1977-79) [booklet], the first level consisted in an introductory year in which students were “trained to be trained” in field education: “This means equipping the student with the attitudes and skills fundamental to work in ministry” (p. 25). The first year in the program consisted in two
introductory courses with parish field placements. The learning goals of the first year included integrated skills:

- To develop the ability to function constructively in peer-groups
- To discover personal strengths and weaknesses
- To receive and offer mutual support
- To learn the skill of vulnerability and openness
- To develop and integrated functional theology (p. 26)

In the second level, small groups of students were placed in institutions where individuals experiences the need for specialized ministry: e.g., hospitals, nursing homes, prisons, mental health clinics and other places where there is a significant need for ministry. In the second level of the sequence, the student experiences were identified as ministry to a person in crisis. The reflection on these experiences took place in peer groups under the careful guidance of highly trained chaplains of these institutions. The learning goals of the second year included:

- To increase specialized ministry skills
- To relate effectively to people on a daily basis
- To relate in a healing way to people in crisis (p. 26)

During the third level of the program students were placed in a full-time internship from June-December before the student’s final academic semester. The internships were supervised by a pastor-supervisors and faculty from the Field Education Program. To facilitate this process, a training workshop for pastor-supervisors was held
prior to the internship. The learning goals for the internships were articulated by in the program description:

- To discover the means and grace of a sacramental ministry
- To develop spirituality in a parish situation
- To establish a continuing education plan to be implemented after graduation
- To develop personal growth through self-sacrifice
- To learn to work in staff relationships
- To integrate academic learning with the practice of ministry
- To continue reflection of the practice of ministry
- To function at a professional level in parish ministry (p. 26)

According to “Field Education Committee Minutes” (1977), the progression [sequence] of the multi-leveled program was constructed as the result of several years of cautious experimentation and thorough evaluation.

The “St. Thomas Seminary Bulletin” [booklet] of 1977 features the Field Education Program with a photo collage of seminarians ministering in a variety of field situations. Included in the collage is a large caption: “The curriculum attempts to provide a cooperative effort among those disciplines which bear upon the understanding of man and prompting his well-being…” The quote reflects expanded course offerings in the social sciences in the 1970s. The social sciences were integrated in the Seminary’s program of studies as a result of the clear directives of the Second Vatican Council’s Optatam Totius (1965) in the section on “Revision of Ecclesiastical Studies” which states: “They [seminarians] should also be taught to use the aids which the disciplines of
psychology and sociology can provide…” (Second Vatican Council, 1965, art. 20). In response, pastoral counseling courses were added to the pastoral curriculum of St. Thomas through the 1970s; by the end of decade, the social sciences were more thoroughly integrated in the Seminary program of studies with the purpose of supporting ministry. Courses in the Pastoral Psychology department in 1979 included: “Introduction to Pastoral Counseling,” “Pastoral Psychology,” “Pastoral Care and Counseling,” “Specialized Ministry” (ministry for persons with special needs), “Marriage Counseling” and “Social Psychology.” Sociology offerings at this time included “Sociology of Religion,” and “Life Cycle.”

Through the 1970s, these curricular courses were taken concurrently with field education placements and content supported these field education experiences. One such example was the “Clinical Pastoral Education” course. The course consisted in a full-time summer quarter. Though the clinical course was described as intensive, the Seminary “Bulletin” notes: “This training is not designed to create a fully qualified therapist, but rather to facilitate an effective pastoral counselor who is able to help parishioners at critical times in their lives” (1977-1979, p. 26).

Field Education Addresses Multicultural Ministry: 1980s

In the 1970s and 1980s, due to the rise of multicultural populations in the U.S. and the growth of diverse populations in Christian churches, ministry in specific cultural contexts began to be addressed more formally. In 1979, Catholic theologian, Karl Rahner, called the attention of the theological community to an important dynamic: the dramatic growth of diverse populations in Christian faith communities during the 20th century. For
Rahner, this shift in population also meant a shift characterized by diverse world-views and “pastoral needs unprecedented in Christian history” (Rahner, 1979, p. 716).

Locally, the Catholic Church in Denver experienced the same growth in multicultural populations particularly the growth of Latino populations. According to local historian, Thomas Noel (1989), the Hispanic population in Denver doubled from 1960-1970. Latino populations grew even faster in the next decade.

In 1980, St. Thomas Seminary announced a new curricular program in Hispanic Ministry which also included a significant field component:

In keeping with the tradition of responding to the developing needs of the Church, St. Thomas Seminary in 1980 has made significant changes in its programs… As the Seminary looked into the 1980s, it became clear that it must face not only the future of the Seminary’s mission but also the direction of pastoral ministry within the Church. (St. Thomas Seminary, 1980-1981, p. 1)

The “Bulletin Supplement” [booklet] announced a “revised curriculum for the Master of Divinity degree” noting as a significant part of the degree “a concentration in field education in an approved setting…” (p. 2). The various cognates for the revised Master of Divinity Degree included “Parish Ministry, Religious Education, Pastoral Care, Peace and Justice and [recently implemented] Hispanic Ministry” (p. 2).

The year before, (the newly elected) Pope John Paul II released an exhortation, Catechesi Tradendae (“Catechesis in Our Time”), in which he emphasized the importance of culture in catechesis. Pope John Paul II notes the importance of seeking “to know cultures and their essential components” and the importance of “helping them bring forth from their own living traditions original expressions of life, celebration and thought” (1979, p. 53). As a result of local pastoral needs and the influence of the
“traveling pope,” and his attention to world cultures, seminary education began to develop formal curricula for multicultural ministry.

The Hispanic Intercultural Ministry Program brought a plethora of new course offerings into the program of studies (though some courses including “Mexican-American Psychology” were included in the curriculum in the 1970s.) The courses comprised a specialized tract within the Master of Divinity degree with the program goal of effective ministry to Hispanic people as well as “building of the faith community.” The courses addressed “the historical, cultural, social, philosophical and psychological dimensions of Hispanic people as fundamental themes in the curriculum” (1980-1981, p. 2). Additionally, courses on Hispanic culture, worship and relevant pastoral issues were included. The program description also emphasized the field dimension of the program “to help put knowledge, theory and awareness into concrete practice” (p. 2).

A foundational element of the program was Spanish language instruction: “To this end, St. Thomas Seminary promotes a concentrated program in the Language for Christian Ministry Program offered in Cuernavaca, Mexico” (p. 3). Specific course titles in the Seminary program of studies included: “History of the US Church: Hispanic Perspectives,” “Hispanic Dimensions of Worship,” “Cultural Perspectives of Mexican-Americans,” “Introduction to Bi-cultural Parishes,” “Methodology on Sermons for Spanish-Speaking Communities,” “Religious Education in Hispanic Communities,” “Sociological Conditions in Mexican-American Communities,” and “Building Hispanic Faith Communities” (p. 99).
By the mid-1980s, St Thomas Seminary’s “Field Education Handbook” (1984) articulated overall program goals: “Pastoral Ministry has as its primary purpose the preparation...for competent leadership in the various ministerial activities of the Church particularly at the local parish and diocesan level” (p. 33). The expressed goals of the program cite the development of “critical reflection” on ministerial experience (praxis): “ongoing self-assessment” through feedback, “lifelong cultivation of competencies” needed in ministry and a deepening “sensitivity to the issues of social justice” (p. 33).

St. Thomas Seminary “Bulletin” [booklet] of 1985-86 offered more diverse and specialized courses (such as “Ministry for Special Needs” and “Personality Disorders”) supporting the pastoral cognates established in 1980: “Clinical Pastoral Education, Parish Ministry, Hispanic Ministry, Peace and Justice Ministry and Educational Ministry” (p. 2). Field placements in the mid-1980s were organized around the pastoral cognate areas.

Field Education Handbooks from 1984-1986 present a wide range of field placements in each cognate area.

Theoretical influences impacted theological field education in the 1980s (Click, 2010). The influential work of Paolo Freire (1970) pointed to the role of praxis in education and was appropriated for seminary education including St. Thomas Seminary. Rev. Robert Schreiter (1985) a professor at Catholic Theological Union advocated the movement to integrate Freire’s work in theological endeavors:

The concept of praxis reaches beyond mere action to include the reflection upon that action...we are reminded once again that we come to know the competence of faith only through Christian performance...where performance moves beyond an intellectual formulation into engagement with its environment we discover its credibility...(p. 119)
Freire established that all learning is contextual in that *practice in context* is shaped by and also informs theoretical work (Freire, 1970). The work of Freire (1970) impacted the evolution of field education in seminaries as his theories informed the development of curricula.

In the 1980s, faculty workshops were given exploring the integration of Freire’s work into theological education. Although not explicitly stated, the field program objectives and student “competencies” integrate a component of *critical theological reflection*. The description of the field education program in a course catalogue notes that “field education courses require students to attend a forum conducted every other week to provide a setting with peers and faculty to explore the integration of academic and field education as well as to reflect theologically with a group on ministry issues” (1986, p. 36). The “Course Catalogue” also notes that the Hispanic Intercultural Ministry Program “strives to sensitize the seminary student by doing theological reflection utilizing the point of view of the Hispanic people” (1986, p. 67).

The Pastoral Field Program of the mid-1980s also developed learning objectives:

- Ability to minister one-on-one in the field cognate areas: Hispanic Ministry, Religious Education, Pastoral Care, Peace and Justice
- Ability to act as a consultant and a resource person
- Ability to develop and implement programs, classes, workshops, training sessions
- Ability to administer and office and work with others in a professional capacity
- Ability to set both personal and profession goals and the ability to evaluate them
- Ability to reflect theologically one one’s ministry and work
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• Ability to see ministerial activities within the larger context of mission of church
• Ability to relate effectively to people within pastoral care (1986, p. 36)

The Pastoral Field Program curriculum of the late 1980s and early 1990s had evolved into a comprehensive program better integrated within the Master of Divinity degree; the academic courses in the pastoral cognates supported experiences in the field curriculum resulting in a more cohesive program. The 1985 accreditation by North Central Association of Schools and Colleges and the Association of Theological Schools helped to shape field education by contemporary educational standards. St. Thomas Seminary held memberships at this time in a number of professional organizations including the Catholic Association of Theological Field Education.

