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ABSTRACT

NAVIGATING DIVERSITY:
INTEGRATING SOCIAL JUSTICE IMPERATIVES IN MISSION DEVELOPMENT
AND IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES AT THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTIONS

Victor Aloyo, Jr.
Mary-Linda Armacost

A qualitative case study methodology was used to determine what drives three Protestant stand-alone theological institutions attempting to become more diverse communities and what role their mission plays in seeking the change they desire. This study focused on Daryl G. Smith’s dimension of institutional vitality and viability with the hope that institutions can make changes that are sustainable beyond the life of individual programs and institutional leadership. The overarching research question that guided this study was: What are the benefits of promoting increased engagement with diversity through the curriculum, campus climate, and policies affecting students and staff in theological higher education? This study employed phone and in-person interviews with four administrative staff at The Association of Theological Schools (ATS), four second-year students, four faculty and four administrators from Peace Theological Seminary, Joy Theological Seminary and Unity Theological Seminary. The purpose of these interviews was to review the diversity and inclusion strategies implemented at these institutions.

Utilizing Smith’s conceptual framework, the results identified that all three institutions share two particular diversity drivers: a biblical mandate and their mission. All three were making some level of progress in matters of diversity and inclusion in
certain areas of its institutional life. None of the participants believed their respective institutions were coordinating and monitoring efforts effectively. These institutions appreciate and celebrate diversity of individuals and groups, as long as, at the institutional level or societal level, things remain neutral. One of the three institutions was identified as having the most potential to sustain their diversity efforts over a long period of time as a result of their geographical location and institutional history.

This study also examined the intersection of diversity and social justice within the theological term of imago Dei (image of God) which emphasizes that all people are created in God’s image and are worthy of respect. The study also analyzed internal organizational structures, leadership behaviors and the initiatives that are bringing some form of transformation, particularly in regard to the centrality of diversity in the mission and planning processes. The final goal of the study was to identify how these institutions can make changes with social justice imperatives that are sustainable beyond the life of individual programs, institutional leadership, and reactive traditional patterns that emerge when the campus is disrupted by a diversity crisis. The study concluded with a review of multiple sustainable strategies that leadership can employ to overcome obstacles and create significant institutional achievement in the area of diversity and inclusive excellence.
Definition of Terms and Concepts

This section includes a discussion of the key concepts to be used in this study. These concepts serve to provide a context for the current research study and are defined according to their application to this study. An expanded glossary of relevant terms is provided in Appendix G.

Campus Climate: Climate (derived from the Greek klima, meaning place). “Behaviors within a workplace or learning environment, ranging from subtle to cumulative to dramatic, that can influence whether an individual feels personally safe, listened to, valued, and treated fairly and with respect” (Campus Climate Network Group, 2002).

Culture: “the sum total of ways of living, including 1) values, 2) beliefs, 3) aesthetic standards, 4) linguistic expression, 5) patterns of thinking, 6) behavioral norms, and 7) styles of communication which a group of people has developed to assure its survival in a particular environment. We are socialized through ‘cultural conditioning’ to adopt ways of thinking related to societal grouping” (World Trust, 2012).

Diversity: One of the vexing challenges in theological higher education is defining diversity. The ATS Diversity Folio (2011) mentions that “Diversity is a relationship of mutuality, an open space where persons contribute simply because they care about the mission of the church to the whole world – to those created as children of God.” The focus on diversity also recognizes our interconnections and brokenness. Diversity means resisting the homogenizing of racial, ethnic, cultural, and class differences into
uniformity. For the purposes of this study, an inclusive conceptualization of diversity is used that includes differences in race, gender identity, age, ethnic culture, national origin, disability, social class, economic status, human sexuality, values, and education.

**Inclusion:** The act of creating environments in which any individual or group can be and feel welcomed, respected, supported, and valued to fully participate. An inclusive and welcoming climate embraces differences and offers respect in words and actions for all people.

**Inclusive Excellence:** According to AAC&U (2005) this term “re-visions both quality and diversity. It reflects a striving for excellence in higher education that has been made more inclusive by decades of work to infuse diversity into recruiting, admissions, and hiring; into the curriculum and co-curriculum; and into administrative structures and practices. It also embraces newer forms of excellence, and expanded ways to measure excellence, that take into account research on learning and brain functioning, the assessment movement, and more nuanced accountability structures.”

**“ISMS”:** “a way of describing any attitude, action or institutional structure which subordinates (oppresses) a person or group because of their target group, color (racism), gender (sexism), economic status (classism), older age (ageism), youth (adultism), religion (i.e. anti-Semitism), sexual orientation (heterosexism), language/immigrant status (xenophobism), etc.” (World Trust, 2012).
Oppression: The systematic mistreatment of the powerless by the powerful, resulting in the targeting of certain groups within the society for less of its benefits – involves a subtle devaluing or non-acceptance of the powerless group – may be economic, political, social, and/or psychological. Oppression also includes the belief of superiority or “righteousness” of the group in power.

Privilege/Internalized Entitlement: White privilege is about the concrete benefits of access to resources and social rewards and the power to shape the norms and values of society that whites receive, unconsciously or consciously, by virtue of their skin color. There are unearned entitlements – things that all people should have – such as feeling safe in public spaces, free speech, the ability to work in a place where they feel they can do their best work, and be valued for what they can contribute. When unearned entitlement is restricted to certain groups, however, it becomes the form of privilege that Peggy McIntosh (2012) calls “unearned advantage.” Unearned advantage gives whites a competitive edge we are reluctant to acknowledge, much less give up. The other type of privilege is conferred dominance, which is giving one group (whites) power over another: the unequal distribution of resources and rewards.

Stand-Alone Institutions: These are theological institutions that are not directly linked to a secular institution of higher education. For instance, Yale Divinity School is accountable to the Board of Trustees of Yale University. Princeton Theological Seminary, although affiliated with the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) has its own Board of Trustees, financial accountability structure, mission statement, and strategic plans.
**Structural Racism/Racialization:** The word “racism” is commonly understood to refer to instances in which one individual intentionally or unintentionally targets others for negative treatment because of their skin color or other group-based physical characteristics. This individualistic conceptualization is too limited. Racialized outcomes do not require racist actors: “Structural racism/racialization refers to a system of social structures that produces cumulative, durable, race-based inequalities. It is also a method of analysis that is used to examine how historical legacies, individuals, structures, and institutions work interactively to distribute material and symbolic advantages and disadvantages along racial lines” (World Trust, 2012).

**Social Justice:** The concept of social justice is multifaceted. While the definition of social justice remains elusive, there are important principles gleaned from philosophical, moral/ethical, and theological perspectives. For the theological academy, a theological perspective of social justice is particularly relevant to the discourse. From a Judeo-Christian viewpoint, justice is rooted in God’s very being and redemptive purposes for all of creation. Marshall (2005) explains: “The biblical narrative of God’s creative, sustaining and redemptive activity is the primary place Christians can learn the meaning of justice. . . . Justice originates in God’s own being. . . . True knowledge of God entails understanding God’s own devotion to justice and striving to emulate God’s justice in one’s own manner of living in the world” (p. 65). A more detailed definition will be examined in Chapter 2: Literature Review.
Sustainable Approach: One of two approaches that institutions of higher education can implement on matters of engaging diversity, inclusion, and social justice. See Table 1 for a comparative overview with the Traditional Approach.

Traditional Approach: One of two approaches that institutions of higher education can implement in engaging circumstances and/or incidents on campus relating to issues of diversity, inclusion, and social justice. See Table 1 for a comparative overview with the Sustainable Approach.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Making Connections

As an administrator, educator and clergy, with an interest in the theological academy, particularly as it relates to social justice issues and actions, I embarked on a qualitative research study to examine the intersection of diversity, social justice and theology that might assist theological institutions in their mission of preparing theology-ministry students for a growing pluralistic society. The theological term of *imago Dei* (image of God) emphasizes that all people are created in God’s image and are worthy of respect. The Bible offers insight regarding morals and laws such as humility and hospitality, and opposition to idolatry and selfishness (Jindra, 2007). Many Christians may believe that the valuing of difference has been a part of Christian theology since the beginning of time, though the Church and its institutions have not always followed through in actions. A new narrative must evolve and provide deeper and more complex reasons as to why theological institutions, as instruments of theological discourse, inquiry, and preparation, should include change into practices of biblical tenets of justice that contribute to institutional vitality and viability. An unsophisticated theology of tolerance is adequate for superficial engagement but not for sustained and real institutional action (McNeil & Pozzi, 2007). This study serves as a call for a more multiculturally competent theological academy that will value an individual’s cultural identity, and place it in a celebration with others.

The mere mention of the words diversity and social justice in the title of this study is likely to evoke a visceral response within many readers. Terms like nondiscrimination, equal opportunity, multiculturalism, inclusion and affirmative action are linked with
some of the most controversial aspects of life in American society. One of the reasons for such controversy is that these terms now carry the baggage of decades of social, economic, political, theological, philosophical, and educational policies and programs. These initiatives are linked historically to some of the most painful and shameful aspects of the American experiment. In practice, they have been misunderstood, misused, abused, and maligned. Whether the level of analysis is the nation, the church, institutions or the individual, dealing with diversity and inclusion is a challenging, sensitive, and often divisive task.

The study of diversity-related issues spans a multitude of professional disciplines and academic domains. They include public policy, education, government and politics, sociology, and criminal justice. Even the health and human services professions must recognize the challenges of cultural competence and the effects of demographic differences in physiology, pharmacology, and even psychology. It would be neither practical nor reasonable to attempt to sample this vast breadth of knowledge in the context of this dissertation.

Therefore, three stand-alone Protestant theological institutions, Peace Theological Seminary, Joy Theological Seminary, and Unity Theological Seminary served as the context for this qualitative research study. The overarching research question for this study was: What are the benefits of promoting increased engagement with diversity through the curriculum, campus climate, and policies affecting students and staff in theological higher education? One of the goals of this study was to examine how these institutions engage on matters of diversity and inclusion and whether a particular diversity framework is employed in their efforts.
Another goal of this study was to explore the viability of integrating social justice imperatives described by Dantley and Tillman (2010) within Daryl G. Smith’s (2009) diversity framework to provide a sustainable approach in engaging matters of diversity and inclusion within the theological academy. According to Dantley and Tillman (2010), there are three essential imperatives of social justice:

1. *leadership for social justice*, which examines policies and practices that shape educational institutions and may perpetuate social inequalities and marginalization;

2. *moral transformative leadership*, which views education from a progressive, critical perspective and focuses on power in institutions; and

3. *social justice praxis*, such as research, scholarship, and pedagogical methods that broaden the discourse on social justice.

These imperatives enable social justice to become a vibrant part of the everyday reality and ethos of the institution. The social justice literature surfaces a number of themes that characterize leadership for social justice. Leadership for social justice is “action-oriented and transformative, committed and persistent, inclusive and democratic, relational and caring, reflective, and oriented to a socially just pedagogy” (Furman, 2012, p. 5). Leadership for social justice requires confronting contentious issues in order to bring about necessary change within institutions and communities (Lumby & Coleman,
While acknowledging the challenges in addressing institutional disparities, leaders can achieve change “if only in that a persistent and consistent attempt to do so is in itself a powerful communication of challenge to inequity” (p. 122). These scholars argue that a stance of permanent mindfulness and navigating uncomfortable realities requires moral courage and stamina on the part of institutional leaders.

**The Problem: Invited but Not Welcome**

While the growth of enrollment at theological institutions across the United States is increasing in large part due to the increase in racial and ethnic students, it is far from being representative of the percentage of racial and ethnic minorities in this country. This is a critical problem because the wider society in which we live is becoming a mosaic of differences. Theological education has always been more accessible than most other forms of post-baccalaureate education, but the changing racial/ethnic composition of society and the church are challenging assumptions about the cultural visages of privilege, like what constitutes intellectual excellence, what backgrounds qualify individuals for admission to study, and what determines the current intellectual agenda.

