

# 2025 General Ordination Examination

## Scale of General Criteria

Evaluators weigh GOE answers with the following in mind: *perception (and analysis)* of issues; *application* of resources; *demonstration* of knowledge; and *articulation* of views. These factors are implicit in all the two-level scales used for the entire GOE. Together with the two-level scales for each individual set, these factors give Evaluators clear criteria for deciding how well a paper addresses the questions. The two levels of these general criteria represent proficiency in the area being tested or a lack thereof, in accordance with Episcopal Church Canons III.15.2-4.

*Proficient:* The response gives evidence of a sound and perceptive understanding of the basic issues raised by the question(s) and how those issues relate to the canonical area being tested. Written presentation is clear and organized with apt use of source material.

*Not Proficient:* The response indicates largely erroneous, minimal, or no understanding of essential issues in the area being tested or does not answer the question asked. Arguments that the paper offers may be flawed, ineffective or incoherent. Writing may be unclear, with little, inept, or inappropriate use of sources.

## Set 1: The Holy Scriptures

### *Open Resources*

In a response of approximately 1,000 words discuss Romans 8:18-25.

Your answer should address the following:

A. Context: Briefly explain the original historical context of the passage and its significance within the canon of Scripture.

B. Theological implications: Analyze the theological implications of the passage concerning the concept of Creation. How does this passage conceive of the relationship among God, people, and the whole of Creation?

C. Contemporary application: Critically assess how this passage might be used when discussing Creation in the context of a sermon or Bible study.

## Scoring Rubric

**A Proficient answer must satisfy the requirements of at least three of the four criteria.**

Criteria	Proficient	Not Proficient
Historical context	Provides a clear and cogent analysis of the passage's historical context	Offers a superficial or inaccurate description of the historical context for the passage
Canonical context	Provides a clear and cogent analysis of the passage's context within the canon of Scripture	Offers a superficial or inaccurate description of the passage within the canon of Scripture
Theological implications	Analyzes the theological implications of the passage with regard to the concept of Creation  and  Explains how this passage conceives of the relationship among God, people, and the whole of Creation	Offers a cursory or superficial explanation of the passage's implications for the concept of Creation  or  Does not adequately engage the relationship among God, people, and the whole of Creation
Preaching or teaching application	Describes a use of the passage in a sermon or Bible study that is congruent with the overall argument described above	Describes a use of the passage in a sermon or Bible study that is inadequate or incongruent with the overall argument described above

# 2025 General Ordination Examination

## Scale of General Criteria

Evaluators weigh GOE answers with the following in mind: *perception (and analysis)* of issues; *application* of resources; *demonstration* of knowledge; and *articulation* of views. These factors are implicit in all the two-level scales used for the entire GOE. Together with the two-level scales for each individual set, these factors give Evaluators clear criteria for deciding how well a paper addresses the questions. The two levels of these general criteria represent proficiency in the area being tested or a lack thereof, in accordance with Episcopal Church Canons III.15.2-4.

*Proficient:* The response gives evidence of a sound and perceptive understanding of the basic issues raised by the question(s) and how those issues relate to the canonical area being tested. Written presentation is clear and organized with apt use of source material.

*Not Proficient:* The response indicates largely erroneous, minimal, or no understanding of essential issues in the area being tested or does not answer the question asked. Arguments that the paper offers may be flawed, ineffective or incoherent. Writing may be unclear, with little, inept, or inappropriate use of sources.

## Set 2: Christian Theology

### *Open Resources*

A parishioner comes to you concerned about a friend who has a chronic illness. The parishioner hopes for divine healing for their friend. As someone new to the Episcopal Church and who grew up in a tradition where prayer for healing was a regular practice, the parishioner asks you, “Does God work like that?”

In an answer of approximately 1,000 words, provide theological reasoning that would motivate your answer to the question, “Does God work like that?” The response should discuss two different theological perspectives on healing within the breadth of the Anglican tradition. It should also consider how God interacts with us in various situations, for example in healing of relationships and physical ailments. Support each theological viewpoint on healing with at least one scriptural reference. One theological viewpoint on healing should refer to a 20<sup>th</sup> - or 21<sup>st</sup> - century Anglican theologian. The other should refer to a pre-Reformation theologian. Finally, offer a response to the parishioner’s question.

