MYEDAH WHITE PAPER

Algorithmic Pastoral Care

A ministry-aware framework for surfacing care opportunities without exposing trade-secret implementation details

This paper describes the principles, safeguards, decision model, and ministry use cases behind MyEdah's algorithmic care concept. It intentionally omits proprietary scoring formulas, weights, thresholds, and system internals.

Public edition

Safe for external sharing
Version 1.0

Core thesis

Healthy pastoral care is relational, prayerful, contextual, and human. Software should not replace shepherding. It can, however, help leaders notice patterns earlier, see the church more clearly, and respond with wisdom.

Prepared for: public ministry review and product education

Executive Summary

Algorithmic pastoral care is the practice of using structured digital signals to help ministry leaders notice care opportunities, engagement changes, and positive re-engagement across the life of the church.

In MyEdah, this concept is designed as an awareness layer - not an automated pastor. The system is meant to highlight patterns worth reviewing while leaving prayer, discernment, relationships, and follow-up decisions firmly in human hands.

This public white paper explains what the framework is for, the kinds of signals it may observe, the protections that should govern its use, and the boundaries that keep the platform from exposing trade-secret methods or encouraging careless overreach.

Non-Negotiable Design Principles

Principle	Why it matters
Human-led interpretation	Signals should suggest review, not create automatic judgments about a person's spiritual life.
Context before action	Known life events, health issues, travel, schedule changes, and pastoral notes must be allowed to explain a pattern.
Positive movement matters	A care system should notice recovery, renewed engagement, and improvement - not only decline.
Minimize disclosure	Public documents should describe concepts and safeguards without revealing formulas, proprietary thresholds, or defensible trade secrets.
Pastoral usefulness over technical novelty	The goal is not to impress with analytics; it is to help a church see people more clearly and care more wisely.

What algorithmic care is

- A visibility framework for surfacing engagement patterns that may deserve pastoral review.
- A prioritization aid that helps leaders look across a congregation without depending on memory alone.
- A companion to ministry records, attendance history, event participation, serving activity, and member interaction context.

What algorithmic care is not

- It is not a spiritual score or a verdict on someone's faithfulness.
- It is not a replacement for relationships, prayer, discernment, or personal follow-up.
- It is not a public-facing ranking system and should never be used to shame, pressure, or classify people carelessly.

Signal Categories a Ministry System May Observe

The public model below explains the types of information that can contribute to awareness. It does not disclose how signals are combined, weighted, or thresholded inside the proprietary system.

Attendance continuity

Changes in normal worship attendance, group presence, or sustained absence from familiar patterns.

Participation breadth

Whether engagement appears to remain broad and healthy or narrows suddenly across multiple ministry touchpoints.

Serving and response behavior

Changes in volunteering, ministry assignments, event registrations, or consistent response pathways.

Re-engagement and recovery

Healthy returns, resumed participation, renewed consistency, and encouraging movement back toward connection.

Suggested Ministry Workflow

A safe algorithmic care workflow should look more like a triage-and-review loop than an automated enforcement pipeline.

1. Surface	2. Review	3. Discern	4. Respond
The system highlights a noteworthy pattern or positive movement.	A leader checks known context, notes, and recent ministry activity.	The church decides whether prayer, patience, outreach, or no action is most appropriate.	Any follow-up remains personal, relational, and ministry-led.

Governance and Safeguards

- Restrict access to authorized pastoral, care, or leadership roles with a legitimate need to know.
- Preserve private context: known explanations should be visible only within appropriate permission boundaries.
- Require human confirmation before any contact, escalation, or member-status action.
- Avoid deterministic labels. A member should not be permanently defined by a temporary pattern.
- Design for auditability: leaders should be able to see why a review prompt exists at a high level, without exposing proprietary internals publicly.
- Support redemptive use: the system should celebrate improvement and restoration, not merely detect decline.

What This Paper Intentionally Does Not Disclose

To protect product defensibility and avoid careless imitation, this public edition omits the following:

- Signal weights, thresholds, and proprietary formulas.
- Exact severity logic, escalation ladders, or scoring math.
- Internal model tuning methods and experimental heuristics.
- Architecture specifics that would reveal implementation secrets beyond a safe conceptual level.

Representative Ministry Use Cases

Scenario	What the system may notice	Healthy ministry response
Quiet withdrawal	A previously consistent	Review context first, then

	member becomes less visible across several normal touchpoints.	decide whether a gentle pastoral check-in is appropriate.
Temporary life disruption	Attendance changes but notes indicate illness, caregiving, travel, or work changes.	Use the context to prevent overreaction and keep the signal framed appropriately.
Encouraging return	A member who had been drifting begins attending again and reconnects with groups or serving.	Notice the positive movement, encourage wisely, and avoid treating care systems as only problem detectors.

Frequently Asked Questions

Does algorithmic care replace pastors?

No. It should function as an aid to visibility and prioritization, not as a substitute for shepherding, prayer, or human judgment.

Can the system misread a situation?

Yes, which is why context, notes, permissions, and human review are essential. The framework is strongest when it prompts thoughtful review rather than automatic action.

Why keep implementation details private?

Because public education should explain the philosophy and safeguards without disclosing proprietary formulas or operational logic that create product value.

What makes this approach ministry-safe?

A ministry-safe implementation centers on humility, privacy, access control, human oversight, contextual interpretation, and redemptive use.

Closing Position

Algorithmic pastoral care should help churches notice what they might otherwise miss, while protecting dignity, honoring context, and keeping ministry decisions in faithful human hands. In MyEdah, the aim is not to automate care - it is to support wiser care.