**Vincentian Institute for Pastoral Studies: 1990s**

As the 1980s drew to a close, enrollment at St. Thomas Seminary (which became a concern in the later 1970s) continued to decrease sharply. As the 1990s arrived, there were only 13 students in the program of studies for ordained ministry (St. Thomas Seminary, 1990). This reduction in seminary students studying for ordained ministry as priests followed a national trend in the United States. In order to lessen the impact of decreasing enrollment, St. Thomas Seminary with the approval of the new Archbishop of Denver, Francis Stafford, had opened the Vincentian Institute of Pastoral Studies in 1987-1988 academic year. Vincentian Institute was a parallel educational body which served the *laity* (the regular body of church members) and utilized the St. Thomas Seminary facilities and professors with programs adapted for those in church ministry who would
not be ordained priests or deacons. As the need increased for various parish ministries, lay people with appropriate education in pastoral ministry filled positions in parishes.

The introduction of the “Course Catalogue” of 1988-1989 includes St. Thomas Seminary’s mission statement: “The Seminary’s primary mission is to prepare men for ordination to the Roman Catholic priesthood and deaconate according to the teachings of the Second Vatican Council and its implementing documents, primarily Program of Priestly Formation” (1988, p. 10). The introduction also explains that St. Thomas had expanded its mission to the Church “by training not only seminarians for the priesthood but also laity for non-ordained ministries” (p. 10). The structure of the Field Education Program was modified and field education cognates were added which addressed the needs of lay people working in church ministry. These new cognates consisted in “Ministry to the Poor, Ministry in a Clinical Setting, and Ministry in a Parish” (p. 10). Field education courses were integrated in certificate programs which were directed toward lay people working in volunteer or paid position in the Church (St. Thomas Seminary, 1987-1988).

Despite the increased enrollment resulting from the addition of the Vincentian Institute of Pastoral Studies, as the mid-1990s approached, the Vincentian Order made the decision that, due to budgetary problems, the facilities and campus of St. Thomas Seminary were too large to maintain. The Vincentians announced the closure of St. Thomas Seminary in 1995 (Archdiocese of Denver, 2008). The students studying for ordained ministry were sent to Mundelein Seminary in Indiana to complete their academic programs.
Seminary Field Education in the 21st Century: 2000-2010

As the 20th century came to a close, the groundwork for reopening the seminary was laid by Archbishop Charles Chaput, the seventh archbishop of Denver, who was appointed in 1997 by Pope John Paul II. The Archdiocese of Denver purchased the campus from the Vincentian religious order and in 1998, within a year following his installation as the Archbishop of Denver, Archbishop Chaput announced plans to found a new diocesan seminary using the site (and buildings) of the former seminary (Archdiocese of Denver, 2008). In the 1999-2000 academic year, the seminary was reopened under another name, St. John Vianney Theological Seminary. In 2003, the archdiocese began a five-million-dollar expansion to accommodate the growing enrollment encouraged by the leadership of Archbishop Charles Chaput. The expansion was completed in 2004 to accommodate almost 100 seminarians studying for the priesthood in that year. An additional expansion was completed in 2010 to house students as a result of increasing numbers.

With the opening of the new St. John Vianney Seminary, changes were made in the structure of the educational programs. The Archdiocese of Denver made the decision to reduce the variety of educational programs offered at the Seminary; an Institute for Pastoral Studies (Augustine Institute) for laity was reopened in 2005; however, it was not part of the Seminary’s educational programs (though it shared some professors). The Seminary program of studies focused (as it had for most of its history) on educating students who would be ordained ministers (priests and deacons).
As in past decades, the new St. John Vianney Seminary adapted directives and teachings from the worldwide Church. The prolific work of Pope John Paul II, a Polish Cardinal, elected just before 1980, continued to impact seminary education across America:

After much consultation with the priests and people of the Archdiocese of Denver, Archbishop Chaput announced his plan to open a theological seminary to serve the formation needs of clergy…engaged in the new evangelization of John Paul II…in the Rocky Mountain West… (St. John Vianney Seminary, 2007-2010, p. 5)

Seminary field education in the new millennium was particularly influenced by an exhortation (similar to an apostolic letter) of Pope John Paul II released in 1992: Pastores Dabo Vobis (“I Will Give You Shepherds”) on the training of priests. Further, the American Bishops updated, in 2006, the 5th edition of the Program of Priestly Formation based in large degree on the pope’s exhortation Pastores Dabo Vobis (1992). These pastoral guidelines gave clear directives for pastoral field education programs in seminaries.

As a result of these Church guidelines, the Pastoral Field Education Program of the Seminary continued to evolve in new directions. In the first years of St. John Vianney, field education focused on parish assignments influenced by the exhortation of Pope John Paul II, Ecclesia in America (1999).

…parishes are called to be welcoming and fraternal places of Christian initiation, of education, of celebration of the faith, open to the full range of charisms, service, ministries, organized in a communal and responsible way, utilizing existing…apostolates, attentive to the cultural diversity of the people, open to pastoral projects which extend beyond the individual parish and alert to the world in which they live. (art. 41)
Ecclesia in America called for the parish to be the center of ministry. Consequently, the first years of St. John Vianney’s new field program focused primarily on parish ministry including religious education in the parish schools. A Handbook of Field Education was developed for 2003-2004 academic year and updated most recently in 2010-2011.

The most recent revision to the “Pastoral Field Handbook” (2010-2011) [booklet] opens with guidelines from the Program of Priestly Formation (2006): “Clearly, pastoral [field] formation not only connects with the other three pillars (spiritual, intellectual, human) of priestly formation, but in itself, it provides a goal that integrates the other dimensions (art. 241). The “Handbook” summarizes: “Simply put, in the mind of the Church, seminaries exist to make pastors; thus all formation in the seminary is to be pastoral…the pastoral field program at St. John Vianney Theological Seminary exists to serve this end” (St. John Vianney Seminary, 2011-2012, p. 4).

A cursory review of “Pastoral Field Education Handbook” (2010-2011) reveals similarities to Seminary programs of past decades. The field program is multi-leveled (as it was in the past) and structured in three phases. The “Handbook” stresses that this process of movement through three phases addresses both the need for “broad (non-specialized) exposure to basic human needs as well as the more parochial-specific placements of a student who is training precisely to become a parish priest” (2010-2011, p. 8). The three phases of the program-design address competencies of the evolving student minister as the field programs had done in the late 1970s and 1980s. The current “Handbook” describes the three phases: The first phase is based on the Biblical reference to “works of mercy” (Matthew 25:34-46): feeding the hungry, giving drink to the thirsty,
clothing the naked, giving shelter to homeless, visiting the imprisoned, caring for sick and burying the dead. Seminarians in the first phase receive apostolic assignments in line with these “works of mercy” such as apostolates in hospitals, nursing homes, prisons, shelters for the homeless, food banks, and the Archdiocesan cemetery. Sites for field ministry include many of the locations which were utilized by St. Thomas Seminary in past decades and thus have a long history of collaboration with seminarians including the St. Vincent de Paul Society which has worked in partnership with Denver’s Catholic Seminary since the 1930s. Some examples of long-term field sites include St. Joseph Hospital, Samaritan House, Denver County Jail, Mullen Nursing Home, Catholic Worker Soup Kitchen.

The second phase of pastoral field education, described in the “Handbook” is the assignment of a teaching role in religious education: “The increasing depth of both a seminarian’s theological knowledge and his ability to articulate it enables appropriate field placements in religious education” (St. John Vianney Seminary, 2010-2011, p. 8). Examples of assignments include parish religious education for adults, Rite of Christian Initiation (preparatory instruction for joining the Church) confirmation classes for teenagers. The Archdiocese of Denver has a long history of teaching partnerships with seminarians and many of these partnerships endured even into the new century.

The third phase according to the “Field Education Handbook” is comprised of a series of placements in Archdiocesan parishes anticipating professional ministry: “The parish is the specific environment in which the seminarian is preparing to minister” (p. 8). This phase combines five parish placements in a variety of Northern Colorado contexts:
urban, suburban, rural or mountain, multi-cultural. In addition, in the final year of studies (as an ordained deacon), seminarians are assigned a part-time professional placement in an Archdiocesan parish (which is the present practice). Each field assignment is part of a curricular course of the Pastoral Field Education curriculum strand in the graduate Theology program. Seminarians receive academic credit and a grade for each semester of field education.

In line with the United Stated Catholic Bishops updated, *Program of Priestly Formation* (2006), the third phase of the Field Education Program focuses on parish ministry and appears to consist in a traditional field placement in a parish; on closer examination, the program description reveals a significant shift in educational pedagogy (St. John Vianney Seminary, 2010-2011). The evolution of theological field curriculum in the first decade of the new century relates to broader shifts in the field of education including the rise of 21st century and service learning pedagogies as well as the integration of contextual learning based originally on the work of Freire (1970). These pedagogies were being appropriated in theological education in the United States and shared through professional associations in which St. John Vianney also participated.

Click (2010) notes that a variety of scholarship encouraged seminary field education programs to utilize the pedagogy of 21st century education as well as contextual education, which came to be seen as a way of contextualizing the learning gained in theological academic courses, in order to more effectively prepare students for ministry. Subsequently, new curricular programs were developed which aimed at contextualizing theological learning in authentic settings and developing, in students, 21st
century competencies. These trends as well as the guidelines from *Program of Priestly Formation* (2006) impacted St. John Vianney. The Seminary’s “Pastoral Field Education Handbook” (2010-2011) program description reflects contextual learning pedagogy and the inclusion of 21st century competencies adapted for the Seminary’s Pastoral Field Education Program.

Emily Click (2010) of Harvard Divinity School outlines key components of contextual learning in theological field education including the pedagogical structure of field programs as well as curricular elements. She focuses on three key areas: First, the supervisory relationship plays a key role between a mentor (usually a member of clergy) and a student. The most recent “Field Education Handbook” cites as a specific learning goal of pastoral field education: “to assist a seminarian to see a connection between the act of ministry and…the prism of a particular theology, theologian, ecclesial document or the more personal insight of a supervisor [emphasis added]” (St. Thomas Seminary, 2010-2011, p. 5).

Second, Click (2010) cites the integration of experiences and learning in the field program with learning embedded in the curriculum experiences. The Pastoral Field Handbook expresses this integration:

> The Field Program is designed to be an effective bridge between human, spiritual and intellectual realms of formation and the pastoral realm… For, to the extent that a seminarian can effectively integrate and relate his human spiritual and intellectual self…and bring to bear Jesus Christ in concrete pastoral situations, he has to the same extent achieved the object of seminary formation as envisioned by the Church. (2010-2011, p. 4)

A related learning goal listed in the “Field Handbook” is to assist seminarians to understand the meaning and implication of theological church teachings in the
practical context within which they exercise ministry. This allows the integration of this theological knowledge with ministerial field experiences.