## Scoring Rubric

**A Proficient answer must satisfy the requirements of the first criterion and the requirements of two of the remaining criteria.**

Criteria	Proficient	Not Proficient
Theological understanding of healing and how God acts in various circumstances	Clearly identifies and explains two distinct theological perspectives on healing within the Anglican tradition	Presents a non-Christian theology of healing or Presents theologies of healing that are superficial or unclear or Presents only one theological understanding of healing or Omits discussion of healing or how God acts in various circumstances
Scriptural support	Cites one appropriate scriptural reference for each of the theological perspectives discussed  The referenced Scripture supports and deepens each discussion on healing  The response clearly explains the Scripture's relevance	Omits the required sources or Scripture cited does not support the theology articulated in the response or Presents only one scriptural reference
Theologian support	Cites one Christian theologian from the 20th or 21st century and one pre-Reformation theologian to support the theological perspectives' discussion  The theologians cited clearly support and deepen the discussion on healing	Omits any required supporting sources or Sources cited do not support the theology articulated in the response or Both theologians cited are from the same period or Presents only one theologian

Treatment of parishioner's inquiry	Directly answers the question, "Does God work like that?" with a nuanced understanding that incorporates theological perspectives	<p>Does not address or superficially addresses the parishioner's dilemma</p> <p>or</p> <p>Inadequately or incompletely connects the theology of healing</p> <p>or</p> <p>Inadequately or incompletely connects the theological dilemma to the stated understanding of healing</p>
------------------------------------	---	---

# 2025 General Ordination Examination

## Scale of General Criteria

Evaluators weigh GOE answers with the following in mind: *perception (and analysis)* of issues; *application* of resources; *demonstration* of knowledge; and *articulation* of views. These factors are implicit in all the two-level scales used for the entire GOE. Together with the two-level scales for each individual set, these factors give Evaluators clear criteria for deciding how well a paper addresses the questions. The two levels of these general criteria represent proficiency in the area being tested or a lack thereof, in accordance with Episcopal Church Canons III.15.2-4.

*Proficient:* The response gives evidence of a sound and perceptive understanding of the basic issues raised by the question(s) and how those issues relate to the canonical area being tested. Written presentation is clear and organized with apt use of source material.

*Not Proficient:* The response indicates largely erroneous, minimal, or no understanding of essential issues in the area being tested or does not answer the question asked. Arguments that the paper offers may be flawed, ineffective or incoherent. Writing may be unclear, with little, inept, or inappropriate use of sources.

## Set 3: History of the Christian Church

### *Open Resources*

In “Mission, Race, and Empire” (pg. 2, 2024), Jennifer Snow defines mission as “the church incorporating others beyond its current boundaries.” In an answer of approximately 1,000 words:

#### Part I

Describe one domestic and one foreign missionary strategy that the Episcopal Church (or its predecessor, the Colonial Church of England) has used to “incorporate others beyond its current boundaries.” Examples of the domestic missionary strategy must be before 1900 within what we geographically recognize as today’s continental United States. Examples of the foreign missionary strategy can come from anywhere else in the world, after 1835.

Relevant information for each example would include:

- (1) who is identified as “the other”
- (2) what specific organization sponsored the missionary activity
- (3) what is the cultural context of the mission effort
- (4) what strategy was used

#### Part II

Explain how each of these models would need to change to be effective today. Provide one contemporary example that demonstrates this change.

## Scoring Rubric

**A Proficient answer must satisfy the requirements of at least two of the three criteria.**

Criteria	Proficient	Not Proficient
Historic examples	<p>Answer identifies one domestic and one foreign missionary strategy of the Episcopal Church (or its predecessor, the Colonial Church of England) with the relevant information</p> <p>Relevant information must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) who is identified as “the other”</li> <li>(2) what specific organization sponsored the missionary activity</li> <li>(3) what is the cultural context of the mission effort</li> <li>(4) what strategy was used</li> </ul>	<p>Answer provides only one example of either foreign or domestic missionary strategy</p> <p>or</p> <p>Answer does not provide any example of either foreign or domestic missionary strategy</p> <p>or</p> <p>One or more of the four types of relevant information is missing</p>
Assessment of historical models	<p>Answer provides a critical analysis of the identified historical mission strategies</p> <p>With supporting argument, answer provides any necessary changes to these models in order to be effective today</p>	<p>Answer does not address any necessary changes in the historic models</p> <p>or</p> <p>Answer does not effectively argue why no change is necessary in order for the models to be effective today</p>
Contemporary example	<p>Answer identifies and explains a contemporary example of mission that exemplifies the changes expressed in the critique</p>	<p>Answer does not identify a relevant, contemporary example or explain its connection</p>

# 2025 General Ordination Examination

## Scale of General Criteria

Evaluators weigh GOE answers with the following in mind: perception (and analysis) of issues; application of resources; demonstration of knowledge; and articulation of views. These factors are implicit in all the two-level scales used for the entire GOE. Together with the two-level scales for each individual set, these factors give Evaluators clear criteria for deciding how well a paper addresses the questions. The two levels of these general criteria represent proficiency in the area being tested or a lack thereof, in accordance with Episcopal Church Canons III.15.2-4.