Dr. Fernando Cascante-Gomez, Director of the Justo L. Gonzalez Center for Latino/a Ministries states that the challenges of racial and ethnic diversity in theological education will become more urgent because of the growing demands of the changing sociocultural realities in the United States (Cascante-Gomez, 2008, p. 35). As the demographic shifts provide a variety of socioeconomic challenges to national and regional politics, such as the recent debate on Religious Freedom legislation; ecclesial polity, as witnessed by the recent decisions of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) regarding
same sex marriage; and educational systems where Title IX, the Violence Against Women’s Act, and the Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act, these issues represent some of the social inequities being confronted by society and indeed the church.

The discussion on the role of theological education in strategies against poverty and exclusion and in the promotion of active citizenship is resurfacing in a context of a global economic crisis challenging the capacity of nations to guarantee the provision and regulation of public services. By integrating social justice imperatives and ministry formation, I refer to advocacy for structural change within the theological academy’s infrastructure to benefit the marginalized, impoverished and/or oppressed. In this context, the question of ‘what kind of theological education and for whom’ is increasingly pressing, particularly as the North American religious experience is becoming more pluralistic with families and peoples that bring their understanding of spirituality and religiosity from countries of the Global South (Africa, Latin America and Asia).

Woven through the narrative of this study is the critical recognition that learning is an embodied practice. Theological education is premised on the shared values and ethical responses of justice in the face of injustice, compassion in the face of cruelty, liberation in the face of suffering. Dr. W. Anne Joh (2013) an Asian American professor of Systematic Theology posits,

“As educators, practitioners and students, we not only bring our own embodied lived experiences (never homogenous or singular) but also our bodies into the classrooms. Our bodies themselves are sites of collective memories (never homogenous or singular), historical traumas (never monolithic but complex and multiple), as well as collective resistances, which continue to persist and endure” (p. 2).
Joh recognizes as an educator within the theological academy that the task of theology, both the teaching and the doing, belongs not just to the world of knowledge and intellect, but to the world of Spirit, culture and grace, and also to the “incarnate world of human experience” (Brown 2013). The concept of learning is transformational as it embodies a variety of experiences! Eleazer S. Fernandez, a professor of Constructive Theology posits, “Part of the work of creating and nurturing the right institutional habitat is formulating benchmarks to help educational institutions, particularly seminaries, assess where they are in their institutional journey toward becoming a culturally diverse and racially just institution” (2014, pg. 4).

Theological schools are now being confronted in more profound ways with the realities of a growing pluralism in the United States according to Spellener (2002), an African American church historian and religious educator. While research has focused on disparities in the theological academy in areas ranging from access, enrollment, graduation rates, faculty diversity, and administrative leadership, what is missing in the literature are strategies that substantiate a sustainable approach for diversity and inclusion that is consistent with the mission, history, and culture of these institutions of higher education (see Table 1).

Dr. Daniel Aleshire, Executive Director of the Association of Theological Schools posits, “The future of theological schools will be in shaping American religion in the context of its changed cultural reality.” By 2032, the American population, according to ATS’ Diversity Folio (2011), will have completed a fundamental shift that began in the late nineteenth century: this nation of immigrants largely from Europe and the British Isles will be only a few years from becoming a nation in which “white” will be the racial
Persons of African descent, Asian descent, and Latino/a descent will outnumber white residents. According to Aleshire (2011), the closer we get to that time, the more white privilege will be eroded by the inevitable shift in the population, and as that privilege erodes, forms of cultural conflict will increase. (pg. 3).

**Table 1: Sustainable Approach vs. Traditional Approach**

(Table obtained from the Teaching & Learning class at the University of Pennsylvania)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainable Approach</th>
<th>Traditional Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-term focus on a single issue</td>
<td>Episodic focus with key issue buried beneath multiple issues in disconnected meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility shared by a team</td>
<td>Responsibility carried by one or two people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular meetings</td>
<td>Concerns raised reactively and urgently at random meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular time set aside for strategic thinking</td>
<td>Issue addressed between other urgent demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The expectation of a multiyear building process</td>
<td>The expectation of the quick fix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working a plan</td>
<td>Reacting to anxiousness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Theological education in the United States is at a crossroads when it comes to diversity and inclusion. Theological institutions have attempted to address these changing dynamics within a “traditional” approach. Too many diversity-planning efforts follow a reactive pattern that emerges when the campus is disrupted by a diversity crisis. According to Damon A. Williams, former vice provost and chief diversity officer at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, “For many institutions, this is the only time they engage in a serious conversation about campus diversity issues. However, because of the
need for a rapid response, their efforts often lack continuity and focus” (2006, pg. 1). Consequently, many institutional diversity initiatives are largely symbolic and fail to deeply influence organizational culture and institutional behavior (Williams, Berger, and McClendon 2005). At Joy Theological Seminary, a Latina administrator mentioned a racial incident that occurred in 2012 involving an African American faculty member and a Euro-descent faculty member during chapel service. She posits,

“We did not have institutional format or protocol to handle such a sensitive matter on campus. We were making things up as we moved along confiding in the integrity of both faculty members. Yet, the historical wounds that resurfaced on the part of the African American faculty member, transcended academic standing and institutional loyalty” (2014).

As a result both faculty members resigned from their posts and the campus climate backlash that ensued from irate students, administrators and faculty members are being confronted three years later.

This study is important because within the theological academy well-meaning institutions tell students, faculty, and administrators from communities of color that they are inclusive and have a commitment to diversity, but they neither cultivate institutional will for justice-oriented diversity nor forge new institutional habits. “As a result, students and faculty of color are often left to work as individuals within institutions whose wills and habits are in opposition to, or in direct conflict with, the lived worlds of these scholars” (Joh, 2014 p. 2). Professor Joh keenly underscores institutions systems of racialized injustices within the theological academy when administrative polices, curricular development, and campus climate events tend to silence the voices of the “other.” Recent incidents involving race have impacted college campuses across the country, from the racist chant at the University of Oklahoma to the suspension of the Pi
Kappa Phi fraternity at North Carolina State University after the discovery of a pledge book containing racially and sexually offensive language to the discovery of a noose in front of the Multicultural Center at Duke University. Such incidents have become more common due to the debate on immigration, police brutality and an African-American president in the White House, said Marybeth Gasman (Chambers, 2015), an expert on diversity and higher education at the University of Pennsylvania.

Therefore, this study matters profoundly because the theological academy faces the same challenges with growing diversity and its implications as secular higher education. The question no longer is whether to acknowledge or pursue diversity and inclusion, but to understand the conditions that are needed to make diversity work in different contexts. Daryl G. Smith (2009, pg. 18) posits, “One of the critical tasks facing higher education, in general, is building institutional capacity to create the conditions to capitalize on the benefits of diversity, and to do so in contexts that are too often characterized by inequities.” According to an interview with an African American officer at the Association of Theological Schools (2014),

“For theological institutions, one of the conditions is capitalizing on the unique identity, mission, and theological foundation of their institution as a source of strength in promoting diversity.” She further states that “Diversity and inclusion in the theological academy is strengthened when rooted in the institution’s identity and mission.” The future, according to Aleshire (2011) “will bring struggles to theological schools, not because they are endemic to the gospel, but because theological schools will be forced to struggle with the loss of cultural privilege it has enjoyed.” “In North America, theological education, still dominated by white male, Eurocentric perspectives that unconsciously, and sometimes consciously-mirrors in different degrees the still prevalent racism of the broader culture” (Cascante-Gomez, 2008, 22). Although
enrollment at theological schools is increasing due to an increase in the racial ethnic composition of the student class (see Table 2), the racial, ethnic and women administrators, staff, faculty, and student demographics at ATS schools do not reflect the racial and ethnic demographics of the United States (Cascante-Gomez, 2008, 21). As a consequence, theological schools still teaches students about Augustine and Aquinas, Luther and Calvin. The most recent of those figures is half a millennium in the past. No medical school or business school, according to Aleshire (2011), “is giving much attention to content that old, or if it does, mentions it only for historical reference, not because it can be a normative guide for thinking in this first century of the third millennium” (pg. 2).

The Study

The overarching research question for this study was: What are the benefits of promoting increased engagement with diversity through the curriculum, campus climate, and policies affecting students and staff in theological higher education? Secondary questions arising from the 1996 ATS accrediting standards were:

1. How do the institutions selected in this study understand diversity and inclusion at various levels of its institutional life?

2. What drives theological institutions to become more diverse communities and what role do their mission statements and strategic plans play in seeking the change they desire?
3. Is there a need for a sustainable approach where individual and community engagement in navigating diversity derive motivation from theological convictions of social justice?

The 1996 ATS accrediting standards emphasize that “attention to diversity is not simply a matter of inviting participation, but a lens in the theological school’s essential tasks of learning, teaching, research, and formation” (Gilligan, 2002, p. 56).

In order to address my research question, I looked at what drove three stand-alone Protestant theological institutions (named for the purposes of this study Peace Theological Seminary, Joy Theological Seminary and Unity Theological Seminary) in trying to make progress in achieving diversity and inclusion at all levels of the institution through their mission statements, core values, strategic plans, and institutional leadership. I explored the experiences of students, administrators, and faculty in the areas of diversity and inclusion as they related to curriculum, campus climate and mission development.

**Importance of Study**

This study on diversity and social justice is important because each of the contributing institutions has recognized something critically important in the role of intellectual life, the responsibilities toward students, and the belief that justice ought to be an essential tenet of the broader institutional life of theological higher education. “Christianity today is a multicultural faith: it is not the property of any one cultural tradition, even though it has been deeply shaped by Greco-Roman traditions and by the culture and intellectual tradition of Western Europe” (Esterline & Kalau, 2006). Matters of diversity and inclusion must be embraced if Christian theological seminaries and
divinity schools are to be successful in educating relevant and impacting leaders for a pluralistic and interconnected world. Diversity and cross-cultural engagements should be among the leading forces and objectives in theological seminaries and divinity schools due to the changing demographics being experienced in the United States and indeed the world.

A faculty member at Peace Seminary acknowledged that in his experience there “is fear of the change(s) that would take place in enhancing the curriculum with scholars and scholarship outside the rubric of Western European thought.” A seminary administrator at Unity Seminary maintained that “many of my colleagues are reticent in recognizing the realities of a changing society and church.” Seminaries motivated by halfhearted forces of “invitation” such as denominational pressure, traditional approaches to resolve past incidents of harassment or discrimination, are becoming ethnically diverse for the wrong reasons. “If the salt has lost its saltiness, how can you season it?” asked Jesus rhetorically (Mark 9:50). Christian communities, including its structures, according to Volf (1996), “which should be ‘the salt’ of the culture, are too often as insipid as everything around them” (p. #56).

Therefore, this study matters because too many diversity-planning efforts as mentioned by Damon Williams, follow a reactive pattern that emerges when the campus is disrupted by a diversity crisis (2006, pg. 1). Diversity and inclusion impacts institutional life from student enrollment and retention, faculty engagement, and curricular development, to board governance and institutional outcomes. This study concludes with various recommendations for how to create or improve effective pathways in advancing a sustainable approach of connecting institutional mission with
diversity efforts as seminaries meet the challenges of preparing women and men for acts of relevant ministries in a pluralistic and globalized society.

**Conceptual Framework**

In order to determine which institutions would be selected for this research, I used the Dimensions of Diversity as a conceptual framework designed by Daryl G. Smith (2009). These dimensions consist of institutional vitality and viability, educational and scholarly mission, access and success, and campus climate (Smith, 1995; Smith, 2009; Smith & Parker, 2005).