Third, Click (2010) notes that contextualized learning is set into an interpretive framework through a reflective seminar. The concept of theological reflection has come into prominence over the last 30 years in seminary education serving a number of ends (Dickey, 2006). Kinast (1990) summarizes: “Theological reflection is the discipline of exploring our individual and corporate experience in conversation with the wisdom of a religious heritage…the conversation is a genuine dialogue” (p. 3). The Seminary’s “Field Education Handbook” emphasizes the importance of reflection: “Key to this process of integration is theological reflection…Indeed theological reflection is the raison d’etre of pastoral field assignments…” (p. 5).

Although the Seminary has included a “reflection component” in field education courses in past decades, the latest program description presents theological reflection utilizing the pedagogy of contextual education as appropriated by theological field education. A pedagogical base in this approach is that “a living theology holds theory and praxis together” (Trokan, 1997, p. 145).

John Trokan (1997) notes that current scholarship in contextual learning presents a plethora of models for theological reflection and these models provide a “working map” of contextual theological learning. The “Handbook for Pastoral Field Education” (2010-2011) presents a reflection model with adaptations of Groome’s (1991) Christian praxis model. This model is considered as the Seminary’s “standard” model according to the “Field Handbook.” Groome’s model is considered a synthetic model of theological
reflection. The “Field Handbook” presents, in detail, the adapted synthetic model in a step by step process of reflecting upon a ministerial encounter:

1. Description of Encounter
2. Evaluation /Critical Reflection
3. Theological Perspective/Christian Vision
4. Analyze /Dialectical Hermeneutic
5. Commitment /Decision Response (St. John Vianney, p. 6)

The Field Program incorporates other methods to reflect theologically which also integrate contextual learning and synthetic models such as elements of pastoral circle (Holland & Henroit, 1984):

1. Insertion
2. Social Analysis
3. Theological Reflection
4. Pastoral Planning (St. John Vianney, p. 7)

Trokan (1997) notes that synthetic reflection models in theological education “attempt the difficult task of integrating Scripture, tradition, cultural information and personal experience in a dialogical way” (p. 148). Similarly, the “Field Handbook” explains the practice of synthetic reflection as “discerning the spiritual contours of an event,” that is, to see the presence of Jesus, to see the connections between human events and Scripture, to integrate Church history, and encyclicals. In short, it becomes a central point for integrating the components of theological ministry and contributes to the ministerial formation of the students, themselves.
An additional method of theological reflection utilized by the Seminary is the Lonergan Transcendental Model (1972). The background for this model is addressed in the Seminary’s philosophy program courses as it presupposes familiarity with the work of Thomas Aquinas, scholastic philosophy and epistemology. This model addresses the human capacity for self-transcendence in the following steps:

1. Attending
2. Understanding
3. Judging
4. Deciding
5. Loving (Lonergan, 1972)

Formal assignments in the field courses involving reflection include the *verbatim* assignments in which seminarians utilize a theological reflection model to produce a written reflection on a ministerial encounter which is initially described “verbatim.”

As noted in the program description, the majority of the student’s field education takes place in the parish setting. As distinct from the past, the emphasis has shifted from encountering multiple *types* of ministerial experiences to reflecting upon and engaging more deeply in the *experiences of the faith community*: “The goal is that the seminarians grow in their ability to reflect theologically on the pastoral encounters typical to and encountered within the parish.” Part of this shift is predicated on the work of Pope John Paul II who sees the parish as the *locus* of ministry from which other pastoral ministry extends outward (John Paul II, 1999).
In the last decade, Colorado has been designated as one of 12 destinations states for immigrant populations (State of Colorado, 2004). In response, Archbishop Chaput called for seminary preparation for multicultural ministry (2004). Subsequently, along with the regular field education program, the Seminary instituted a summer field education program which was designated for students’ preparation for multicultural ministry and which integrated 21st century skills. The “St. John Vianney Catalogue” (2007-2010) and the most recent “Catalogue” (2011-2013) describe intensive summer courses in Enculturation and Cultural Competencies for international and American seminarians including labs on intercultural communication and a field component (pp. 40-41).

A recent body of scholarship (Tortorici, 2010; Lindstrom, 2011; Moore, 2010) focuses on intercultural competencies as key components in effective field education programs in the 21st century. Tortorici (2010) advocates, for theological field education, “intercultural competencies that include the skills, attitudes, and behaviors that enable us to be effective in ministry across cultural contexts” (p. 55). The Seminary’s intercultural summer field program was designed to develop multiple interpretative and analytical abilities as described in 21st century competencies (Moore, 2010). The field program was designed to address a variety of multicultural settings in Denver and local faith communities and included field experiences. The curriculum included elements of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops’ (USCCB) program for intercultural competencies later published as Building Intercultural Competence for Ministers (2012). The USCCB program, developed in five modules, is designed to stress specific content and
intercultural competencies. For example, the content of Module 3 was developed to address intercultural communication in pastoral settings. Intercultural competencies addressed in this model include making decisions using culturally sensitive processes in a multicultural group, developing emotional discernment in intercultural communication, developing models of communication that are proper to a specific culture, applying conflict resolution skills in a multicultural context, applying models of ecclesial (church-related) integration. Along with the USCCB program, the Seminary’s intercultural program utilized contextualized reflection for processing experiences in intercultural ministry and fostered the development of intercultural competencies for ministry; the lab component of the summer program included visitation of sites in Denver and surrounding areas (St. John Vianney Seminary, 2007-2010).

The philosophy of the current Pastoral Field Education Program is articulated in the most recent Seminary Catalogue (2011-2013) opening with the work of Pope John II, Pastores Dabo Vobis (1992) and the words of the Second Vatican Council. These works stress that the whole training of seminary students should have as its objective the formation of seminarians as “shepherds of souls after the example of our Lord, Jesus Christ, teacher, priest and shepherd” (Optatam Totius, 1965, art. 4) focusing on key dimensions of Jesus’ ministry. The presentation of the program philosophy emphasizes that it is not enough that one be “emotionally, spiritually and intellectually mature; all these attributes have to be placed at the service of others” (p. 2011-2013, p. 11). Pastoral formation requires “that the seminarian be able to integrate in an authentic way what he has learned through study with what he has learned by experience” (2011-2013, p. 11).
Part III: Seminary Curriculum History in Light of Definition, Location, Tradition

Kelly Ritter (2009), in her historical study of basic writing curricula at Harvard and Yale, explores socio-historical forces that shape curriculum. Ritter notes in her work that, surprisingly, the histories of basic writing curricula at Harvard and Yale were quite different (2009, p. 7). In view of this, Ritter explores socio-historical aspects of curriculum development that may easily be overlooked but which she contends play a formative role in the evolution and history of a particular curriculum. Ritter (2009) proposes conceptual labels for a number of these socio-historical processes which she sees impacting curricula. Three of these concepts, *definition, location*, and *tradition*, provide a framework for the analysis of the findings in this study in light of the research questions.

**Definition in Curriculum History**

As a result of her study of curriculum history at Harvard and Yale, Ritter (2009) observes that socio-historical forces shape how a particular curriculum subject area is *defined*. Ritter (2009) notes that the *definition* of a curricular area “is a relative term, meaning something different in context” from institution to institution (p. 30). Ritter notes the importance of reaching back into institutional histories in order to trace the *definition* of a curriculum both chronologically and conceptually (p. 31). Ritter notes that, in order to fully grasp the social history of a curriculum, it is important to trace how a curricular area was defined at different points and to identify the forces shaping the definition.
Through the history of St. Thomas / St. John Vianney Seminary, the focus of field ministry was often guided by Church encyclicals (letters) issued by the pope or shaped by documents issued by the Apostolic See (the governing body of the Roman Catholic Church). As a result, the emphasis, parameters and *definition* of field ministry in theological seminaries was impacted by the authority of the Catholic Church. In investigating the first research question of this study: the role of the Catholic Church in the history of seminary field education, Ritter’s concept of *definition* of a curricular area comes into play. The role of the Catholic Church in the history and development of theological field education at St. Thomas / St. John Vianney Seminary involved providing or influencing the *definition* of ministerial field education.

Ritter (2009), in her work, points out the importance of acknowledging historical definitions of curricular programs in order to tie the definition to the direction which the curriculum took. Such a connection can be observed in the curriculum history of St. John Vianney Seminary. Archival materials cite themes addressed in papal encyclicals or cite Church directives utilized in the development of the Seminary’s curricula for field education programs. In the first part of the 20th century, field education was not part of the Seminary’s formal academic curriculum but did function as *non-formal education* as defined by the scholarly literature (Coombs, Prosser & Ahmed, 1973; Simkins, 1977; Fordham, 1993; Tight, 1996). Coombs et al. (1973) see non-formal education as any organized educational activity outside the established formal system that is intended to serve identifiable learners and learning objectives. Simkins (1977) established that non-formal
education utilizes curricula. As seminary field education in the first half of the 20th century included organized programs with objectives related to the tasks of ministry, these activities are best captured by the category of *non-formal education*.

At the turn of the century, an important encyclical on the dignity of work was released to the worldwide Church by Pope Leo XIII. This encyclical’s emphasis on the dignity of work was incorporated into seminaries as a seminal form of field education; these organized work programs benefited the Seminary as well as charitable organizations. The farm at St. Thomas Seminary and similar programs in other Catholic seminaries at the time (e.g., the building of wooden caskets at St. Joseph Seminary in Louisiana), based on the principles of *Rerum Novarum* (1899) were seen to benefit the students themselves through the virtue of work as well as aiding the Seminary and those in need.

Papal encyclicals issued to the worldwide Church continued to impact and alter approaches to ministerial formation. The encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno* by Pope Pius XI (1931), called for social reform; the encyclical emphasized the mutual responsibility of all to care for those in need. Precepts in this encyclical impacted seminaries including St. Thomas (White, 1989). In the 1930s, early field ministry evolved from organized work programs to *charitable service*; this new definition of field service was applied at St. Thomas Seminary though the projects of the St. Vincent de Paul Society and organized under Seminary *extra-curricular activities*. An early seminary handbook recommended participation by seminarians in the St. Vincent DePaul Society which was an international Catholic organization dedicated to charitable works for the
poor. Pope Leo XIII had promoted the St. Vincent de Paul Society and beginning in 1911 a St. Vincent de Paul Society Council was established in each diocese of the United States. A new definition of practical training for ministry was accomplished through universal Catholic organizations. Seminarians in Denver participated in the charitable ministry of the St. Vincent de Paul Society providing over 23,000 free meals to those in need in 1932 as a result of the significant poverty caused by the Depression (Noel, 1989).