**Proficient:** The response gives evidence of a sound and perceptive understanding of the basic issues raised by the question(s) and how those issues relate to the canonical area being tested. Written presentation is clear and organized with apt use of source material.

**Not Proficient:** The response indicates largely erroneous, minimal, or no understanding of essential issues in the area being tested or does not answer the question asked. Arguments that the paper offers may be flawed, ineffective or incoherent. Writing may be unclear, with little, inept, or inappropriate use of sources.

## Set 4: Christian Worship

### *Open Resources*

Your congregation is starting a Healing Service, which is a new practice for them. Some parishioners are asking for an instructed eucharistic healing service that explains the liturgy, theology, and practice of laying on of hands and anointing.

In approximately 1,000 words, respond to the following:

Part I (approximately 250 words)

Using the Episcopal Church's authorized liturgical texts, elaborate on the history and practice of laying on of hands and anointing within the Episcopal Church.

Part II (approximately 250 words in outline form)

Outline an instructed eucharistic healing service using authorized resources, such as the Book of Common Prayer, or Enriching our Worship 2, or Book of Occasional Services. Include lessons and assign roles according to appropriate orders of ministry for the various parts of the liturgy.

Part III (approximately 500 words)

Explain three of the choices you make regarding what and/or whom to include in the healing service, outside of the ordinary parts of the eucharistic liturgy (i.e. Liturgy of the Word, hymns, eucharistic prayer).



## Scoring Rubric

**A Proficient answer must satisfy the requirements of at least two of the three criteria.**

Criteria	Proficient	Not Proficient
Develops an outline of a eucharistic liturgy that includes healing	Uses an authorized liturgical text and Follows the directions, and uses the permitted liturgical rubrics and Chooses at least two readings and Assigns appropriate ministers to various roles in the healing portions of the liturgy	Does not follow the directions or use the permitted liturgical rubrics or Does not choose at least two readings or Does not assign ministers or Assigns ministers inconsistent with the rubrics of the chosen liturgy or Does not use an authorized liturgical text or uses a non-Episcopal resource
Elaborates on the history and practices included in the healing service	Response cites BCP and/or BOS, and/or EOW2	Does not cite any authorized liturgical resource and/or Authorized liturgical resources are not cited accurately and/or References to liturgical resources do not support practices and theological understanding of Unction
Makes rubrical choices	Explains three choices providing a rationale that goes beyond personal preference or convenience	Does not explain the three choices or Explains a choice based on personal preference or convenience or Offers only a shallow or superficial discussion

# 2025 General Ordination Examination

## Scale of General Criteria

Evaluators weigh GOE answers with the following in mind: *perception (and analysis)* of issues; *application* of resources; *demonstration* of knowledge; and *articulation* of views. These factors are implicit in all the two-level scales used for the entire GOE. Together with the two-level scales for each individual set, these factors give Evaluators clear criteria for deciding how well a paper addresses the questions. The two levels of these general criteria represent proficiency in the area being tested or a lack thereof, in accordance with Episcopal Church Canons III.15.2-4.

*Proficient:* The response gives evidence of a sound and perceptive understanding of the basic issues raised by the question(s) and how those issues relate to the canonical area being tested. Written presentation is clear and organized with apt use of source material.

*Not Proficient:* The response indicates largely erroneous, minimal or no understanding of essential issues in the area being tested or does not answer the question asked. Arguments that the paper offers may be flawed, ineffective or incoherent. Writing may be unclear, with little, inept, or inappropriate use of sources.

## Set 5: Christian Ethics and Moral Theology

### *Open Resources*

Generative AI is culturally ubiquitous in everything from social media to military and law enforcement. Because this technology has been rapidly developed and diffused, it has been widely, and sometimes uncritically, adopted. As with any new technological development, Christians are called to reflect on the ethical implications of Generative AI in the light of the Gospel.

In a response of approximately 1,000 words, describe the Christian ethical principles or framework that you find helpful in addressing this issue. Refer to one theologian/ethicist in your discussion. How do these principles or framework help you think in a distinctively Christian way about engaging Generative AI? Consider the implications and unintended consequences of the use and development of this technology in areas such as impacts on the environment, human labor, economics, human development, art and creativity. Discuss at least two of these dimensions.