The *access and success* dimension relates to an institution’s undergraduate and graduate populations by field and levels, student success (e.g., graduation rates, persistence, and honors), and pursuit of advanced degrees and transfer among fields. The *campus climate* dimension encompasses the type and quality of social interactions among students, faculty, and staff, as well as individual and group perceptions of institutional commitment to diversity. The *educational and scholarly mission* dimension involves the availability of courses with significant diversity content, but also diversity course-taking patterns, faculty engagement with diversity issues, and student-learning outcomes related to diversity (Clayton-Pedersen et al., 2007). The dimension of *institutional viability and vitality* includes the following characteristics: increasing the racial/ethnic diversity of faculty, a public examination of the institutional history of diversity issues and incidents, strategies being employed to address diversity, the centrality of diversity in the mission and planning process, the monitoring of the work being done on diversity, the perceptions of the public and other constituents of the institution’s commitment, and the governing
board’s engagement on the issue (Clayton-Pedersen et al., 2007; Parker & Smith, 2005; Smith, 1995).

For the purposes of this study, more weight was given to institutions that displayed certain indicators within the dimension of institutional vitality and viability because institution mission is at its center (see Figure 1). This study focuses on the dimension of institutional vitality and viability with the hope that institutions can make changes that are sustainable beyond the life of individual programs and institutional leadership—possibly even to make diversity part of the ethos of their institutions. Clayton-Pedersen et al. (2007) provide indicators or drivers that influence success in this particular dimension: understanding the link between mission, history, and culture; reducing the fears that underlie resistance; moving from “project-itis” to coordinated action; and resolving the ‘quality versus diversity’” debate (pp. 32–33).

**Figure 1: Daryl G. Smith’s (2009) Diversity Framework**
Institutions Selected

In the case of the three institutions selected for this study, I examined their mission statements as provided on their websites. Using the aforementioned indicators from the dimension of vitality and viability, I was able to determine if these institutions were in the process of connecting matters of diversity with their theology, history, and culture.

The institutions that were chosen are members of the Association of Theological Schools (ATS). More than 270 graduate schools of theology in the United States and Canada form The Association of Theological Schools. Member schools conduct post-baccalaureate professional and academic degree programs to educate persons for the practice of ministry and for teaching and research in the theological disciplines. These schools differ from one another in deep and significant ways, but through their membership in ATS, they demonstrate a commitment to shared values about what constitutes good theological education. Collectively, ATS member schools enroll approximately 74,500 students and employ more than 7,200 faculty and administrators. I reviewed the websites of 74 institutions in the United States that are members of the ATS to identify which institutions mentioned or referenced diversity in their mission statements and/or value statements. Sixty-three institutions did so. Those institutions identified as meeting the criteria were further analyzed by using Smith’s (2009) dimensions to find proof of their work within each dimension. They were selected as potential case studies if this research confirmed that the institutions were programmatically addressing each of the dimensions of access and success, campus
climate, and educational and scholarly mission, and if there were three or more efforts within the dimension of institutional vitality and viability.

Due to time constraints in researching this study, the amount of three institutions and 12 interviews at each location were determined by my dissertation committee to be an appropriate number of theological schools. To determine which three institutions would be contacted for further study, I utilized the same method that Aleman and Salkever (2003) used in their study, which was identifying the institutions that had taken on major diversity initiatives. For their study, a liberal arts college was identified in order to answer the following question: Is liberal education compatible with multiculturalism at liberal arts colleges? Aleman and Salkver assessed how the faculty, students, and administrators understood the mission of liberal education and its importance toward becoming a “multicultural community” (p. 564). This could include an institution receiving a large grant for conducting work in the area of diversity or a program that has required a large financial commitment from the institution. In addition to these criteria, I noted denominational affiliation to ensure a balance was achieved, meaning that the selected institutions were not all from the same denomination.

Three institutions were selected representing three different regions of the country (Southwest, Mid-Atlantic, and East Coast). Pseudonyms were used to insure anonymity: Peace Theological Seminary, Joy Theological Seminary, and Unity Theological Seminary. The seminaries are institutions that are affiliated with the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), United Church of Christ, and Non-denominational. I analyzed institutional documents and archival information to provide additional data that would assist in determining (a) what drives an institution to seek change in the area of diversity, (b) the
progress each institution was making within each of the dimensions of diversity, and (c) how the institution was monitoring progress. The items examined consisted of demographic data, seminary catalogs, student handbooks, mission statements, values statements, external reports, organizational charts, institutional policies, and the institutional websites.

At each of these institutions, four students, four administrators, and four faculty members representing various racial ethnicities and positions were selected to be interviewed. I communicated with known colleagues at each institution and requested their assistance in identifying students, faculty, and administrators based on the focus of my research. At each institution, I met with the interviewees for approximately one hour.

**Researcher Bias**

As a pastor/theologian and practitioner, former trustee of a theological institution, and an administrator at a prominent seminary known for a long history and commitment to the integration of faith and learning, social justice, and cross-cultural engagement, I intend to contribute to the discourse on matters of diversity and inclusion within the theological academy. These institutions of education are a pearl of great value as they prepare social activists and change agents for a stage where demographic shifts are a constant and its confines provide opportunities in recognizing the voices of the “other” who are to be invited and welcomed to the great banquet table.

I have witnessed graduates from theological institutions renouncing their call to ministry after a short period in practice due to a variety of factors. For some the issue relate to preparation for particular contexts; being overwhelmed by the complexities of
societal issues; the lack of denominational/ecclesial support; not having the relevant skill sets to confront the paradigm shifts in their respective communities, etc.

The world is becoming inescapably connected and interactive with a plurality of people, ideologies, backgrounds, and orientations. Ethnic violence, religious conflicts, struggles for sovereignty, and urban unrest have both local and global implications inside and outside the walls of the theological academy. Within the walls, long-standing issues of inequity along lines of race, class, gender, and sexual orientation regarding access to, and representation in, theological institutions are ongoing concerns to scholars, laity, clergy, missionaries, chaplains, and the church at large. Similar to secular counterparts, the theological academy has a diversity imperative that, according to Damon A. Williams (2006) and Daryl G. Smith (2009), must be embraced if the theological academy is to be successful in a pluralistic and interconnected world.

Limitations

As with any study using qualitative data, this study relies on respondents’ thoughts, perceptions and beliefs with regard to the questions posed. As such, the findings reflect the perceptions of the research participants and are not meant to convey a comprehensive overview of how all students, administrators, and faculty members interpret their socialization to matters of diversity and social justice. Moreover, the small number and limited racial and gender diversity of the participants will curb the generalizability of the results to all students, administrators, and faculty members.
Key Findings

Although there have been sporadic improvements in matters of diversity and inclusion as offered through a variety of programmatic initiatives at the three selected institutions, the focus of this research is to determine whether these institutions used any particular framework to guide their strategies or have their efforts been merely peripheral and programmatic. In the three theological institutions studied, there are compelling reasons why social justice can serve as a compelling imperative for promoting diversity as a powerful enabler of institutional mission. Furthermore, according to my findings that will be further elaborated in chapter four, the intentional development of mission statements with comprehensive diversity action plans that are developed and embraced by the entire institution is essential as diversity assumes a more prominent role in shaping the institution’s identity, reputation, and ultimate effectiveness in preparing students to live and work in increasingly diverse local and global contexts.

Based on the interviews and data gathered prior to and during the campus visits, I concluded that all three institutions demonstrated progress within each of the four dimensions in Smith’s (2009) framework. In terms of a diverse workforce with regard to faculty, Unity Theological Seminary and Joy Theological Seminary had the most ethnic diversity. The faculty is key in sustaining diversity efforts (Smith, 2009). In addition to faculty, trustees are also seen as important in sustaining efforts. In this regard, both Joy Seminary and Unity Theological Seminary have made the most progress.

In educational and scholarly mission, Joy Theological Seminary has put a strategy into place to assist faculty in engaging the issue of diversity in the classroom by offering
workshops. These workshops are to help the faculty members increase their skill set in effectively integrating diversity into their classes.

A goal of this study was to determine what drives these institutions in trying to make progress in achieving diversity. All three institutions share two particular drivers: a biblical mandate and their mission. These are real drivers, as evidenced by the number of participants who referenced these specifically. As Clayton-Pedersen et al. (2007) and Smith (2009) state, institutions should tie their efforts to their mission. Thus, for theological institutions, there also needs to be a link to their theology. The rationale for this assertion is based on the interviews conducted at all three institutions. A way to make this link for these and other institutions is to author official theological position papers on diversity. The only institution in the process of developing a theology of diversity is Joy Theological Seminary.

Description of Dissertation Chapters

This dissertation is organized into six chapters. **Chapter One: Introduction** provides an overview of the components of the proposed study. This includes the development of context by providing background information and a summary of the state of existing research on the topic of interest. The purpose of the study, the explicit statement of the problem addressed, the overarching and secondary questions, and the significance of the results are outlined accordingly.

**Chapter Two: Literature Review** is organized into five broad categories which include an analysis of published information relevant to (a) a historical perspective, (b) a Biblical/Theological Witness, (c) current demographic context, (d) methodology, and (e)
key themes and concepts such as Social Justice Imperatives, Institutional Mission, Culturally-Relevant Pedagogy, and Strategic Planning. Collectively, this information provides the necessary context from which this study was conceptualized. A review of relevant literature in each of these broad categories was critically analyzed to permit inclusion of only that information which directly related to the proposed study.

**Chapter Three: Research Design and Methodology** depicts in detail those methods and procedures that comprise the research protocol utilized for the study. Detailed statements presenting the research questions addressed in the study are offered, followed by a comprehensive research plan. This research plan introduced the overall research design protocol. Attention was given to the role of the researcher and my unique contribution to the topic of interest and the study. Then, an in-depth explanation of the research plan was provided. A detailed protocol addressing participant selection, data collection and analysis procedures, as well as issues related to the reliability, validity, and trustworthiness of findings are specified.

**Chapter Four: Findings** presents specific results and discussion points of qualitative data from institutional mission and vision statements, strategic plans, pertinent institutional documents and interviews. Analysis of the data collected is described using the interview protocol as the method of inquiry in gaining the solicitation of verbal data. The findings of the collected data were transcribed in an effort to learn about participants’ perceptions and experiences as they related to the topic of interest. Particular attention was given to a discussion of the findings in an effort to establish the trustworthiness of conclusions.
Chapter Five: Analysis and Institutional Applications includes analysis, insights and recommendations as they pertained to the results of the research described in Chapter Four. A summary of the purpose of the study, procedures and methods, results, and recommendations on possible approaches and models are also made in this chapter.

Chapter Six: Summary and Conclusions addresses the implications of this research for relevant audiences and provides suggestions for future research on the topic of interest in this study.

Summary

The overarching research question for this study is: What are the benefits of promoting increased engagement with diversity in Christian higher education? Cultural diversity in society is amplified in all spheres of influence including the Church and its theological academy but it is seldom taken into account as an influential variable in the personal and social development of all its students: “Institutional culture in the theological academy transmits specific socio-cultural values (those of the dominant group), excluding other cultural features that are not in accordance with it” (Foster, 2002, p.63). With projections placing the U.S. church in a nonwhite-majority context in the near future, mission development and implementation at all levels of the theological academy as a matter of social justice is becoming paramount: “Not only will future seminarians be increasingly racially diverse, but seminary graduates will be ministering in a racially diverse church context as well” (Aleshire, 2010, p. 4). Therefore, one of the greatest challenges confronting the theological academy is in the development of a culturally relevant pedagogy and curriculum that will prepare women and men for acts of
service in varying vocational opportunities in a globalized and pluralistic society composed of a plethora of cultures.

Reflection about diversity begins with exploration of theological visions of the seminary and its education, or more concretely, the responsibility of the seminary to the mission of the church. Diversity needs to go beyond the rhetoric of theoretical and philosophical discourse while undermining the social ills such as poverty, classism, segregation, economic disparities, etc., that are pervasive within our society. Moreover, this theological conversation is not only for faculty members, rather it is a broad and multifaceted conversation for the whole church, involving faculty, administration, church leaders, board members, and students.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The literature review contextualizes the research questions in the study which provides the reader with what he or she needs to know in order to understand the significance of this study (Foster & Waters, 2007, pg. 53). The following literature review concerning diversity as a matter of integrating social justice in mission development and implementation at theological institutions provides a basic understanding of the issues, both historical and current, faced by higher education institutions and specifically, the theological academy.