In the 1940s and 1950s, relevant messages for the times were issued by the Apostolic See under the guidance of the newly elected Pope Pius XII. In the 1940s and 50s, the encyclicals of Pope Pius XII were well-circulated in the Seminary (encyclical literally means circulating letter) and a column, “The Pope Speaks,” was included regularly in the official seminary publication: Ambassador of Christ. An important encyclical for seminaries was Pope Pius XII’s, Menti Nostrae, which called for increased seminary preparation for active ministry. Pope Pius XII noted the difficulties of “the passage from the sheltered…life of the seminary to active ministry…” and called for guidance for future priests “in the first steps of ministry” (1950, art. 102).

In response to these directives from Pope Pius XII, seminary programs were supplemented with more experiences of active ministry. This focus (new definition) on tasks of active ministry impacted field experience. At the local level of St. Thomas Seminary, the directive of Pope Pius XII to “paternally guide future priests in the steps of ministry” was answered through expansion and development of apostolates (missions of service) in pastoral preparation of seminarians. These apostolates ranged from Motor Missions to teaching apostolates to specialized ministry for rural areas as described in the
findings. Though the apostolates were not yet part of the formal curriculum, they did utilize non-formal curriculum (such as Motor Mission instruction). These experiences in “active ministry” called for by Pope Pius XII enabled seminarians to develop pastoral skills before ordination and “enlarged their perspective of the wider activities of pastoral service in life beyond the seminary” (White, 1989, p. 347).

With the advent of the Catholic Church’s Second Vatican Council in the early 1960s, there came to be a more formal focus on training priests for active ministry. In 1965, Pope Paul VI promulgated the “Decree on Priestly Training” (Optatam Totius). The document outlined the Second Vatican Council’s vision for seminary education and formation initiating a period of educational reform; one such reform was the Council’s directives on pastoral field formation:

Pastoral concern…ought to permeate thoroughly the entire training of students…since it is necessary for the students to learn the art of exercising the apostolate not only theoretically but practically…they should be initiated into pastoral work, both during the course of studies and also during times of vacation. (Second Vatican Council, 1965, art. 20)

Supported by the vision of Pope John XXIII and Pope Paul VI, seminaries, worldwide, received a letter in 1966 from the Apostolic See authorizing them to undertake educational reform.

The work of the Second Vatican Council significantly impacted the parameters and definition of seminary curricula including what would become formal theological field education. Archival documents from the academic year of 1966-1967 reflect a change in educational philosophy initiated by the work of the Second Vatican Council, particularly, the promulgation of Optatam Totius, by Pope Paul VI in the fall of 1965.
Seminary Rector, Fr. Patrick O’Brien’s letter (noted in the findings) to the Seminary community in the winter of 1966 affirmed the impact of the Second Vatican Council in defining educational programs in Catholic seminaries: “[the] Vatican Council is explicit in its direction to seminary administrators…to bring to reality the aims of Vatican II…”

One such aim was an emphasis on field ministry. In the 1966-1967 academic year, St. Thomas Seminary presented a series of articles (as described in the findings) which addressed the direction of seminary education as prescribed by documents of the Second Vatican Council. The first article explored “one aspect of the formation of future priests – pastoral training…in light of some of the documents of the Second Vatican Council” (St. Thomas Seminary, 1967, p. 12). The article continues noting that Optatam Totius (“Decree on Priestly Training”) asserts that “pastoral concern should thoroughly penetrate the entire training of the seminarian and attaches special importance to practical application of this training” (p. 19).

The work of the Second Vatican Council significantly shaped the parameters and definition of seminary curricula including what would become formal theological field education. The directives of the Second Vatican Council initiated a broadening of the definition of field ministry and emphasized the importance of preparation of active ministry. By the late 1960s, a pastoral year (a year-long internship of ministerial service) was integrated into the final year of priestly formation at the Seminary and foreshadowed the creation of a curricular field education program in the next decade. The evolving definition of theological field education was broadening the development of future pastors and drawing seminarians toward the world as the field of their work.
In 1969, the U.S. Bishops Conference began to work to issue guidelines for American seminaries in order to implement the directives of the Second Vatican Council on seminary reform. These guidelines were approved under the title: *Program of Priestly Formation*. This reform of seminary programs included specific directives for pastoral education in which was included guidelines for field-based education. These guidelines constituted the first time that field education was integrated into the formal curricular programs of Catholic seminaries. White (1989) cites the guidelines specifically:

…every seminary should have a field education program under a priest who is a member of the faculty. Field education is to be integrated with spiritual and academic aspects of the seminary. The field experience of the seminary...[may include] parish work ...work in religious education, hospitals, charity projects and community organizations… (p. 418)

Contemporary Church historian, John Paver (2006), sees this as a turning point as field education was now distinguished as a formal curricular area rather than service work or extra-curricular activity. Field education came to be *defined* as an academic theological discipline.

In response to this new conceptualization of field education, Catholic seminaries began to develop curricular programs in ministerial field education. St. Thomas Seminary established the institution’s first curricular field education program in 1971. According to “Seminary Bulletin Supplement” (1971) which announced the new program: “The St. Thomas Theological Seminary Field Education program is based on the directives of Vatican II calling for a more pastoral preparation for students in preparation for priesthood and all students in preparation for [ordained] ministry” (p. 1). A Committee of Field Education was established to develop the field curriculum and
organize “various apostolic ministries” (p. 1). At St. Thomas Seminary, the new field education program still utilized the local tradition of apostolate from past decades. However, as described in the “Bulletin Supplement” (1971), there was a conscious effort to develop content, scope and sequence.

By the mid-1970s, the philosophy and structure of the field program and the relationship to Vatican II prescriptions was more fully conceptualized and enumerated in “Field Education Program of St. Thomas Seminary” (1973-1974). The program rationale was tied to the documents of Vatican II: “At the heart of ministry, then, is service—both service to fellow Christians…and service to all in realizing the transformation of all human reality in God, our Father…” (Second Vatican Council, 1965, art. 2). Here, the definition of theological field ministry is articulated as “service to all…” The evolving definition of the field program stressed social concerns throughout society. This new emphasis was illustrated in the Seminary’s field education handbook of 1973-1974. The curriculum and structure of the field program had changed to seven cognate areas which dealt with social concerns: Ministry to the Aged, Ministry to Youth, Ministry to the Mentally IIn, Catechetical Ministry and Ministry to the Sick.

Through the 1970s, the curriculum at St. Thomas Seminary continued to evolve using the work of the Second Vatican Council as the guiding definition. As a result of Second Vatican’s Council’s “Revision of Ecclesiastical Studies” which states: “They [seminarians] should also be taught to use the aids which the disciplines of psychology and sociology can provide…” (Second Vatican Council, 1965, art. 20), the social sciences were integrated in the seminary program of studies with the purpose of
supporting field ministry. Again, the St. Thomas Seminary field curriculum was directly affected by defining directives from the documents of the Second Vatican Council.

As the decade of the 1980s opened, diverse populations increased in Christian churches worldwide, including the United States. Catholic theologian, Fr. Karl Rahner, who had been an expert advisor to the Second Vatican Council and had been appointed by Pope John XXIII, called the attention of the theological community to an important dynamic: the dramatic growth of diverse populations in Christian faith communities during the 20th century. For Rahner, this shift in population also meant a shift characterized by diverse worldviews and “pastoral needs unprecedented in Christian history” (Rahner, 1979, p. 716). At the same time, the newly elected, Pope John Paul II, released one of his first exhortations, Catechesi Tradendae (“Catechesis in Our Time”) in which he emphasized the importance of culture in catechesis. Pope John Paul II affirms the importance of seeking “to know cultures and their essential components” and the importance of “helping them bring forth from their own living traditions original expressions of life, celebration and thought” (1979, art. 53).

Addressing the needs of increasingly diverse faith communities, worldwide, the Church’s focus on multicultural ministry (as well as diocesan pastoral initiatives) shaped and broadened the definition of field education programs and St. Thomas Seminary began to develop formal curricula for multicultural ministry. A “Bulletin Supplement” of 1980 announced a new curricular program in Hispanic Ministry which also included a significant field component. The new program addressed “the historical, cultural, social and philosophical and psychological dimensions” of the Hispanic community (p. 2).
The Hispanic Intercultural Ministry Program brought a plethora of new course offerings into the program of studies. The courses comprised a specialized tract within the Master of Divinity degree with the program goal of effective ministry to Hispanic people as well as the building of faith communities. Additionally, courses on Hispanic worship and relevant pastoral issues were included. The program description also emphasized the field dimension of the program: “to help put knowledge, theory and awareness into concrete practice” (p. 2).

In the 1980s, a theoretical pedagogy which influenced theological field education (and general education as well) was the work of Paolo Freire (1970). Freire, a Roman Catholic taught at the Pontifical Catholic University of Sao Paulo in Brazil during the 1980s. Pontifical universities are academic institutions established or approved by the Apostolic See. These institutions are designated in a special way to further the mission of the worldwide Catholic Church. Subsequently, Freire’s work became influential in the social sciences but was also addressed in theological scholarship.

In 1985, Rev. Robert Schreiter, a professor at Catholic Theological Union advocated the movement to integrate Freire’s work in theological endeavors: “The concept of praxis reaches beyond mere action to include the reflection upon the action…[in the same way] we come to know the competence of faith through Christian performance.” In the mid-1980s, workshops were offered at St. Thomas Seminary exploring the integration of Freire’s work into theological education [ca. 1980s, brochure]. Course catalogs of the mid-1980s describe critical theological reflection as a
component of the field education program. Expanded definitions of ministerial competency such as critical reflection informed the development of field education curricula at St. Thomas Seminary.

In the 1999-2000 academic year, after a 5-year closure (noted in the findings), the seminary reopened under another name, St. John Vianney Seminary. As in past decades, the new St. John Vianney Seminary applied and adapted directives and teachings from the universal Church. The prolific work of Pope John Paul II shaped seminary education across America and the world. Seminary field education, in the new millennium, was particularly influenced by an exhortation (similar to an apostolic letter) of Pope John Paul II released in 1992: Pater Dabo Vobis (“I will Give You Shepherds…”) on the education of priests. Further, the American Bishops Conference updated the Program of Priestly Formation in 2006 and this new edition was based in large degree on the pope’s work, Pater Dabo Vobis (1992). These guidelines set the parameters and definition for pastoral field education giving clear prescriptions for programs in seminaries. As a result of these Church guidelines, the Pastoral Field Education Program of the Seminary continued to evolve in new directions. In the first years of the new St. John Vianney Seminary, the field education program emphasized parish ministry influenced by the exhortation of Pope John Paul II, Ecclesia in America (1999): “Parishes are called to be welcoming and fraternal places of Christian initiation, of education, of celebration of the faith, open to the full range of charisms, service, ministries…apostolates, attentive to the cultural diversity of the people…” (art. 41). Ecclesia in America (1999) called for the parish to be at the center of ministry.
Consequently, St. John Vianney’s new field program focused primarily on parish ministry in line with the concepts advocated by Pope John Paul II. The Seminary “Handbook of Field Education” notes: “Simply put, in the mind of the Church, seminaries exist to make pastors; thus all formation in the seminary is to be pastoral…the pastoral field program at St. John Vianney Theological Seminary exists to serve this end” (St. John Vianney Seminary, 2010-2011, p. 4).