## Scoring Rubric

**A Proficient answer must satisfy the requirements of at least two of the three criteria.**

Criteria	Proficient	Not Proficient
Ethical framework and theologian/ethicist	Identifies a theologian/ethicist and lays out Christian principles and framework	Does not identify a specifically Christian framework or Does not coherently discuss the principles or framework
Applications to Generative AI	Discusses the way the principles or framework inform specifically Christian engagement with Generative AI	Does not demonstrate how these principles or framework apply to Generative AI or Offers only a general polemic for or against technology
Implications/unintended consequences	Explores two implications/consequences	Does not discuss two implications/consequences or Offers only a shallow or superficial discussion

# 2025 General Ordination Examination

## Scale of General Criteria

Evaluators weigh GOE answers with the following in mind: *perception (and analysis)* of issues; *application* of resources; *demonstration* of knowledge; and *articulation* of views. These factors are implicit in all the two-level scales used for the entire GOE. Together with the two-level scales for each individual set, these factors give Evaluators clear criteria for deciding how well a paper addresses the questions. The two levels of these general criteria represent proficiency in the area being tested or a lack thereof, in accordance with Episcopal Church Canons III.15.2-4.

*Proficient:* The response gives evidence of a sound and perceptive understanding of the basic issues raised by the question(s) and how those issues relate to the canonical area being tested. Written presentation is clear and organized with apt use of source material.

*Not Proficient:* The response indicates largely erroneous, minimal, or no understanding of essential issues in the area being tested or does not answer the question asked. Arguments that the paper offers may be flawed, ineffective or incoherent. Writing may be unclear, with little, inept, or inappropriate use of sources.

## Set 6: The Practice of Ministry

### *Open Resources*

The question of when and how to hold children's Christian formation involves far more than the obvious logistical and practical considerations. This decision also involves a theory of the relationship of the child to the Body of Christ, the place of children in the liturgy, and the purpose of Christian formation.

Some congregations offer formation during the principal Sunday liturgy, others offer it before or after the liturgy, and still others on another day of the week. Clergy leaders must be capable of weighing competing practical and theological considerations as they work with the congregation to choose a time for children's Christian formation.

In approximately 250 words, outline a theory of the relationship of the child to the Body of Christ. In your outline, cite a relevant Scripture passage and an authorized Episcopal resource that connect the passage and resource to the theory of the child.

Then, in approximately 750 words, propose a time for holding children's formation and explore the pros and cons of that time in light of the theory described, including both pragmatic and theological considerations. As part of your discussion suggest a decision-making process for the congregation. Identify the stakeholders and explain why they are stakeholders in this decision.

## Scoring Rubric

**A Proficient answer must satisfy the requirements of at least four of the five criteria.**

Criteria	Proficient	Not Proficient
Articulate a theory of the child in relation to the Body of Christ	Coherently describes a theory of the relationship between the child and the Body of Christ  and  Uses theology to inform the theory	Does not offer a description of the relationship between the child and the Body of Christ  or  Theory is confused or incomplete.  or  Provides an exclusively developmental or psychological account of the child in relation to the community without reference to theology
Sources cited	Cites both a relevant Scripture passage and an authorized Episcopal resource  and  Connects the Scripture passage and authorized Episcopal resource to the theory of the child articulated above	Does not include both a relevant Scripture passage and an authorized Episcopal resource  or  Does not connect both the Scripture passage and authorized Episcopal resource to the theory of the child in relationship to the Body of Christ
Rationale for the time chosen	Considers the pros and cons -- includes at least one theological and one practical consideration -- and relevantly references the theory of the child to the Body of Christ	Neglects to include either a theological consideration or a practical consideration  or  Either consideration is offered without reference to the theory of the child to the Body of Christ
Leading congregational discernment	Describes a process to guide a congregation through discerning when to offer children's formation    The process draws on the theory and rationale previously discussed	Offers no discussion of how to lead congregational discernment  or  The discussion of congregational discernment does not connect to the theory and rationale that has been previously discussed

Identification of stakeholders	<p>Identifies stakeholders who should be included in the decision-making process</p> <p>and</p> <p>Explains why selected stakeholders are relevant to the decision-making process</p>	<p>Does not identify any stakeholders</p> <p>or</p> <p>Does not offer a rationale for why these stakeholders were identified</p> <p>or</p> <p>The rationale for stakeholders does not explain why they should be included in the decision-making process</p>
--------------------------------	---	--