Christian theological higher education have a diversity imperative that, according to Daryl G. Smith (2009), must be embraced, if, Christian theological seminaries and divinity schools are to be successful in educating leaders for a pluralistic and interconnected world. The literature specifically to the study of diversity and cross-cultural engagements showed much of the research to consist of quantitative examinations of the lack of students, faculty and administrators of color in accessing opportunities for vocational development in theological institutions. This literature review includes primary and secondary sources on historical church perspectives on matters of diversity, demographic trends, Biblical/Theological foundations, diversity framework, social justice imperatives, institutional mission, and culturally-relevant pedagogy, and strategic planning. Each area of review has informed the development of the framework of this study, “Navigating Diversity: Integrating Social Justice
Imperatives in Mission Development and Implementation Strategies at Theological Institutions.”

Both secular and theological institutions often focus on programmatic efforts to make changes in the area of diversity (Yancey, 2010). Social justice pertaining to diversity issues in higher education, particularly in the theological academy has moved slowly to address the diversity in our institutions and society. Theological higher education faces the same challenges with growing diversity as secular higher education. Increasingly, the importance of institutional leadership in developing a strong, sustainable commitment to diversity in higher education is recognized (Bowen, Kurzwell, & Tobin, 2005; Paredes-Collins, 2009; Smith, 2009). Despite real gains over the past decades, racial, ethnic, and gender disparities continue to persist in these three theological institutions. Disparities remain in boards of trustees (Association of Governing Board of Universities and Colleges, 2010; Fain, 2010), administrative leadership (Dominici, Fried, & Zeger, 2009; Gander, 2010; King & Gomez, 2008; Longman & Anderson, 2011; Longman & Lafreniere, 2012), faculty (Turner, Gonzalez, & Wong, 2011; Turner, Gonzalez, & Wood, 2008), and students (Bowen et al., 2005; Chang, Astin, & Kim, 2004; Darling-Hammond, 2010; Smith, 2009). Therefore, there is a lack of understanding the lived experiences of diverse people groups functioning as students, faculty, and administration within the theological academy.

A Historical Perspective

This section will examine the relationship between theological institutions and the church. Many “stand-alone” seminaries have a historic affiliation with a denomination.
A majority of divinity schools are affiliated with larger secular educational institutions that have historic ecclesial underpinnings that guide their mission efforts. As such, it is crucial to understand the general historic realities of the church’s relationship in matters of diversity, inclusion, and social justice. The church has a long and similar history of allowing diversity for the sake of maintaining control. As the church expanded throughout Europe after the fall of Rome, it enjoyed the patronage of aristocratic families and regional warlords. These families and chiefs had an overriding interest in keeping order with in their domains. The church proved itself a particularly useful institution in subduing local leaders and in incorporating diverse communities within the larger society. To be sure, the church often allowed local languages and devotions to find a place within the liturgy. In the long run, however, these expressions of local culture were gradually replaced by a liturgy that was increasingly uniform over large stretches of territory. Thus, the church has a questionable record in allowing diversity within its domain. During its European expansion, local pieties, to the extent that they survived outside the church, slowly became deviant and anomalous. Furthermore, communities or groups based on ethnicity or gender that retained the capacity to organize were regarded as potentially dangerous and heretical according to Dr. Richard K. Fenn, professor of Practical Theology (2001, pg. 65). Many of the ecclesiastical base communities of the church in Latin America have lacked enough autonomy to define themselves liturgically.

According to ATS Diversity Folio (2002), a collection of essays and cases on matters of diversity, “The focus on diversity merely illustrates the history of Christian faith and the embedded conversations and conflicts that occurred over differing commitments and traditions. These commitments and traditions were born in historical
moments, affected by cultural patterns and practices, and sought to faithfully witness to and live out the revelation in Christ” (pg. 2). What appears to be missing in the literature is how theological institutions making progress in the area of diversity are laying the groundwork for change by linking their efforts to their mission and history, and more importantly their theology. The literature points out how the church and the theological academy have not done well at making progress in the area of diversity.

**Demographics: The Realities of the Numbers**

Reports suggest that by the year 2050, the White, non-Hispanic population will only account for 50% of the total U.S. population (Johnson, 2006), as compared to the current 63% according to the 2010 census. If one were to take the future predictions of demographics to be correct; the U.S. will become a “minority majority.” That is to say, there will be no clear “racial” majority population. This is also being reflected in higher education enrollment, which predicts that the “growth of minorities will outpace rate of increase for Whites” (*Chronicle of Higher Education*, September 16, 2006). According to a recent issue brief by The Pew Charitable Trusts, “states such as New York, California, Florida and Texas have already demonstrated this demographic population change (Pew, 2014). Current demographic patterns indicate that students of color represent a growing percentage of the population on Seminaries and Divinity School campuses (ATS, 2012). The rub is that this population change is not being proportionally represented in all universities and theological institutions. In addition, while universities are good at outreach and recruitment, their retention of students is not robust (Moses, 1990).
The U.S., the third most populous country globally, accounts for about 4.5% of the world’s population. The U.S. population – currently estimated at 308.7 million – has more than doubled since its 1950 level of 152.3 million. More than just being double in size, the population has become qualitatively different from what it was in 1950. As noted by the Population Reference Bureau (2011), “The U.S. is getting bigger, older, and more diverse.” This reality is reflected in the total headcount of students enrolling in theological institutions (see Figure 2). No longer can it be assumed that enrollment in the theological academy is relegated to the 20-39 age cohort. A number of socio-economic factors influence this demographic shift. Ten years ago, according to a study conducted by the Auburn Center for the study of theological education, the most discussed feature of the profile of student enrollments was age. The average age of students entering a Masters level program was about 35, with a cohort of students between 30 and 49 growing fast. In 2003, however, as shown in Figure 2, the growth of the 30-39 and 40-49 master’s cohorts peaked, and both continue to decline. Meanwhile, there was steep growth in the 20-29 age group between 1997 and 2005 and fast and continuing growth in the smallest age cohort, students 50 and older. Because of these two developments – steep earlier growth in the youngest cohort and continuous growth in the 50-64 cohorts – young and older students are prominent features of students today, and students in the 30s and 40s are less in evidence.

The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) has been producing high school graduate forecasts for over 30 years, for use by a wide and diverse audience of policymakers, enrollment managers, college counselors, schools and school districts, researchers, and the media. This 8th edition of Knocking at the College Door
presents projections through the class of 2028 by state and race/ethnicity. These projections indicate that the era of annually increasing graduating classes through about 2011 is ending, while graduating classes are rapidly becoming more diverse. The map views in Figure 3 show how these trends will vary considerably by region and state.

Regarding race and the impact of immigration, Daniel Aleshire, president of the Association of Theological Schools (2010) claims that “By 2032, the American population will have completed a fundamental shift that began in the late nineteenth century; this nation of immigrants largely from Europe and the British Isles will be only a few years from becoming a nation in which ‘white’ will be the racial minority” (p. 2). By 2040, persons of African descent, Asian descent, and Hispanic descent will outnumber white residents. According to Aleshire (2011), “The closer we get to that time, the more white privilege will be eroded by the inevitable shift in the population, and as that privilege erodes, forms of cultural conflict will increase in various societal spheres of influence.”

Figure 2

(Chart obtained from the Auburn Center for the Study of Theological Education, 2013)
The conflict is already evident in the energy of small towns and large cities across this country as tensions between communities of color and the police escalate due to a variety of circumstances that relate to issues of fear and change. We also experience the impact of these cultural changes as border-states (e.g., Arizona, California, and Texas) curb the tide of undocumented immigrants and in the inability of the national government to come up with an effective response to immigrant issues.

Theological institutions face a unique challenge in embracing cultural diversity. One of the primary reasons theological intuitions struggle with diversity is fear that embracing diversity will ultimately result in the institution’s atmosphere becoming contrary to the faith (Abadeer, 2009). Essentially, many seminaries and divinity schools fear that an unintentional byproduct of incorporating diversity is that their campus will become secularized. Other challenges exist for the schools simply as part of their line of business. Daniel Lipson (2007) points out that for an institution to gain prestige and remain competitive, it has to recruit students with good grades and students who are able to undertake the financial burden of paying tuition, which sometimes does not line up with the organization’s desire to become demographically diverse.
According to the Commission on Accrediting of the Association of Theological Schools (2013), while white enrollment rates in theological schools in the U.S. have declined 17%, one demographic trend seems to draw new constituencies to theological education and holds promise to continue in the future. Nonwhite populations of North America are growing and so are the enrollments of African Americans and Hispanics in theological schools (see Table 2).

Rising black enrollments probably reflect rising expectations for ministry in black churches and a larger pool of college graduates eligible for further study, while Hispanic enrollments are no doubt bolstered by immigration and educational advances (see Figure 4). Data show that between 1990 and 2010, the number of black students enrolled in U.S. undergraduate programs more than doubled and the number of Hispanics tripled.)
Schools that make efforts to serve these groups are likely to see sustained and increased enrollment. Meanwhile, Asian enrollments have held fairly steady, and may grow in the future.

**Table 2: Recent Changes in Racial/Ethnic Headcount Enrollment**

(Chart obtained from the Auburn Center for the Study of Theological Education, 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>PEAK</th>
<th>TOTAL GAIN OR LOSS</th>
<th>ANNUAL GAIN OR LOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>-17% from peak</td>
<td>-3% from peak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>+7% from 2005</td>
<td>+1.75% from 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>+26% from 2005</td>
<td>+4% from 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>-7% from peak</td>
<td>-1.75% from peak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visa*</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-9% from peak</td>
<td>-3% from peak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Visa includes foreign students of any race living in the U.S. or Canada on nonresident visas. † Still increasing as of fall 2011

Aleshire (2010) posits, “The future will bring struggles to theological schools, not because they are endemic to the gospel, but because theological schools will be forced to struggle with the loss of the cultural privilege it has enjoyed” (p. 2). The problem is that this population change is not proportionally represented in theological institutions and divinity schools as it pertains to student enrollment, trustee membership, faculty composition, and curriculum development (Gin, 2013). There is an increased need given the demographic revolution taking place both nationally and globally for matters regarding curriculum, classroom activities, and purposeful pedagogies related to
addressing the need for discussion of social justice within graduate-level courses on diversity in theological higher education: “In short, we in the mainline have not paid attention to multiple disruptive forces affecting clergy leadership development . . . In an increasingly post-Christian America, churches have new and different expectations for clergy, including the possession of entrepreneurial skills” (Carter, Jones, Jones, 2014, p. 14). A more diverse population – including women and people from a variety of ethnic and immigrant traditions – are answering God’s call into ministry. Congregations and entire denominations are undergoing profound change. According to Wheeler (2013) “Today all religious groups, including evangelicals, are losing strength, and seminary enrollment patterns track this change rather closely” (p. 2), as Figure 4 indicates.
Broader social forces and trends may be in play as well, such as economic constriction and changing patterns of participation in higher education as indicated in Figure 5. Changing demographics and student attendance patterns pose new challenges for higher education. Three important demographic trends are affecting higher education today and will continue to play a pivotal role in shaping the future of postsecondary education. First, as the children of the Baby Boomers – the generation known as the Baby Boom Echo – enter college over the next fifteen years, the traditional college-age population will expand dramatically. Second, as the U.S. continues to become more racially diverse – with the increase in the number of people of color far outpacing that of whites in some parts of the country – so will the college population. Finally, the number of adults participating in postsecondary education also continues to increase.
Thirty years ago, the overwhelming majority of college students were white and under the age of 25. Today, 28% of students are persons of color and a third of undergraduate students are 25 years old and older. Recent data suggest that these trends will only grow stronger during the next decade (Anderson, 2003). The increase in older students and students of color create a variety of challenges for institutions of higher education particularly the theological academy. Researchers and educators agree that in light of an increasingly global and pluralistic society, it is important to equip all students with the appropriate cultural competency skills to navigate and thrive in the culturally diverse environments of the 21st century (Anguiano & Harrison, 2002; Chennault, 2005; Edwards, Carr, & Siegel, 2006; Smith, 1997). In addition to the demographic patterns in the U.S., times have changed globally. According to the Pew Research Center (Figure 6),
we are in the midst of a migration to Europe and North America of millions of people from Asia, Africa, Latin America, and the Caribbean that began during the middle of the last century (2013).