Additionally, Pope John Paul II advocated key competencies called for by the challenge of ministry in the 21st century. In 1999, John Paul II released the encyclical, *Ut Unum Sint* (“That All May Be One”) which called for the advancement of peace with particular emphasis on dialogue and intercultural competencies: “Although the concept of ‘dialogue’ might appear to give priority to the cognitive dimension. it involves the human person in his or her entirety…” (1999, p. 11). Preparation for the 21st century was also advocated in the updated *Program of Priestly Formation* written by the U.S. Catholic bishops and approved by the Apostolic See; this book formulated a prescriptive program for seminary education “identifying particular concerns and giving specific directions in light of needs and experiences in the United States” (p. 2) In the opening, the U.S. bishops emphasized the importance of the context of 21st century which “ought to play an important part in shaping seminary formation” (p. 5). The affirmation of the value of 21st century competencies by the U.S. Bishops influenced evolving field curricula at St. John Vianney. The Seminary’s most recent field education program reflects an emphasis on 21st century pedagogy including intercultural competencies (based on guidelines from the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops) and other 21st
century skills such as leadership, adaptability, collaboration, emotional discernment as well as critical and creative reflection and social analyses developed through contextual learning pedagogy as shown in the findings (“Pastoral Field Education Handbook”, 2010-2011).

Ritter (2009) in her historical study, notes that curricular areas are often redefined as contexts change. The Seminary’s curriculum history exhibits this dynamic in both the non-formal and formal field education curricula; the definition and parameters of field education evolved according to the influence and directives of the Church in changing historical eras.

**Location in the History of Curriculum**

In 1915, the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities was created under Pope Benedict XV. This was a new development in Church history, for since the Council of Trent, the local bishops had been the key figures in determining the program of the diocesan seminary. As a result, in the next 50 years, Roman authority played a significant role in providing guidelines and directives in the development of seminary programs (Ellis, 1967). These Church directives and prescriptions shaped the definition of seminary programs which in turn shaped seminary curricula. Ritter (2009) points out the importance of acknowledging historical definitions of curricular programs in order to tie the definition to the direction which the curriculum took. However, in regard to American seminary education, the role of local context also played a part in the development and history of seminary curriculum. Joseph White (1989) notes: “In the United States, universal ideals met the realities of local applications” (p. 266). This dynamic can be observed in the field curriculum history of Denver’s Catholic seminary.
The theme of “local application” is addressed in Ritter’s historical study of writing curricula. Ritter’s construct of location describes socio-historical forces shaping curriculum in the local context. She describes this concept as having two dimensions. First, it refers to the geographic location (and accompanying culture) within which curricula is developed. Second, it refers to the symbolic location in which curricula is placed in an institution’s program of studies. Ritter notes, “In sum, location is physical and metaphysical…it is practical and theoretical” (2009, p. 19).

In regard to the second research focus of this study, the findings indicate that the prescriptions and guidelines for seminary curriculum, originating from the Apostolic See, were applied and adapted by the local institution: St. Thomas / St. John Vianney Seminary. Ritter’s (2009) concept of location illuminates practitioners’ interpretations and applications of universal directives in the local context. As seen in the findings on the Seminary’s field curriculum history, the geographic location oriented the Seminary toward the American West and the institution sought to prepare students for ministry in the West even from its inception: “Since the priest who serves in a Western diocese should know how to care for his own rectory and church, the student preparing for such ministry will find excellent training in work of that nature…[such as] outdoor work (St. Thomas Seminary, p. 26, [booklet]). This orientation exists even today as the Archdiocese recently described the Seminary as a “sign of a new evangelization in the Rocky Mountain West” (Archdiocese of Denver, 2013, p. 5). As a result, universal Church prescriptions for pastoral field education were applied to this local geographic context.
In the early days of the Seminary, field experience consisted in organized work programs; the specific form of the work program was influenced by the Seminary’s location. St. Thomas Seminary established a working farm (as the findings note) as agriculture and livestock management were key livelihoods of the West. Notably, the skills seminarians acquired on the working farm gave them a practical foundation for life at a time when Colorado was more rural than urban (Wyckoff, 1999). Utilizing such skills, “the priest working in the Western diocese” could help support himself and his flock.

In the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s, the Seminary presented regular workshops in partnership with the Conference for Rural Life as much of the Rocky Mountain West was still rural. Several long-running apostolates provided field training devoted to specialized ministry for rural areas dedicated to the spiritual and material welfare of rural communities. Additionally, as many of the Seminary’s students would go on to minister in rural areas, St. Thomas Seminary promoted and hosted the Annual Western Seminarians Workshop held in the 1950s and 1960s. This three-day conference addressed issues related to field ministry in a rural context. Seminarians from Western dioceses took part in lectures by experts and discussions on the opportunities and the challenges facing priests in rural work. Seminary announcements promoted the annual workshop held near the beginning of the academic year (St. Thomas Seminary, 1958, [official publication]). This field ministry focused on caring not only for Catholics but other denominations also living in rural communities. Even in the new millennium, seminarians participate in field ministry adapted to life in the Rocky Mountain West. Such ministry includes mountain
retreats which combine catechesis and spiritual reflection and such activities as hiking, camping, and liturgical celebrations on mountain tops (Dwyer, personal communication, 2011).

In the 1980s, Archbishop of Denver, Francis Stafford, in a letter to seminarians, cites the Seminary’s role in the development of the Rocky Mountain West:

St. Thomas Seminary is the only Catholic theologate for nearly 1000 miles in all directions. As such, it fulfills an important role in preparing seminarians for priestly ministry with a special accent on the needs of this region of the United States. I am also grateful for the seminary’s leadership in intercultural ministry, particularly as our Hispanic population is experiencing significant growth. [letter]

The development and inclusion of a Hispanic Ministry curricular program in the 1980s directly addressed the increasing Hispanic populations in Denver and the West as Archbishop Stafford notes “in the ecclesial province.” The area of Hispanic Ministry offered a comparatively large number of courses supported by faculty positions (St. Thomas Seminary, 1981). Specific course titles in the Seminary program included:

“History of the US Church: Hispanic Perspectives,” “Hispanic Dimensions of Worship,” “Cultural Perspectives of Mexican-Americans,” “Introduction to Bi-cultural Parishes,” “Methodology on Sermons for Spanish-speaking Communities,” “Religious Education in Hispanic Communities,” “Sociology of Mexican-American Communities,” “Building Hispanic Faith Communities” and electives. A foundational element of the program was Spanish language instruction including a “concentrated program in the Language for Christian Ministry Program offered in Cuernavaca, Mexico” (St. Thomas Seminary, 1981, p. 3). St. Thomas Seminary’s Hispanic Ministry curricula was not only influenced by the Church’s call for more culturally-sensitive ministry in the 1980s but also the
Seminary’s geographic location; historically, St. Thomas had a long-standing involvement in Hispanic ministry as demographic increases in immigrant and native Hispanic populations impacted the American West. In the 1950s, seminarians were sent to Montezuma Seminary in New Mexico to prepare for Spanish apostolates, to learn the Spanish language and to increase their cultural knowledge. In the 1950s, Denver’s Archbishop Vehr affirmed the value of Spanish apostolates “to establish a common bond between Denver clergy and the Spanish-speaking people of the archdiocese” (Ambassador, 1959, p. 12). The development of an extensive Hispanic Ministry curricular field program in the 1980s and 1990s and the inclusion of intercultural ministry courses (with a field component) in the new millennium (as described in the findings) reflect the ongoing local response by the Seminary to the historically-rooted Latino community of Colorado and the West.

Ritter (2009) contends that the “site of study” (institution’s location) significantly impacts curriculum decisions and development. The history of the field program at St. John Vianney reflects the Seminary’s application of Church prescriptions in the local geographic location of the American West and reflects the Seminary’s identity as a centrally located theologue dedicated to “preparing seminarians for ministry with a special accent…on this [Western] region…” (Stafford, ca. 1980s, [letter]).

The second dimension of location is symbolic and refers to the location of specific formal and non-formal curriculum within the educational institution. Ritter (2009) notes that the location of various curricular programs within the institution is an “embodiment of the values and priorities of the institution itself” (p. 24). In the case of theological field
education, for much of the history of St. Thomas Seminary, field education was not part of the formal program of studies. The actual practice of ministry was not considered an academic endeavor but rather charitable or pastoral work. Ministerial field experiences operated as extra-curricular activities or as apostolates. Though ministerial field training was not part of the Seminary’s formal academic program, it was respected and valued by the institution and students. For example, the bishop attended St. Vincent de Paul Society meetings at the Seminary and, for the popular Motor Mission apostolate, students were instructed in preaching and evangelization (though outside the formal program). Students were able to practice ministerial skills through experiential activities supervised by priests and laity in mentoring roles. At this time, field ministry was seen in the local context as a pastoral endeavor distinguished from an academic endeavor. However, the fact that early field ministry could be characterized as non-formal education (according to the scholarly literature) suggests that pastoral work was considered to be an important type of instruction by the institution. Another indication of the value of early field ministry is seen through archival photographs of seminarians engaged in field ministry (Klein, personal communication, 2013).

Ritter (2009) emphasizes that the curriculum of any program is impacted by how the institution constructs and places curricular programs. After its implementation as a formal academic program in the 1970s, according to Church directives, the location of the field curricula in the overall program of studies shows an increasing emphasis given by the local Seminary. Ministerial field education moved from a fledgling program in the 1970s to an integrated program in the 1980s and to a central location in the new
millennium. In the 1970s, field education became part of the formal curriculum and was housed as a “strand” in the pastoral theology department. By the 1980s, field education came to be seen as an important component and point of integration for the well-rounded development of ministerial competency. The pastoral cognates (such as Peace and Justice Ministry) developed as part of the Master of Divinity degree in the 1980s included a field component integrated with regular academic courses which supported the field ministry.