**Figure 6: U.S. Immigrants and Emigrants**

In his address to the 2000 Biennial Meeting in Toronto, ATS Executive Director Daniel Aleshire underlined these values: “We are educating religious leaders whose careers will witness the cultural transition from a predominantly white North America to one in which white will virtually cease to be the racial majority in the United States and will be notably lessened as the racial majority in Canada” (see Figure 5). According to the Pew Research Center (2013), “Despite global shifts in international migration, one constant remains: the U.S. has the world’s largest number of international migrants.” The number of immigrants in the U.S. doubled from 23 million people in 1990 to 46 million in 2013. During this time, no other country has come close to the number of foreign-born people living within its borders.
“The U.S. has also become a major recipient of migrants from key countries with large numbers of emigrants. Although the U.S. was not a leading destination of migrants born in top origin countries in 1990, things have changed considerably in a quarter century. By 2013, nearly 1-in-6 (2.1 million) migrants born in India – the top country of birth for international migrants in 2013 – lived in the U.S. Almost the entirety of the 13 million migrants born in Mexico – the second highest country of birth for international migrants in 2013 – also lived in the U.S. And the U.S. is the top recipient of migrants from about a quarter of the world’s countries. In 1990, the U.S. was the top destination of migrants born in 53 countries. In 2013, that number was about the same at 52 countries” (Pew Research Center, 2013).

One result in the U.S. is a profound cultural, religious and demographic shift. Within the religious experience, many of these families that come from Latin America, Asia, and Africa arrive with their distinct religious practices and religious affiliations, which may not be consonant with the existing religious options availed here in the U.S. As a result, Mainline Protestant denominations, deeply imbedded within a Western European religious and theological experience, do not have the same culture-shaping influence and identity we once took for granted. In this country, and in Europe, growing numbers of people are not practicing Christians; many do not have Christian roots. In many regions and geographies these people constitute a majority. Seminaries must adapt to serve faith communities within this changed context. We must address and resolve new questions about need and priority such as: given the changing demographics and global migration, what constitutes culturally embedded intellectual excellence; what educational and experiential backgrounds best qualify students for admission to
A Biblical/Theological Witness

In light of these challenges, a theological perspective of diversity in a framework of social justice is imperative at this point of the research. The theological academy in the 21st century ought not to be a place for rhetorical vision and eloquent mission statements; it is a call. The call is to follow Jesus into new patterns of living and into Christian spiritual practices of inquiry, exploration, and service that create genuine and respectful community. The celebration of diversity and inclusion is noticeably articulated in the Bible in many events, commands, parables, and prophecies, from creation to eternal consummation.

The theological term of *imago dei* (image of God) emphasizes that all people are created in God’s image and are worthy of respect. In the beginning of human life, God the Trinity reveals the marvelous notion of creating and forming humans in the likeness of the One Triune God (Gn 1:26). The plural reference to “our image” and “our likeness” of the One Triune God was directly embodied in the making of humans. The diversity of the One Triune God has its unique significance in celebrating redemptive diversity: God the Creator, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit.
Diversity and inclusive engagement were integral throughout Jesus’ ministry. For example, Jesus praised the faith of the Roman centurion and healed his servant (Mt 8:5–8). Jesus also crossed embedded cultural boundaries by initiating a direct engagement with a Samaritan woman at the water well, offering her and her people the Living Water (John 4:4–10). Diversity was also rooted in the teaching and parables of Jesus. For example, the Good Shepherd has sheep from other pens, and all will be one flock with one shepherd. People from different nations will come together, invited and called by God to be God’s own (John 10:14–16).

The Good Samaritan story offers a further lesson in initiating and implementing redemptive diversity (Luke 10:30–37). It starts with the Levite’s and priest’s apathy toward a victim of robbery who was left almost dead on the road. One should wonder about the cultural norms, fear, apathy, or other barriers that prevented them from attending to the victim. Then, in contrast to what seemed to be the existing cultural settings, a traveling Samaritan, a stranger, took pity on the victim and attended to him. He bandaged the victim’s wounds, poured oil and wine on them, put the victim on his donkey, took him to the inn, took care of him, visited him the next day, paid the victim’s expenses, and promised to return and pay for any extra expenses. The Good Samaritan did not give in to existing fallen norms and customs; instead, he took a redemptive risk. In a way, the Good Samaritan put himself into the place of the victim, and lifted his burden, crossing existing cultural barriers and transforming fallen norms through initiating a redemptive intervention. He saved the life of a foreign victim, treating him and loving him as a brother or neighbor. The Samaritan’s acts were not mere emotional
responses at the spur of the moment; he visited the victim the next day, paid the extra expenses for taking care of him, and promised to return.

A Diversity Framework

In the review of existing literature on diversity, research indicates that an institutional framework of diversity helps create a shared understanding and broader context of diversity. While legal and institutional policy issues remain critical, the work of diversity as an enabler of institutional mission requires reframing diversity as central to institutional mission and effectiveness, rather than programmatic or marginalized activity. This framework consists of the following dimensions: access and success, campus climate, educational and scholarly mission, and institutional viability and vitality (Smith, 1995; Smith, 2009; Smith & Parker, 2005). The access and success dimension relates to an institution’s undergraduate and graduate populations by field and levels, student success (e.g., graduation rates, persistence, and honors), and pursuit of advanced degrees and transfer among fields. The campus climate dimension encompasses the type and quality of social interactions among students, faculty, and staff, as well as individual and group perceptions of institutional commitment to diversity. The educational and scholarly mission dimension involves the availability of courses with significant diversity content, but also diversity course-taking patterns, faculty engagement with diversity issues, and student-learning outcomes related to diversity (Clayton-Pedersen et al., 2007). The dimension of institutional viability and vitality can be described by the following characteristics: increasing the racial/ethnic diversity of faculty, a public examination of the institutional history of diversity issues and incidents, strategies being employed to
address diversity, the centrality of diversity in the mission and planning process, the monitoring of the work being done on diversity, the perceptions of the public and other constituents of the institution’s commitment, and the governing board’s engagement on the issue (Clayton-Pedersen et al., 2007; Parker & Smith, 2005; Smith, 1995, 2009).

In this review Smith’s (2009) framework for diversity is explored as the most appealing and relevant to this research because it provides a way of understanding diversity at an institutional level and importantly what it can look like in practice. The framework places institutional mission at the center, which recognizes the importance of aligning diversity with the distinct mission of an institution (Abadeer, 2009; Clayton-Pedersen, 2007; Perez, 2010; Smith, 2009). More specifically, this study focuses on the dimension of institutional vitality and viability with the hope that institutions can make changes that are sustainable beyond the life of individual programs and institutional leadership – possibly even to make diversity part of the ethos of their institutions. In addition, identifying what drives three stand-alone Protestant theological institutions to make diversity central to their missions will hopefully silence critics who see diversity efforts as merely being politically correct.

Therefore, diversity is not an end in itself but, rather, a precondition for academic excellence, institutional relevance, national vitality, and global integrity. The arrival of words like diversity and phrases like “diversity is good” has meant a departure from, perhaps, more critical words and concepts like social justice, equality, and equal opportunities. Professor Joh (2014) states, “I wonder at the appeal of the term diversity: Does its assimilation and acceptance by institutions signal a loss of critical edge? Might it be possible that the term is much more appealing to institutions because it is far easier
to diffuse diversity than social justice?” Valid questions that point to the inadequacies of traditional approaches that are implemented at institutions of higher education including the theological academy while masking the realities of oppressive systems that undergird the viability and integrity of stories of students, faculty, administrators, support staff, facilities staff, and community stakeholders that come from near and far.

The literature in navigating diversity within theological institutions may be numerous, yet, there is an apparent gap identifying social justice as a motivating driver or imperative in embracing diversity within the mission of the 21st century theological institution. I will use a combination of definitions, as the term is complex by its very nature. Engagement with this issue and its complexities are central, not tangential, to an institution’s mission and to the maintenance of its leadership position within the Church and in theological higher education.

Researchers have primarily studied three forms of diversity in higher education: structural, curricular, and interactional. **Structural diversity** refers to the proportion of diverse individuals in a given setting. For example, studies that examine the proportion of black or Hispanic students enrolled in a university are looking at structural diversity. Of the three types of diversity, structural diversity has received the least empirical attention (Demson & Change, 2009). **Curricular diversity** refers to classes, workshops, seminars, and other programmatic efforts that expose individuals to diversity-related content. One study that examined curricular diversity compared the end-of-semester prejudicial attitudes of students who enrolled in a diversity course to the prejudicial attitudes of students who enrolled in a research methods course (Rudman, Ashmore, & Gary, 2001). Finally, **Interactional diversity** refers to interpersonal contact with diverse
individuals. Interactions may occur horizontally via contact with peers and other equals or they may occur vertically via contact with diverse superiors or subordinates. Studies that examine roommate relationships among interracial and same race pairs investigate horizontal interactions, whereas studies that examine gender-matched versus mixed-gender pairings between managers and employees investigate vertical interactions. Although the majority of research produces similar findings regardless of how diversity is measured, these measurement differences may be important to consider when studies produce discrepant results. Further, certain types of diversity may be more effective than others. Interactional diversity, for instance, is particularly influential in affecting learning outcomes compared to structural and curricular diversity (Bowman, 2010). For these reasons, this qualitative research will distinguish between these three forms of diversity.

There is considerable debate over the specific individual differences that are relevant to a discussion of diversity and inclusion. Traditionally diversity research and policy focused on differences in race and gender. However, more recent scholarship has served to expand the boundaries of what is pertinent. Differences, for example, in personality, height, weight age, and sexual preference have become part of the domain (Carr-Ruffino, 2006; Prasad, Pringle, & Konrad, 2006). In the words of Prasad and her colleagues (2006), “. . . diversity is a more relevant concept if it focuses on those differences that have been systematically discriminated against, irrespective of whether or not they receive legal protection” (p. 2).

Other scholars separate these diversity characteristics into primary and secondary dimensions. Primary dimensions are those such as race, gender, age, and mental/physical abilities and characteristics, which exert a primary influence on our
identities. Secondary dimensions are less visible, often considered more malleable, and exert more varied influences on our personal identities: “They include: educational background, geographic location, religion, first language, family status, work style, work experience, military experience, organizational role and level, income and communication style” (Rijamampianina & Carmichael, 2005, p. 109). Given this breadth of dimensions, diversity itself may be defined very broadly or more narrowly depending on the propinquities of the researcher. The focus of this discussion is primarily on the more visible, salient human differences or primary dimensions, most of which are legally protected categories in the United States.

While theological institutions have attempted to address diversity and its implications for several decades, a commitment to diversity is a relatively recent phenomenon and few diversity studies have been conducted in these settings (Aleshire, 2010, ATS, 2011, Kratt, 2004). In addition to the Biblical/Theological Witness introduced in this literature review, the use of Scripture is vital to obtain a theological framework on matters of diversity, inclusion and justice. Scriptural texts are robust in pointing to the fact that God’s purpose is to invite people from all racial and ethnic groups, gender, social class, age, life-style, and differently-abled into a relationship with God, which will ultimately result in every tribe and nation being present in God’s realm (Isaiah 2:2–4, 25:6; Luke 13:28–29; Revelation 5:9–10, 7:9). In addition, Scripture repeatedly suggests that human beings should stand against oppression and promote justice (Amos 5:24; Luke 10:36–37; Mark 11:15–17; Micah 6:6–8; Zechariah 7:9). Most importantly, Scripture repeatedly underscores the importance of breaking down the partiality and hostility that divides
people in order to bring about true racial reconciliation and harmony (Acts 15:23, 26; 2 Corinthians 5:16–21; Ephesians 2:14–16; Galatians 3:26–28; James 2:8–9; John 17:20–23).