When St. John Vianney opened in 1999-2000, the field education program operated as a distinct curricular program; additionally, course work in the entire theology program had integrated a pastoral ministry component. The course catalogue states, “Every moment of the process of growth in the seminary should make reference to the pastoral setting” (St. John Vianney Seminary, 2011, p. 7). Moreover, a block of time in the academic schedule was devoted to field education: along with field education courses, one afternoon each week was reserved for actual field apostolates. The central location of field ministry is reflected in the 2010-2011 field education handbook, “All theological education leads to ministry” (p. 3). Ritter (2009) concludes: these historical locations say something about the value and institutional worth of a curricular area” (p. 25). The increasing focus on the importance of theological field education at St. Thomas / St. John Vianney Seminary is an example of practitioners’ response to educational directives in the local context.

**Tradition in Curriculum History**

A third socio-historical force described by Ritter (2009) is the great influence of institutional tradition on the development of curricula through time. Ritter looks beyond
“the theoretical research-based arguments” which address the evolution of curricula (p.19). Ritter, instead, notes the diverse histories of institutions and the far-reaching impact of “course-artifacts that existed in a particular time and place” but still live in the tradition of the institution. Ritter also notes that a curriculum is “often built on local histories” (p. 19). Ritter’s (2009) concept of tradition is relevant to the second research focus of this study and sheds light on the process by which practitioners interpreted and applied universal prescriptions in the local context of the Seminary.

One such example is the Church’s emphasis on experiences of active ministry for seminarians; this was applied in the local context according to a long-standing tradition of affirming teaching ministries at Denver’s Catholic seminary. Even from the time of the first bishop of Colorado, Bishop Machebeuf, there had been an emphasis on the development of religious education. In the subsequent decades, seminarians were highly involved teaching catechetics (doctrine) and religious education in a variety of settings: Catholic mountain camps, Catholic schools, and public lectures for the community. Seminarians also taught for the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine (religious education in public schools) from the 1930s to the present day.

Through time, the Seminary developed a number of teaching apostolates in specialized contexts. One such example was the Catholic Camp Movement, a summer apostolate in which seminarians worked as catechism teachers and craft instructors. In the 1950s and 1960s, one in four seminarians gained teaching experience in the Catholic Camp Movement (Noel, 1989). Another example of a teaching apostolate in a specialized context was religious education for Spanish speakers including migrant workers as these
populations increased through the 1950s. A Seminary report relates: “This past summer… a number seminarians worked among Spanish-speaking migrant workers in northeastern Colorado…These seminarians gave religious instruction in Spanish and did other apostolic work” (St. Thomas Seminary, 1957). Additionally seminarians were involved in traditional teaching apostolates in the Denver Catholic school system. As described in the findings, seminarians taught in Catholic elementary and high schools to the large population of students in the 1950s and 1960s. Teaching apostolates were promoted in these decades and the official publication of the seminary, Ambassador of Christ, proclaimed “all…are to be teachers…” (1953, p. 3). As seminarians were involved in so many teaching activities outside of the Seminary, formal changes were implemented in the curricula to support teaching apostolates as early as the 1940s with the courses, “Educational Psychology” and “Catechetics.” By the 1950s, courses in administration were implemented which included guest speakers on a variety of topics. Although teaching apostolates still operated (for the most part) as non-formal curriculum, substantial training was directed toward students engaging in teaching field experiences.

The archival findings of the study reflect the value placed on education in the local context of the seminary. The Seminary’s official publication presented a treatise on education by Bishop John Wright of Pittsburgh in 1959. The bishop emphasized the key role of teaching in field ministry:

The Council of Trent, St. Augustine, St. Charles Borromeo, St. Pius X, Pope Leo XIII and many others insist that teaching is the chief duty of the episcopal [bishop’s] Office. Priests share in this duty… (Wright, 1959, p. 6).
As the new decade opened, a required minor in Education was added to the program of studies “since the priest is often called to teach formally in the classroom” (St. Thomas Seminary, 1959). Specific courses in the curriculum included “History of Education,” “Philosophy of Education,” “Psychology of Education,” “Methodology of Education” as well as “Educational Guidance” (educational counseling). An educational minor, a cognate as part of a Master of Divinity Degree or a certification were maintained in the curriculum through the 1990s. With the reopening of the Seminary in 2000, educational courses could be taken in partnership with Regis University and field experiences in teaching constitute part of the introduction to field education as well as the entire second phase of the pastoral field program. The long-standing emphasis on the importance of teaching ministry is reflected in St John Vianney Seminary’s current faculty: five former students have returned to the Seminary as faculty and former students have served as teachers in the Seminary’s past history (Dwyer, personal communication, 2011). Regarding institutional tradition, Ritter (2009) points out a dynamic in which a curriculum “aligns itself with an increasingly historical sense of correctness” (p. 26). The Seminary’s tradition of holding teaching ministry as a key element of formal and non-formal field curricula is another example of the interpretation and application of field education in the local context.

The history and evolution of field education curricula at St. Thomas / St. John Vianney Seminary involved an ongoing adaption and application of curricula to the local socio-historical context; at the same time, curricula was shaped in conjunction with pastoral goals and directives of the worldwide Catholic Church which was responding (as
well) to new historical eras. In 1965, Pope Paul VI promulgated the significant Vatican II document, *Optatam Totius*, which reflects a universal and local complementarity shaping the education of future priests:

[Thus] will the universal laws be adapted to the particular circumstances of the times and localities so that the priestly training will always be in tune with the pastoral needs of those regions in which the ministry is to be exercised.

(Second Vatican Council, 1965, p. 1)
Chapter Five: Summary and Critical Discussion: Influences of Social & Historical Context on Curriculum

An examination of instructional practices and curriculum at institutions outside the traditional circles…not only expands our understanding… but illuminates the development of… curriculum and instruction in America as a whole.

Gold (2008) on historiography of education

Summary

The preceding chapters of this study trace the curriculum history of theological field education at St. John Vianney Seminary in Denver. This study describes formal, and non-formal field education and chronicles the evolution of field experiences and field programs during the period of time from 1910-2010. The historical method was utilized for this research which involved analyzing two-dimensional sources located in archival repositories. The majority of the sources used in the study consisted of archival materials from the Archdiocese of Denver Archives and Special Collections. The sources used in this study included Seminary course catalogues, bulletins, program handbooks, student handbooks, institutional reports, flyers and the official (seasonal) publication of the Seminary, letters, spiritual guides and other documents. Photographs provided additional background. The variety of materials allowed for multiple perspectives of the Seminary program of studies and non-formal field experiences.
The chronological description of the curriculum was divided into two sections: the period from 1910-1969 in which field education existed without formal inclusion in the academic program and the period from 1970-2010 when the field education program was established as a curricular program in the overall program of studies. During the first historical phase of field education in the early years of St. Thomas Seminary, the first field experiences were primarily work programs. With the onset of the Depression, the intense hardship called for charity work and these non-formal pastoral experiences were captured as extra-curricular activities in the “Rules and Customs of St. Thomas Seminary” [booklet].

In the 1940s and 1950s, field education was more formalized under the concept of apostolate (service missions). Apostolates were promoted and part of seminary culture. Though outside the formal program of studies, students received training and instructional materials for various service missions such as the Motor Mission and Catholic Action projects. As teaching was considered important preparation for a priest, seminarians sought field experiences in teaching although the training was non-formal. In the 1960s, a minor in Education was added to the curriculum; however it contained only one methods course.

In the second phase of the curriculum history chronology, 1970-2010, field education was established as an actual curricular program. Documents authored by the Second Vatican Council gave directives for the development of field education in seminaries. At St. Thomas Seminary, the first curricular programs were organized as ministry classes in the pastoral theology curriculum strand. Field courses were organized
under *community ministry apostolates* (such as parish work) and *specialized ministry apostolates* (such as hospital and jail ministry). In the first years of the field education program, exposure to these ministerial contexts was considered educational, in itself. In the 1970s, *critical theological reflection* was integrated into the field education curriculum influenced by the work of Freire (1970) and his affiliation with Brazil’s Pontifical Catholic University.

In the 1980s, the field curriculum was integrated more cohesively into the Master of Divinity degree and incorporated standards of professional educational. The pastoral theology strand (which housed field education) was restructured and divided into several pastoral cognates containing both field education courses and regular academic courses. In this way, both regular courses and field courses supported ministerial learning in a particular cognate such as *Religious Education* or *Peace and Justice*. In the 1980s, both field-based and academic courses were added to the program of studies to support multicultural ministry. At the time, this was designated *Hispanic Ministry*.

As enrollment dropped substantially by the 1990s, certificate programs in pastoral theology and other areas were developed for laity (non-clergy) as part of the new Vincentian Institute of Pastoral Studies inaugurated in the late 1980s. Certificates were offered in specialized ministerial areas and included a field education component. With the closure of St. Thomas Seminary in the mid-1990s, due to budgetary problems, the Vincentian professors and administrators were assigned to other Vincentian institutions in the United States. Consequently, field program structures and curriculum content were redeveloped with new pedagogies when the Seminary reopened. In the academic year of
1999-2000, the Seminary was established under a new name: St. John Vianney Seminary. The educational curriculum in the first decade of the new millennium was shaped by the prolific work of Pope John Paul II and contextual pedagogies being utilized in theological education.

In the process of researching and reconstructing the curriculum history of the seminary’s Theological Field Education Program as recounted in the findings (see Chapter Four), the study was guided by research questions, specifically: the investigation of the role the Catholic Church in the development of field education; second, inquiry into the adaption and application of Church guidelines in the local context of St. Thomas Seminary / St. John Vianney Seminary. The conceptual framework of Kelly Ritter (2009) was utilized as a tool to analyze the findings in light of the research questions. The analysis shows the role of the Catholic Church primarily consisted in providing the definition of seminary educational programs according to Ritter’s conceptualization of the term. Regarding the second research question, the adaptation and application of Church guidelines and directives were interpreted in the local context based on the Seminary’s location in the American West and in accord with the Seminary’s tradition; two more concepts of Ritter (2009) which describe socio-historical forces shaping curricula.

**Reflection on Findings Relative to the Research Literature**

The findings of this study support and are consonant with a number of research studies in key areas in the scholarly literature: seminary education, curriculum history and educational *historiography* (which is the narrative presentation of history based on
critical examination of material from primary sources). A large percentage of the scholarly literature on seminary education in the United States is found in the form of historical accounts and tends to focus on Catholic seminaries in the eastern and midwestern United States (rather than the American West) and on Protestant seminaries. There are very few comprehensive studies of Roman Catholic Seminaries, which differ to an extent, in mission, structure and curriculum from their counterparts; in particular, in regard to the influence of Rome as an authority in establishing goals, directives and prescriptions for educational programs. Munro-Hendry (2011) observes that the dearth of research on significant areas of Catholic education has “distorted the history of education by neglecting one of the longest surviving continuous educational institutions in the United States” (p. 126). This study of curriculum history at St. John Vianney Theological Seminary seeks to help fill an existing gap in the literature regarding Catholic seminary education.

This research also seeks to contribute to the scholarship in the area of curriculum history through the examination of a “neglected narrative of curriculum history,” that is, the study of theological field curricula in a Catholic seminary in the American West. The study of curriculum history allows insight into the context of how curriculum was constructed and chosen including the historical and social contexts. Munro-Hendry notes that certain curriculums are “possible and impossible in particular historical moments” and she calls this the “conversation between curriculum theory and history (2011, p .x).”

“Excavating” a curriculum history allows one to uncover and examine the “social, political and cultural dynamics of ‘knowledge’…” (Munro-Hendry, 2011, p. ix). This
“excavation” allows for scholarly examination of the historical and social forces which shape curriculum. Kliebard (1992) notes the importance of using historical analysis as a “way of disentangling…” the construction of curriculum. In this study, the “historical excavation” of archival data suggests a pattern manifested in field program evolution; curricular changes were tied to the different emphases of different popes through time. The goals, themes and directives of each particular papacy were made concrete and adapted in the local context of St. John Vianney Seminary’s program of studies. One such example, described in the findings (see Chapter Four), was the call by Pope Pius XII for “active ministry” which prepared seminarians for the “passage from the sheltered…life of the seminary” to active ministry in the community (1950, art. 102). In response to this call articulated by Pope Pius XII in the encyclical, Menti Nostrae, seminary programs were expanded to include more experiences of active ministry. At the local level of St. Thomas Seminary, the archival data shows the expansion and development of apostolates (missions of service) which particularly served the needs of the American West in the pastoral preparation of seminarians. The correlation between the emphases of each historical papacy and the incarnation of these emphases in local seminary programs appeared as a repeated pattern shown in archival material; for example, the goals and emphases of the papacy of Pope Pius XII were presented and highlighted in official seminary publications from the 1950s (St. Thomas Seminary, 1950, 1954, 1957). Catholic seminaries looked to the leadership of the pope for spiritual guidance in living out the mission of the Church in different historical eras: “Pope Pius XII is the guiding
model of compelling inspiration… He is that ‘servant of the servants of the Lord’ whom we pray will continue to instruct us…” (St. Thomas Seminary, 1957, p. 4).

This pattern is also seen in response to the work of the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965). Supported by the vision of Pope John XXIII and Pope Paul VI, the Second Vatican Council presented directives for seminary educational reform including the implementation of pastoral field programs: “it is necessary for the students to learn the art of exercising the apostolate not only theoretically, but practically… they should be initiated into pastoral work, both during the course of studies and also during times of vacation…” (Second Vatican Council, 1965, p. 19). Archival data reflects the forthcoming changes prescribed by the documents of Vatican II. Seminary Rector, Fr. Patrick O’Brien, in a letter to the seminary community from 1966, supports the changes directed by the work of the Second Vatican Council: “Vatican II is explicit in its direction to seminary administrators. Students and faculty alike hope…that what we do to bring to reality the aims of Vatican II will promote…oneness in Christ” [letter]. At the local level of St. Thomas Seminary, as well as seminaries, worldwide, the implementation of formal field education programs was the concrete result of Vatican II directives.

This same pattern is seen in the Seminary’s theological field program of the new millennium. Archival material, such as the pastoral field handbook, states explicitly that the field program was shaped by the writings of Pope John Paul II, in particular, the 1992 exhortation, *Pastores Dabo Vobis* (“I Will Give You Shepherds”) as well as the documents of the Second Vatican Council. Both implicitly and explicitly, the goals and themes of different papacies through time shaped the parameters and definition of field
education at St. Thomas / St. John Vianney Seminary. This curriculum history study is consonant with the work of Kliebard who sees that the evolution of curriculum and the “interplay of multiple forces which shape curriculum” can be manifested through a curriculum history (Kliebard, 1992).

The work of David Gold (2008) advocates research of “institutions outside traditional circles” noting that these unique case studies “illuminate the development” of curriculum and instruction “in America as a whole” (p. 7). Munro-Hendry (2011) advocates research of “narratives of curriculum history which have been refused an identity” (p. xi). The focus of this study, St. John Vianney Seminary, can be seen as an example of “an institution outside tradition circles” and its theological curriculum history as a “neglected narrative.” Greater scholarly research of understudied cases, such as seminary curricula, contributes a new dimension to the field of curriculum history. Herbert Kliebard sees unique studies in curriculum history as valuable: “individual case studies of curriculum and studies of the evolution of particular subjects…add an important new dimension to curriculum history” (1992, p. xiii). This study of seminary field curricula offers a broadened conceptual framework for understanding the socio-historical forces which influenced seminary field education such as the prescriptive role of the Catholic Church in shaping the definition and parameters of field education, the educational traditions of the Seminary which impacted field curriculum and the shaping of field curricula in the context of the Seminary’s location in the American West.

This study also contributes to the field of educational historiography which emphasizes the use of primary sources to construct a historical narrative. The archival
collections of the Archdiocese of Denver have been utilized for a very limited number of studies touching upon Denver’s seminary (Feely, 1973; Noel, 1989). Archival research for this case study sheds light on the curriculum history of Seminary field education through the use of primary documents, many of which have never been used in a scholarly study (Klein, personal communication, 2012). Specifically, this study explores the socio-historical dynamics of curriculum development as documented in archival material. The substantial amount of archival material relevant to the focus of this study enabled the construction of a field curriculum history in narrative form: a historiography. Archival materials utilized in this study served as important sources for documenting seminary programs and curricula and identifying changes in the curricula through time. Nash (2005) notes that the description of courses, programs and curricula are very valuable sources of data. In this study, archival materials such as seminary course catalogues, program descriptions, bulletins, handbooks, flyers, publications, administrative documents, and institutional booklets provided rich sources of data on non-formal and formal theological field education. Archival materials showed the early development of field education as a non-formal program (through flyers, publications, photographs and handbooks), and later as a formal curricular program (in course catalogues and course bulletins). In this study, seminary archival materials were couched within larger social, religious, political and institutional histories to provide context for the findings and analysis according to recommended practices for archival research in the work of Lewis-Gaillet (2010).
Michael Hill (1993), archival scholar, advocates the use of historical materials for educational research. He contends that social scientists bring to historical research their own disciplinary framework which changes the emphasis of historical work. Hill also stresses the importance of recovering disciplinary history for the purpose of critical understanding. McCulloch (2004) articulates the value of archival research noting its “immense importance for educational…research” regarding both the past and the present: “It is crucial for our understanding of the past, but is also potentially significant for contemporary research and for demonstrating the development of issues over time” (p.73). In this study, historical and archival methods of inquiry are used to describe and interpret the history and context of curriculum development at St. John Vianney Seminary from the early 20th century through the early 21st century. Cohen et al. (2007) note that historical method has been used effectively in curriculum studies.

Limitations of the Study

One aspect limiting this study is its focus on only one seminary as opposed to focusing on a group of seminaries in the western United States. However, Wolcott (2001) notes that much can be learned from an individual case study. Similarly, both Kliebard (1992) and Gold (2008) stress the importance of unique case studies. The educational literature also includes a tradition of scholarship focusing on a single institution or topic as a particular case study. Another possible limitation of this study is that it may not be applicable to other institutions of higher education. However, David Gold (2008) notes that an unusual case may shed light on other cases. He contends: “National educational histories cannot be understood but in relation to local histories…” (p.152).
As mentioned earlier in the discussion of methods, historical studies are always limited by the range of existing sources that are available. Consequently, this study focused on selected decades from which sufficient materials were preserved to arrive at an “interpretive stance and a degree of description which seems adequate” (Rury, 1993, p. 268). Regarding the research data, the Archdiocese of Denver Archives & Special Collections revealed more abundant archival materials from certain time periods (e.g., the 1950s & 1970s). As a result, the research was more thorough for decades in which more source materials were preserved. Parameters were also placed on the scope of this project; this study is limited to an analysis of St. Thomas Seminary / St. John Vianney Seminary curricula in the years between 1910 and 2010 although materials exist on priestly training and formation prior to this time. As all historical research encounters limitations, Jordanova (2006) warns against the “crippling ideal” of comprehensiveness in a historical study.

**Implications & Further Research Suggested by this Curriculum History Study**

The unique history and development of curricula at St. John Vianney Seminary address Kliebard’s contention that such a case “brings into focus a dimension of curriculum...that might otherwise not be considered” (1992, p. 214). The exploration of seminary curriculum history within this study provides relevant insights for general education as a whole, in particular, the forces shaping the evolution of curriculum through time.

Additionally, the development of American seminary curricula followed a path which can be recognized in a current trend in general education, that is, the local
implementation of national educational initiatives. In this study, theological field programs are examples of prescriptive curriculum programs which must be adapted locally. In seminaries, theological field curriculum is based on “norms suggested by ecclesiastical authorities for seminary programs” (Roebert, 1978, p. iv). Historically, American Catholic theological seminaries locally applied the curricular guidelines which came out of Church Councils (in Rome), other universal Church documents (e.g., encyclicals and exhortations) or governing bodies such as the Congregation of Seminaries and Universities.

Current research (Zorn et al., 2003, McLaughlin, 1993, Morgan et al., 1993), on the implementation of highly prescriptive programs (such as national initiatives) which were implemented locally, reflects the dynamic process found in the history of seminary curriculum development. For example, adaptations in local contexts can be necessary in order to allow national initiatives to work (Zorn et al., 2003). Adaptations make programs more meaningful and allow them to fit the contexts in which they are being used. In a similar manner, adaptive practices in seminary field programs allowed for the application of guidelines in the local context. Archival research, in this study, showed the impact of local context on the development of seminary theological field programs through time, specifically, the adaption of field curricula to serve the needs of the American West and the impact of institutional tradition in shaping field curricula.

Research, in the understudied area of seminary curricula development, sheds light on the “balancing act” which American education faces today. In the current educational climate, Zorn et al. (2003) note the increase of “top-down advocacy for standardized,
prescriptive education programs” (p. 14). These researchers also note the importance of
of “paying attention” to the fact that highly prescriptive programs are “always applied in
particular socio-cultural contexts” (2003, p. 14). In their research, Zorn et al. (2003) warn
that local conditions “mitigated against...a cookie-cutter approach” in the implementation
of educational programs (p. 14). Historically, the process of seminary curriculum
development has integrated universal prescriptions and local socio-cultural conditions.
The unique curriculum history of St. John Vianney’s field education program reflects
“irreducible elements” of universally prescribed guidelines as well as a “wealth of
adaptations” that current scholars, such as Zorn (2003), have noted in research on the
dynamics of local application and adaption of prescriptive curriculum programs.