Social Justice Imperatives

“Imperatives” are stakes in the ground about the big, important things that should be considered as representations of the institutions’ will to renew and transform in matters that are identified as critical. According to Dantley and Tillman (2010), there are three essential imperatives of social justice:

4. leadership for social justice, which examines policies and practices that shape educational institutions and may perpetuate social inequalities and marginalization;

5. moral transformative leadership, which views education from a progressive, critical perspective and focuses on power in institutions; and

6. social justice praxis, such as research, scholarship, and pedagogical methods that broaden the discourse on social justice.

These imperatives enable social justice to become a vibrant part of the everyday reality and ethos of the institution. The social justice literature surfaces a number of themes that characterize leadership for social justice. Leadership for social justice is “action-oriented and transformative, committed and persistent, inclusive and democratic, relational and caring, reflective, and oriented to a socially just pedagogy” (Furman, 2012, p. 5). Leadership for social justice requires confronting contentious issues in order to bring about necessary change within institutions and communities (Lumby & Coleman, 2007). While acknowledging the challenges in addressing institutional disparities, leaders can achieve change “if
only in that a persistent and consistent attempt to do so is in itself a powerful communication of challenge to inequity” (p. 122). These scholars argue that a stance of permanent mindfulness and navigating uncomfortable realities requires moral courage and stamina on the part of institutional leaders.

The exercise of legitimate power, whether exercised individually or corporately, is central to understanding moral/transformative leadership. Injustice occurs when power is misused to deny people what they are rightfully due. In her influential work, Young (1990) argues while distributive issues of justice are clearly important, the concepts of domination, oppression, and politics are fundamental to understanding social justice. According to Young, oppression encompasses five key aspects: exploitation, marginalization, powerlessness, cultural imperialism, and violence. A moral/ethical perspective of justice illuminates the critical political and leadership dimensions of social justice.

Recognizing the historical significance of theological inquiry in the formation of church leaders in this country is important to acknowledge as these same leaders have significant impact in the social, political, religious, and educational arenas. Social Justice praxis will depend on the ability of the theological academy to adapt and foresee changes in the external environments that impact their organizations. Consequently, these changes affect the institution’s ability to accomplish the mission of educating persons for ecclesiastical leadership, and for teaching and research in the theological disciplines (ATS, 2011; Morrison, 1992; Speller, 2002).
Theological schools are now being confronted in more profound ways with the realities of a growing pluralism in the U.S. according to Speller (2002), an African American church historian and religious educator. Speller states “if our mission is to prepare women and men for effective ecclesiastical leadership, we fall short of the mission with a theological education that does not reflect the realities of the diversity in our communities” (2002). As a result, of these new realities, institutions are being forced to review their tradition of an exclusive curriculum, a homogenous faculty, and a static or declining majority student population (Speller, 2002). Researchers and educators agree that in light of an increasingly pluralistic society, it is important to equip theological students with the appropriate cultural competency skills to navigate and thrive in the culturally diverse environments of the 21st century (Lesher & Shriver, 1999).

While more questions surfaced than conclusions, the literature review supports the basic premise that strong institutional leadership is needed for theological institutions, particularly self-sufficient seminaries to embrace diversity and realize social justice as an integral part of their mission, institutional values, and ethos. The distinctive mission of theological institutions and its biblical/theological foundations are tremendous assets that can be cultivated and developed in new ways to address the emerging diversity-related challenges facing our institutions. The complexity and significance of these challenges shifts diversity from a programmatic or peripheral emphasis to a “systemic, institutional agenda” demanding a completely new level of thinking and transformation for every component of institutional life that includes enrollment management, campus
climate, curriculum development, faculty recruitment and retention, student access and success, administrative hiring, campus life policies and grievance procedures, and matters of governance.

**Institutional Mission**

The role of identity, both individually and institutionally, is central to diversity-related issues. There is growing recognition that individuals have multiple identities (e.g., gender, race, ethnicity, class, and abilities) and these identities must be understood as they intersect with each other (Smith, 2009). Individual identities emerge, in part, based on their historical, social, political, and economic context: “People live multiple, layered identities derived from social relations, history, and the operation of structures of power. People are members of more than one community at the same time, and can simultaneously experience oppression and privilege” (Symington, 2004, p. 23). Likewise institutional identity is shaped over time by history, context, location, and mission. Institutional culture, as reflected in values, norms, and practices, represents “one of the deepest and most important elements of how institutions admit, value, and reward people. It is directly related to identity” (Smith, 2009, p. 26). The relationship among individual identity, institutional identity, and culture is complex and multidimensional and is an area that would benefit from further research.

In theological higher education, institutional identity, mission, and context are particularly important. While many institutions carefully attend to their institutional identities, some struggle more than others. The tension, and oftentimes conflict, between the academy and the church, is added to the challenges, which requires careful
discernment, transformative leadership, fresh perspectives, and new ways of collaborating over time to remain relevant (Blair, 2010; Henck, 2011). The dynamic interplay of history, changing contexts, and relationships with one's religious tradition highlights the central role of institutional mission and identity in the discourse on diversity in theological higher education.

In responding to the challenges of institutional diversity, Smith's (2009) framework for diversity provides a way of understanding diversity at an institutional level and, more importantly, what it can look like in practice. As noted in Figure 1, the framework places institutional mission at the center, which recognizes the importance of aligning diversity with the distinct mission of an institution (Abadeer, 2009; Clayton-Pedersen, 2007; Perez, 2010; Smith, 2009). Attention to the context in which diversity is being enacted is critical. This research will focus on the first dimension of Smith's (2009) diversity framework of institutional viability and vitality, which examines the institutional history on diversity, board diversity and engagement, institutional strategies and dedicated resources, centrality of diversity in institutional planning, diversity of administrative leadership and faculty, and constituency perceptions of the institution's commitment to diversity. This dimension has direct implications for institutional mission and strategic planning as a critical mechanism for consistent and long-standing integration of diversity at all levels of the institution.

An institutional framework of diversity helps create a shared understanding and broader context of diversity. While legal and institutional policy issues remain critical, diversity must be reframed as central to institutional missions, rather than as a peripheral activity, if it is to enable institutional missions. The six-year Campus Diversity Initiative
(CDI) of 28 independent colleges and universities, including numerous faith-based institutions, demonstrated the challenge of implementing and sustaining institutional-level change, even when supported by institutional commitment, external funding, data, and resources (Smith, 2009). This report shows that diversity-embraced institutional culture depends on understanding and appreciating the differences between people based on their cultural backgrounds and not solely on the implementation of well-devised policies.

Based on extensive investigation, it is my contention that there is no empirical research that has been conducted on institutional-level diversity in theological institutions that is inclusive of governance or that examines the relationship between institutional mission development (governance), diversity, and institutional outcomes. For example, how does board composition (e.g., gender, racial/ethnic, theological diversity) affect institutional effectiveness? What conditions encourage minority and women leaders to serve on governing boards and in presidential and senior administrative roles? What is the relationship between spiritual climate of campuses and diversity of theological institutions? It is evident that significant work and research are needed to build institutional capacity for diversity in a framework of social justice in the theological academy.

In the same manner, governance is a crucial component in the development of institutional mission. Governance refers to the “processes of decision-making within an institution [which]… enable an institution to set its policies and objectives, to achieve them, and to monitor its progress towards their achievement” (Oxford, 2006, p. 5). Across different settings, contexts, and models, decision-making authority and
accountability are at the heart of institutional mission implementation. It is my contention that board leadership becomes more critical as diversity takes a central role in shaping the institution’s identity, reputation, and ultimate effectiveness in preparing students to live and work in increasingly diverse and global contexts. Ultimate accountability for institutional effectiveness and long-term viability rests with governing boards, including their institution’s diversity-related outcomes. Further scholarship and research needs to be conducted that advances understanding, theory, and practice on diversity-related social justice, board governance, and institutional leadership, specifically in the context of theological higher education.

**Culturally-Relevant Pedagogy**

Many academic institutions boast an intellectual consensus regarding the importance of diversity, but faculty members often lack a clear understanding of its implications on their instructional practices and feel unprepared to address these issues in their classrooms (Howard, 2006; Laubscher & Powell, 2003; McAllister & Irvine, 2000). More often than not, the sense of discomfort that they feel leads them to shy away from exploring cultural topics in classroom discussions or even with other faculty members (Neuwirth, 2003). Howard-Hamilton (2000) cautioned that multicultural knowledge must first influence an individual’s belief system before it can be effectively implemented into pedagogical practices. While there is widespread agreement about the need to develop faculty who can effectively communicate to a diverse student population (Brown & Woods, 2005; Clark, 2005; Strasser & Seplocha, 2005; Torres, Howard-Hamilton, &
Cooper, 2003), few models exist for developing culturally sensitive faculty at the Seminary level.

Research studies from the fields of multicultural education, faculty development, culturally responsive pedagogy, and theology have all addressed the complex process of preparing faculty and teaching assistants in institutions of higher education to be effective with culturally diverse students. As university and seminary campuses become increasingly inclusive, it is essential that faculty in these institutions are equipped to work effectively with the students in their classrooms.

While many institutions of higher education require students to enroll in a multicultural or diversity course, the literature revealed the insufficiency of this strategy as the sole approach to this issue (Allen, 2000; Edwards et al., 2006; Howard-Hamilton, 2000; Laubscher & Powell, 2003). First, courses are often ineffective because many faculty have not received adequate training to teach these classes (Edwards et al.; Holcomb-McCoy & Myers, 1999). Second, taking one diversity course has not proven to be an effective means of breaking down stereotypes and producing cultural competency (Fishbein, 1996; Howard-Hamilton, 2000; Lee, 2002; McNeil & Pozzi, 2007). Rather, research suggests that multicultural perspectives must pervade the curricula in order to bring about attitudinal and behavioral changes (Edwards et al., 2006; Price & Valli, 1998). Thus, faculty in all academic disciplines need cultural competency training if they are to transmit this set of knowledge and skills to their students (Clark, 2005; Gay, 2004; Jones, 2004).

Despite the efforts of scholars to provide a biblical basis for diversity, there has been skepticism by some who view it as a form of moral and cultural relativism,
particularly when the idea of multiculturalism or diversity includes sexual orientation (Lew, 2001). This skepticism provides an obstacle for institutional leaders who believe there is a biblical basis for diversity that does not include sexual orientation. The literature addresses the importance of linking diversity efforts to an institution’s mission and history (Smith, 2009). Although this literature focuses on secular institutions, what appears to be missing is how theological institutions are linking their diversity efforts with their theological understanding of diversity within social justice imperatives that may guide their change efforts and overcome the obstacles that such skepticism creates.

**Strategic Planning**

“Strategic Planning is a formal process designed to help an organization identify and maintain an optimal alignment with the most important elements of its environment” (Rowley, D.J., Lujan, H.D. & Dolence, M.G., 1997, pg. 15). During the last several decades, the diversity idea has evolved into a some-times confusing discussion of overlapping concepts such as multicultural-ism, access, equity, inclusion, and affirmative action (Cox, 2001; Norton & Fox, 1997; Smith & Wolf-Wendel, 2005; Thomas, R., 2001). Even though diversity is often associated with equal opportunity and affirmative action employment and admissions policies, it is almost limitless in its definition and includes any number of identities. These definitions would range from a narrow focus on the representation of ethnic and racial minorities, to the fostering of a supportive campus climate for members of the gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, and queer communities, to the infusion of diverse content into the academic curricula and better preparation of all students for the realities of a diverse democracy. According to an ATS officer with whom
I interviewed (2014), “this complexity often paralyzes well-meaning academic leaders, diversity planning committees, student affairs professionals, and others who are unable to reconcile the numerous definitions of diversity on college and university campuses.”

Whereas the initial focus of diversity policies and programs was reactive and limited, changing demographics, the emerging knowledge economy, shifts in the Supreme Court’s view of diversity, and other pressures have enhanced the strategic importance of diversity efforts in the new millennium (Williams et al., 2005). Peterson and Dill (1997) foreshadowed this point in “Understanding the Competitive Environment of the Postsecondary Knowledge Industry,” noting that diversity is one of six major forces re-shaping higher education as we know it.

Demographic shifts, legal and political contestation, economic and workforce imperatives, and increasing conversations regarding diversity as an educational imperative require institutions to transform themselves and make diversity goals central to their educational mission. However, planning and accomplishing diversity goals will continue to be a challenge in the foreseeable future. The ability to align the higher education institution with its environment is one of the strengths of strategic planning (Dalrympie, M., 2009, pg. 4). If strategic leadership is to respond effectively to change, it needs a set of disciplinary tools.

**Summary**

Theological institutions are at a critical junctures in the history of the global church, among people of faith everywhere, and of local institutions of learning, whether they are in Pittsburgh, Dallas, California, or Chicago. Yet, there is need for a strategy
contextualized by each theological institution that comprehends both renewal of traditional strengths and transformative change in the way these strengths are lived out and delivered to meet the objective for increased breadth, depth, and relevance to the global communities we serve. Strategies intended to deliver transformative change within social justice imperatives require rigor that will withstand the test of time.

For theological higher education institutions, the distinctive mission and biblical mandate of justice serves as a compelling rationale for promoting diversity, equity, and excellence. As an administrator in a theological institution with a long history and commitment to faith and learning, justice, and intercultural engagement, this literature review challenges me to think deeply about the nexus of diversity, social justice, and mission development & implementation. Micah 6:6–8 continues to call us to the work at hand in our respective institutions as we seek “to do justice, love mercy, and walk humbly with your God.” While more questions surfaced than conclusions, the literature review supports my premise that strong institutional leadership is needed for theological institutions, particularly self-sufficient seminaries, to embrace diversity and realize social justice as an integral part of their mission, institutional values, and ethos. The complexity and significance of these challenges shifts diversity from a programmatic and peripheral emphasis to a “systemic, institutional agenda” demanding a completely new level of thinking and transformation of our institutions. My study shows that as theological institutions become more diverse, governing boards must become better equipped, faculty need to embrace a culturally-sensitive pedagogy, and administration should harness and value a wide range of differences with and among peers.
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Site Selection

This qualitative research study represents an inductive and descriptive case study. Smith, Wolf and Levitan (1994) suggest that the study of diversity requires the researcher to examine multiple perspectives from multiple methods utilizing the power of voice. Unlike the survey method, which reduces subjects or specials experiences and responses to numerical data, this method, to quote Denzin and Lincoln (1994), “focuses on the socially constructed nature of reality, intimate relationships between the researcher and what is studied, and the situational constraints that shape inquiry” (p. 4). In agreement with these researchers, I chose case study methodology as the best approach for this research because it allowed me to ask “how” and “why” questions that delved into issues using a variety of qualitative approaches, such as structured interviews and a review of relevant documents.

In order to determine which institutions to select for this research, I used a conceptual framework designed by Daryl G. Smith (2009) dimensions of diversity. These dimensions consist of institutional vitality and viability, educational and scholarly mission, access and success, and campus climate. The Dimensions of Diversity is preferred as its center is based on institutional mission. For the purposes of this study, more weight was given to institutions that displayed indicators within the dimension of institutional vitality and viability. Clayton-Pedersen et al. (2007) provide factors that influence success in this particular dimension: understanding the link between mission, history, and culture; reducing the fears that underlie resistance; and moving from “project-itis” to coordinated action. The dimension of institutional vitality and viability
can be described by the following indicators: increasing the racial/ethnic diversity of faculty, a public examination of the institutional history of diversity issues and incidents, strategies being employed to address diversity, the centrality of diversity in the mission and planning process, the monitoring of the work being done on diversity, the perceptions of the public and other constituents of the institution’s commitment, and the governing board’s engagement on the issue (Clayton-Pedersen et al., 2007; Parker & Smith, 2005; Smith, 1995, 2009. Institutions were selected that are attempting to link their efforts between diversity and their theology, history, and culture. The findings from this study may assist institutional leaders in gaining the particular knowledge, appreciation, and openness needed to drive transformative change effectively as we meet the challenges of cultural, theological, racial and other diverse realities. In the case of the three institutions selected for this study, I examined their mission statements as provided on their websites. Using the aforementioned indicators from the dimension of vitality and viability, I was able to determine if these institutions were in the process of connecting matters of diversity with their theology, history, and culture.

The institutions that were chosen are members of the Association of Theological Schools (ATS). More than 270 graduate schools of theology in the United States and Canada form The Association of Theological Schools. Member schools conduct post-baccalaureate professional and academic degree programs to educate persons for the practice of ministry and for teaching and research in the theological disciplines. These schools differ from one another in deep and significant ways, but through their membership in ATS, they demonstrate a commitment to shared values about what constitutes good theological education. Collectively, ATS member schools enroll
approximately 74,500 students and employ more than 7,200 faculty and administrators. I reviewed the websites of 74 institutions in the United States that are members of the ATS to identify which institutions mentioned or referenced diversity in their mission statements and/or value statements. 63 institutions did so. Those institutions identified as meeting the criteria were further analyzed by using Smith’s (2009) dimensions to find proof of their work within each dimension. They were selected as potential case studies if this research confirmed that the institutions were programmatically addressing each of the dimensions of access and success, campus climate, and educational and scholarly mission, and if there were three or more efforts within the dimension of institutional vitality and viability.

Based on time constraints in researching this study, the amount of three institutions and 12 interviews at each location were determined by my dissertation committee to be an appropriate number of theological schools. To determine which three institutions would be contacted for further study, I utilized the same method that Aleman and Salkever (2003) used in their study, which was identifying the institutions that had taken on major diversity initiatives. For their study, a liberal arts college was identified in order to answer the following question: Is liberal education compatible with multiculturalism at liberal arts colleges? Aleman and Salkver assessed how the faculty, students, and administrators understood the mission of liberal education and its importance toward becoming a “multicultural community” (p. 564). This could include an institution receiving a large grant for conducting work in the area of diversity or a program that has required a large financial commitment from the institution. In addition
to these criteria, I noted denominational affiliation to ensure a balance was achieved, meaning that the selected institutions were not all from the same denomination.

Three institutions were selected representing three different regions of the country (Southwest, Mid-Atlantic, and East Coast). The selection of institutions from three different geographical locations was important to this study because matters of diversity are contextual in nature and the demographic information vary based on a number of characteristics, i.e., socioeconomic, political and educational. The names chosen for the individuals reflect my perceptions of each individual’s disposition, outlook, and mannerisms. The names chosen for each institution reflect my perception of the institution’s history and missional outlook. Pseudonyms were used to insure anonymity: Peace Theological Seminary, Joy Theological Seminary, and Unity Theological Seminary. The seminaries are institutions that are affiliated with the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), United Church of Christ, and Non-denominational.

I analyzed institutional documents and archival information to provide additional data that would assist in determining (a) what drives an institution to seek change in the area of diversity, (b) the progress each institution was making within each of the dimensions of diversity, and (c) how the institution was monitoring progress. The items examined consisted of demographic data, seminary catalogs, student handbooks, mission statements, values statements, external reports, organizational charts, institutional policies, and the institutional websites.

In designing this research as case study investigations, I chose a qualitative method of inquiry because, as Turner and Myers (2000) assert, in order to examine socialization experiences thoroughly, a qualitative method of inquiry is most effective. I
communicated with known colleagues at each institution and requested their assistance in identifying students, faculty, and administrators. The selection of students was based on Smith’s vitality and viability dimension, particularly with the indicators that speak of strategies being employed to address diversity, and their perceptions of the institution’s commitment to matters of diversity on campus. The selection of administrators was based on hearing their perceptions and insights on the centrality of diversity in the mission and planning process, their understanding of institutional history of diversity issues and incidents, and their perceptions as to strategies being employed to address diversity. The selection of faculty was centered on matters regarding curriculum development, the institution’s desire in diversifying the faculty, and their involvement in addressing matters if diversity and inclusion.

At each of these institutions, four students (2 male and 2 female) in their second year of study in the Master of Divinity degree, four administrators, and four faculty members representing various racial ethnicities (African American, Latino/a American, Euro-white and Asian American) and positions were selected to be interviewed. In regards to the administrators and faculty members, their gender and racial identities will be identified throughout the study when using their statements. It is important to note that the majority of faculty and administrators interviewed were predominantly Euro-descent. This reality bore witness to prior statements regarding the disparity of racial ethnic representation among administrators and faculty in the theological academy.

In theological schools, the Master of Divinity is the basic core degree program where substantial enrollment is identified. Second-year students in this degree program
were interviewed since they had experienced a full year of educational inquiry within the institution.

The interpretive framework through which I explored the dynamics of diversity in theological education is drawn from a common theme in their mission statements. This framework is preferred, as ATS does not have a universal framework for diversity due to the diverse theological perspectives of its member schools. There are suggested standards regarding diversity in which compliance is necessary, yet there are a number of “qualifiers” that allows each school to determine the level of diversity according to their denominational affiliations and confessional commitments. I examined each institution’s historic past and its current strategic goal to become more culturally diverse. These schools describe their educational mission in terms of personal, spiritual, academic, professional formation (e.g., pastoral or priestly), and empowerment for ministry. Practices of teaching and learning integral to these educational goals vary from school to school.

**Data Collection**

My primary data collection method was in-depth, open-ended interviews with four second-year students, four administrators, and four faculty members at each of the three theological institutions, for which I used an interview guide that I had prepared. Officers from the Association of Theological Schools (ATS) were also interviewed and provided supplemental data regarding their Committee on Race and Ethnicity projects. The work of the ATS Committee on Race and Ethnicity in Theological Education (CORE) addresses both the concerns of racial/ethnic persons in theological education and
institutional practices. The purpose of the committee includes leadership development of racial/ethnic persons; collecting data on the hiring, retention, and promotion of racial/ethnic persons at member schools; and emphasizing mentoring by and for racial/ethnic persons to ensure their retention and enhance their well-being. It was important for this study to receive the insights and recommendations from officers at ATS due to their knowledge of qualitative and quantitative information on its member schools. Also, ATS has been in a systemic process of deliberations with a majority of schools regarding diversity and inclusion entitled: “Preparing for 2040.” “Forty schools participate in the "Preparing for 2040" consultations. The intent is to solidify the gains that have been made, to explore other relevant issues, and to help schools take the necessary steps as they prepare their students to educate and minister in multicultural settings” (ATS, 2015).

The questions for students, administrators and faculty were germane to their particular roles. I arranged and conducted personal interviews with each participant; each interview lasted for about one hour. All interviewees were informed as to the nature of the study prior to the actual interview. Each participant also received an Interview Protocol (see Appendices B, C, D, E and F). All interviews were recorded and transcribed by GMR Transcription Services; I then reviewed the transcriptions and identified particular themes. The audiotape will never be played for any audience other than the researcher directly involved in the project. Upon completion of the project audiotapes will be secure in my home office and will be erased at the completion of the dissertation process. Additional data collection from each institution included their most recent strategic plans, core values, and mission statements. Also, documents from the
Association of Theological Schools were obtained and coded. All data collection complied with the ethical principles of the human subjects review standards of the University of Pennsylvania.