Michael Fullan’s (1994) work also presents research findings on curricular
development and adaptation. Fullan contends that neither “top-down” strategies nor
“bottom-up” strategies aimed at curricular excellence “work” alone. Fullan contends that
what is required is a more sophisticated blend of the two. He presents the conceptual
framework and empirical evidence that suggests a “blend of the two strategies is
essential” for effective results (p. 1).

Specific factors which create a context in which
such a “blending” is workable are explored in the research literature; a key factor is the
existence of a complementary relationship between those bodies issuing universally
prescribed guidelines and those bodies adapting these guidelines locally (Uhrmacher,

Bruce Uhrmacher (1991), in his study of Waldorf education, observes a
complementarity between the educational philosophy of Rudolf Steiner and Waldorf
educators: “The intentions provided by Steiner still have relevance today for Waldorf educators, because, in part, his aims and goals were global enough to give teachers latitude. The flexibility in the orientation of Waldorf education provides one reason why Waldorf educators still engage in Steiner’s intentions” (1991, p. 247). Fullan (1998), in reflecting on educational reform in Canada, notes that, for curriculum reform to be successful, state-level frameworks and structures must provide sufficient flexibility at the local level “for teachers, schools and districts to adapt or develop local versions” (pp. 1-2). Fullan (1998), in his discussion on integrating “top-half” and “bottom-half” constituencies in the process of curricular reform, notes the importance of “sensitivity to the local context” on the part of “top-half” bodies to allow for local adaptions (p. 6). This same type of flexibility or complementarity operated in the evolution of the field program of St. Thomas / St. John Vianney Seminary. As captured in the documents of Vatican II, there is an acknowledgement, at the universal level, of the importance of adapting seminary programs at the local level:

[Thus] will the universal laws be adapted to the particular circumstances of the times and localities [emphasis added] so that the priestly training will always be in tune with the pastoral needs of those regions in which the ministry is to be exercised. (Second Vatican Council, 1965, p. 1)

Other key factors that facilitate a “blending” between the universal and the local levels are described by Uhrmacher (1991) in his Waldorf study. Uhrmacher cites a consonance between Waldorf (Steiner’s) philosophy and intentions of local Waldorf practitioners. Uhrmacher points out that Waldorf educators desire this consonance between Steiner’s intentions and their own. He notes that “teachers have specifically chosen to teach in Waldorf schools, knowing that they are built on Steiner’s ideas” (1991, p. 249). Fullan
(1998) points to the importance of establishing *rapport* between “top-half and bottom-half constituencies” and he describes this dimension as crucially important. Fullan advocates combining “top-down desires and bottom-up inclinations” which strengthens the “overall capacity to mobilize local and universal forces in concert.” (p. 7). The ideological consonance which Uhrmacher notes and the commitment to building rapport between “top-half” and “bottom-half” constituencies, which Fullan advocates, address the *complementarity* which facilitates universal and local integration in the construction of educational programs. Such a complementarity is reflected in this curriculum history of St. Thomas / St. John Vianney Seminary in the sense that there is a consonance and rapport between universal Church leadership and the local seminary (see Chapter 4). In a similar manner, as noted in Uhrmacher’s (1991) Waldorf study, the Seminary faculty has specifically chosen to work at a Catholic institution; additionally, the directives and influences of the universal Catholic Church as seen in papal documents and the work of the Second Vatican Council endorse local application and adaption allowing practitioners to “bring a curriculum idea to life in their concrete interaction with specific students in local circumstances” (Altricher, 2005, p. 7). At the same time, Seminary educators worked to maintain a consonance with the guidelines of the Apostolic See regarding seminary curricular programs:

In keeping with the tradition of responding to the developing needs of the Church, St. Thomas Seminary has made significant changes in its programs…As the Seminary looked into the 1980s, it became clear that it must face not only the future of the Seminary’s mission but also the direction of pastoral ministry within the Church. (St. Thomas Seminary, 1980-1981, p .1)
Like the philosophy of *anthroposophy* embedded in the Waldorf approach, seminary education contains a spiritual dimension. The process of curricular change and innovation can involve altering “understanding and beliefs” including those in a spiritual realm (Altrichter, 2005, p. 2). Complementarity in the dimension of belief and spirituality between universal and local bodies can promote a cohesiveness in collaboration and integration and a high level of mutual commitment. As a religious institution guided by Catholic doctrine and spirituality, at both the local level and the universal level, this spiritual complementarity functions to overcome some of the tensions and possible impasses which can arise in the construction and development of “a new curriculum… which may also include the transformation of…beliefs and understandings…” (Altrichter, 2005, p. 2).

Implications of this study for general education arise from the dynamic relationship between universal bodies and local bodies mutually shaping curricular programs. This study and other research studies (Uhrmacher, 1991; Fullan, 1994, 1998) point to the importance of complementarity for fruitful outcomes regarding universal-level and local-level integration in the development of curriculum. In particular, a universal and local complementarity is exhibited when local constituencies have the latitude to adapt or develop local versions of curricular programs as shown in the findings of this study. In addition, a consonance between overarching universal directives and local application as well as a rapport between universal bodies and local bodies enable these bodies to work in concert rather than in discordant ways. Finally, a spiritual or
philosophical foundation shared at the universal and local levels enables coherence and facilitates collaboration in the development of educational programs.

The unique curriculum history of theological field program development at St. John Vianney Seminary reflects a universal and local “blending” as conceptualized by Fullan (1998); this study encourages continued theoretical research on curriculum development and evolution, particularly, in regard to the relation between universal, prescriptive curricula and the local adaptation and application of these prescriptions. In addition, the findings and analysis of this study suggest the benefit of further historical studies of education, particularly, in the area of archival research studies. Educational historian, Robin Varnum (1992), notes that there is a “tendency for scholars to overlook the first half of the 20th century” (p. 33). Varnum explains that such gaps in educational history have “the effect of denying the resources and lessons of portions of the past to many of us currently teaching…” (p. 33). As in the case of this study, educational research focusing on the first half of the 20th century could prove fruitful for scholarly work.

Future work on the understudied area of seminary education and future studies of St. John Vianney Seminary could benefit from the use of additional archival materials which will be more accessible when the material at the Archdiocese of Denver Archives is completely indexed. Additionally, archival material from St. Thomas Seminary, housed at DePaul University Archives in Chicago, could aid future studies.

Finally, the inclusion of oral history accounts from former students, faculty and administrators could enable the construction of a richer historiography and could allow
the exploration of new insights in future studies. In particular, oral history accounts or interviews could uncover some of the problematic dimensions in the development of field curricula not captured in the archival material. For instance, problematic issues may be uncovered surrounding the material resources needed for curricular programs and the allocation of these resources. (Though not specifically uncovered in the archival research for this study, the archives do show periods of financial need at the Seminary.)

Problematic issues in non-material areas might include inadequacies in regard to achieving the intended outcomes of the applied directives. Other dimensions manifested in an oral history might include differing visions regarding the local adaptation of universal directives or themes. Also, the choice of organizational structure in which a curricular area is embedded may elicit structural change (and subsequent tensions) in a program of studies (an example might be the establishment of field education in a central location in the structure of the program of studies as seen in Chapter Four). Stenhouse (1975) points out that implementing curricular modifications is often an ongoing process; this process could be recorded in more detail in an oral history. Additionally, Stenhouse, notes that curricular modifications are often initiated by practitioners based on their “practical, situational knowledge” and the “demands of the specific locality” (1985, p. 104); similar curricular modifications at the Seminary could be described more fully through the use of oral history. In sum, future research focusing on St. Thomas / St. John Vianney Seminary (or other seminaries), which incorporates an oral history component, could capture social processes and enable the construction of a richer historiography.
For the Future of Education: “History Matters”

Historical research in the service of educational inquiry provides background, insight, and context for current issues in education. McCulloch and Richardson (2000) contend that “historical research is an important means of understanding and addressing contemporary concerns” (p. 5). McCulloch (2004) further stresses the value of historical studies in education, especially the ways in which this history relates to current issues, contemporary problems and policies. McCulloch notes:

In linking the past to the present [through research]…They [historical sources] are a significant medium through which to understand… and to find ways of reconciling the historical with the contemporary. (p. 7)

In tracing the curriculum history of a seminary theological field program, this study, like other curriculum histories, “opens up the possibility of generating new conceptual frameworks for understanding the reasons why the curriculum took the twists and turns that it did over any period of time” (Kliebard, 1992, p. xiv). Research findings of this understudied and unique area encourage exploration of similar dynamics in other curriculum histories; additionally, this research offers insights regarding curriculum development and adaptation, especially, the significant role which the socio-historical context plays in the formation and development of curricular programs. As Michael Hill (1993) reflects: “A social scientist who looks archivally toward the past…can give us new understandings of our society and our disciplines that will take us with greater clarity…into our collective future” (p. 7). More studies of this nature would promote the value of historical research in education, the value of unique educational histories
including seminary programs (as seen in this study) and the value of connections between past and present that enable and encourage the development of fruitful frameworks and pedagogies which enrich the field.
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Appendix A

Archival Photographs from St. Thomas Seminary / St. John Vianney Seminary

*Figure A1*. St. Thomas Seminary chapel, ca. 1920s, Archdiocese of Denver Archives
Figure A2. Motor Mission, ca.1950s, Archdiocese of Denver Archives

Figure A3. Charity work, ca.1960s, Archdiocese of Denver Archives..
Figure A4. Teaching apostolate, ca.1970s, Archdiocese of Denver Archives.

Figure A5. Field education workshop, ca.1970s, Archdiocese of Denver Archives.
Figure A6. Mountain liturgy, 2010, Archdiocese of Denver Archives.

Figure A7. Discernment camping trip, 2012, Archdiocese of Denver Archives.
Figure A8. Aerial view of seminary, 1984, Archdiocese of Denver Archives.
Appendix B


“Target” Research Strategy

The targets the researcher selects guide the search for archival repositories. The target research strategy is a key method to locating archival deposits relevant to the research question. The three types of targets include:

- **Named Holdings in the Archive**
  (Archdiocese of Denver Archives uses specific years for named holdings.)
  *e.g.* **St. Thomas Seminary 1959**

- **Topical Search**
  (General topics are cross-referenced with years.)
  *e.g.* **theological field education**

- **Name-Oriented Search**
  (This includes specific individuals, publications, organizations, events, etc.)
  *e.g.* **Ambassador of Christ** (publication)

*Figure B1.* Explanation of “target” archival research strategy (Hill, 1993).
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