Data Analysis

Data analysis in qualitative research has a two-fold purpose: (a) to understand the participants’ perspectives, and (b) to answer the research question. Marshall and Rossman (1999) defined qualitative analysis in terms of organizing and attributing meaning to the data. To accomplish these tasks, I followed the three-phase procedure described by Miles and Huberman (1994) which includes: (a) data reduction, (b) data display, and (c) conclusion drawing and verification. The methods I used were student and teacher interviews and the review of pertinent documents, such as strategic plans and mission statements that provided the data I needed to answer the research questions. The data consisted of interview transcripts, field notes from observations, a wide variety of records and historical documents, and memoranda. Interviews were open-ended, and incorporated unstructured and structured questions relating to interviewees’ understanding of social justice and diversity as experienced on campus and in lecture halls.

I used qualitative interviews since they are the most appropriate research technique to generate rich, detailed information (Merriam, 1998). Qualitative interviews are especially useful for providing a comprehensive understanding of issues, because the interviewer can clarify and amplify individual responses through guided follow-up
questions (Creswell, 2003). This flexibility allowed me to discover new information and varying viewpoints to supplement existing information.

Three processes are blended throughout the study: collection, coding, and analysis of data (Maxwell, 2013). My analysis identifies emergent themes, patterns and questions. I use coding and matrices for comparison across interviews, and interview summaries to retain the context of the data. I put emphasis on triangulation, employing various methods and tapping different sources for data. Figure 7 illustrates this process.

**Figure 7: Triangulation By Method**

These methods, as well as those described earlier, enabled me to deal with the major threats to the validity of my conclusions; specifically, bias in the selection of professors and students and self-report bias for both. The study posed no serious ethical problems; professors and students remain anonymous throughout the study. I took measures necessary to minimize the possible effect of my authority.

My intention was to frame this study on the basis of trustworthiness as an interpretive paradigm. Denzin and Lincoln (1994) suggest that four factors be considered in establishing the trustworthiness of findings from qualitative research: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability.
Credibility, which refers to the confidence one can have in the truth of the findings, can be established by various methods. My three methods of choice were triangulation, member checking, and negative case analysis. Triangulation is a means of corroboration that allows the researcher to be more confident of the study conclusions. With regard to triangulation, I ferreted out data from multiple sources through multiple methods – in particular, interviews (supplemented with data from key informants), non-participant observation, and document reviews.

Regarding member checking, I telephoned respondents to check the accuracy of facts and observations which took place as data collection segued into data analysis. Crosschecking helped me maintain reflexivity by encouraging self-awareness and self-correction. After the initial write-up of the study, I sought feedback in the theological academy on some of the findings. At least two persons from each research site were asked to confirm the accuracy of my observations. They were also asked to comment on whether my interpretations (embodied in a substantive theory) rang true and were meaningful to them. This process provided participant validation of the findings.

Negative case analysis enhances rigor, and I used it in quest for verification (Padgett, 1998; Miles, Huberman, Saldaña, 2014). In my study, negative case analysis involved a reexamination of every case after the initial analysis was completed, to see whether the characteristics or properties of the emergent themes were applicable to all cases. When it was determined that there were no negative cases or disconfirming evidence, the analysis was considered complete.

All of the taped interviews, memoranda, and field notes were entered into computer files. The analysis of interview transcripts and field notes was based on an
inductive approach geared to identifying patterns in the data by means of thematic codes. The use of a qualitative data analysis (QDA) software program called NVivo was used to code the data received. A scheme of numbers and letters were used to designate major categories and subcategories. “Hard copies” of all computer files of data were also coded using colored pens to mark the margins with the appropriate numbers and letters. Supplemental procedures included writing my observations, ideas and experiences in transcripts and analytic memos. To verify findings and themes, I conducted extensive member-checking of my findings and transcripts on an ongoing basis.

Three interview protocols were developed for this study – the student version, the president/administration version, and the faculty version. The student version interview protocol asked students about their experiences relating to diversity and social justice issues both in the lecture halls and at campus events and activities. The protocol consisted of approximately ten questions (see Appendix B). These questions were divided into three sections utilizing the main research questions as a guide. The sections also included questions regarding the institution’s mission statement, curriculum and campus climate. The president/administration interview protocol covered areas regarding the importance of mission, strategic plans, administrative policies, and governance matters. The faculty interview protocol contained eight to ten questions regarding the institution’s mission and its relevance to curriculum development and culturally sensitive pedagogy.
Reliability, Validity and Dependability

In qualitative research, the researcher is the primary instrument of data collection and data analysis (Miles and Huberman, 1994). As such, it is important to note my own biases, which include a strong commitment to diversifying all levels of the theological academy. However, as a Latino who has developed both policy and programming initiatives aimed at increasing diversity as a matter of social justice in both the parish and academy, I bring a level of personal credibility to this study. Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggest that credibility refers to prolonged engagement and the investment of sufficient time to achieve the necessary learning of the culture and testing for misinformation. My past personal experiences as organizer and director of various congregations in diverse settings, and as the Chief Diversity Administrator and director of the Office of Multicultural Relations at a mainline Protestant theological institution, provide me with the knowledge and sensitivity to the problems underrepresented population groups historically and currently face in the theological academy and ecclesial setting.

My use of detailed transcriptions of the interviews ensures the reliability and confirmability of the data; and although I am using a purposeful sample, the diversity of experiences inherent in the pool, e.g., different schools, lends credibility to the interpretation of common themes and experiences. Confirmability assumes that the findings are reflective of the participants’ perspectives as evidenced in the data, rather than being a reflection of my own perceptions or bias. I enhanced confirmability by stating explicitly my assumptions about the topic of interest in relationship to my own unique contributions or as they were otherwise brought to my awareness. Furthermore,
the use of extremely detailed descriptions of my findings provide additional validity to my study.

Similar to the concept of reliability in quantitative research, dependability refers to whether or not the results of the study are consistent over time and across researchers (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Miles & Huberman, 1994). To address dependability in my study, I relied on consultation with a peer debriefer. The peer debriefer was asked to comment on all aspects of the study, particularly data collection, analysis, and results to determine if the conclusions were similar to mine. The peer debriefer was also asked to comment on the clarity of the research plan and its potential for consistency over time.

**Unique Contribution**

Two important threats to the validity of qualitative conclusions are the selection of data that fit the researcher’s existing theory, goals, or preconceptions, and the selection of data that “stand out” to the researcher (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 263; Shweder, 1980). Both of these involve the subjectivity of the researcher, a term that most qualitative researchers refer to as bias. It is impossible to deal with these issues of diversity and social justice by eliminating my theories, beliefs, and perceptual lens. Instead, qualitative research is primarily concerned with understanding how a particular researcher’s values and expectations may have positively or negatively influenced the process and conclusions of the study and avoiding the negative consequences of these.

My father and mother came to New York City from Puerto Rico with little financial resources due to a floundering economy on the island. Upon arrival they struggled to make ends meet by crafting a business in the Bedford-Stuyvesant section of
Brooklyn, N.Y. Sixteen-hour days, seven days a week were the norm for these two heroes that sought to provide a life of educational excellence for their only son. I witnessed the struggles they endured as society labeled them “inferior” due to the color of their skin and the dialect of their tongue. I clearly remember their encouragement not to lose or abandon my cultural makeup and to strive for the best possible ways to impact society. I experienced the cowardly act of two masked men trying to take my father’s life by shooting at him in the business that he struggled to create. I did not then realize that this act was a direct result of many social, theological and political variables stemming from the economy, poor urban planning structures, dysfunctional school systems, and the diminishing impact of the church’s message in this environment. Consequently, as a result of these and many incidents in my life, I was encouraged to read books on a variety of fields and disciplines, but none had a greater impact in my life than that of Scriptures and those who were inspired to publish their thoughts and revelations, particularly from the perspective of the “other.”

In preparing for my dissertation, I reflected on my role as an administrator in a mainstream Protestant theological institution and pastor of parishes in Brooklyn, N.Y.; The South Bronx, N.Y.; Flushing, Queens, N.Y.; and Plainfield, N.J. for the past twenty-five years. Examining the viability of Christian leadership in this new century has created a sense of anxiety in me. What can I say about the twenty-first century if I feel at a loss when people ask me about next month? Over the years, I have wrestled with my own inner turmoil regarding the state of theological education and its core values in preparing women and men for bold acts of service to and with the church for a rapidly
changing world. My parents and family have experienced a society where differences are reinforced by systemic forces of racism, ethnocentrism, sexism, and classism.

As I experience life in this second decade of the 21st century, it is somewhat clear to me that the repugnance of “the other” is intensified both for those who have power and for those who are powerless. In greed for wealth and power, land and its fruits, one ethnic group oppresses another, excluding it from the things that rightfully belong to it, suppressing cultural distinctiveness, plundering material goods, sometimes even threatening and obliterating its very existence. These patterns of cross-cultural encounter permeate church structures, institutions of higher education, and political processes.

The stories we tell ourselves as a society, whether in the church or in higher education, are not effective in addressing issues that are contextual; indeed, the prevailing narratives only serve to perpetuate injustice by affirming ideologies of accumulation, exploitation, violence, earth destruction, and empire. As I witness the struggles of population groups on the margins of society, I struggle with such powerful forces in this day of increasing demographic changes – forces that attempt to keep hard-working fathers and mothers in the periphery of economic progress. I am convinced that the church and its theological academy are entities that speak and model transformation and have an important role to play in resetting our society’s dominant narrative in a way that serves justice for humans and the earth. For a counter narrative to arise, it is especially important that faculty, students, administrators, and trustees of the theological academy are equipped to critically examine relevant literature with radical eyes – and to use that inspiration not to simply speak truth to power, but to resist.
Ethical Considerations

It is important from an ethical standpoint to maintain the confidentiality of the research participants. Maintaining the integrity of each participant and his/her respective institutions is essential; therefore complete anonymity will be assured. Thus, this study protects the participants’ privacy by changing their names and not identifying their present or past institutional affiliation. Through a Consent Form (Appendix E) each interviewee was provided with an agreement that ensures confidentiality.

Study Limitations

As with any study using qualitative data, this study relies on respondents’ thoughts, perceptions and beliefs with regard to the questions posed. As such, the findings reflect the perceptions of the research participants and are not meant to convey a comprehensive overview of how all students, administrators, and faculty members interpret their socialization to matters of diversity and social justice. Moreover, the small number and limited racial and gender diversity of the participants will curb the generalizability of the results to all students, administrators, and faculty members.
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

Introduction

The overarching research question for this study was: What are the benefits of promoting increased engagement with diversity through the curriculum, campus climate, and policies affecting students and staff in theological higher education? Secondary questions arising from the 1996 ATS accrediting standards were:

1. How do the institutions selected in this study understand diversity and inclusion at various levels of its institutional life?

2. What drives theological institutions to become more diverse communities and what role do their mission statements and strategic plans play in seeking the change they desire?

3. Is there a need for a sustainable approach where individual and community engagement in navigating diversity derive motivation from theological convictions of social justice?

This qualitative study identified a diversity framework coupled with varying social justice imperatives from which to view and value these diverse experiences in institutional culture. This study examined the intersection of diversity and social justice within the theological concept of *imago Dei* (image of God) in the context of mission and its implementation in the theological academy, particularly in selected member schools of the Association of Theological Schools (ATS). The focus was on analyzing the tension between the institutions’ missions and their desire to become more diverse through the curriculum and campus climate. The purpose of my study was threefold. My first and
foremost purpose was to set forth the realities presently at work in the theological academy through the experiences of excellent academicians, educators, administrators, and students. The second purpose was to explore the experiences of students, administrators, and faculty from three stand-alone Protestant seminaries in the area of diversity and social justice as these concepts relate to curriculum, campus climate and mission development. Thirdly, I analyzed the comments from the participants and examined important institutional documents to formulate insights and recommendations for a possible framework/model that could develop a sustainable approach on matters of diversity with social justice imperatives. In striving to achieve the purpose of this study, specific research questions were formulated and are detailed in the following section.

Three Protestant stand-alone institutions were selected representing three different regions of the country (Southwest, Mid-Atlantic and Northeast). Pseudonyms are used to insure anonymity. It is important to note that each theological institution has a similar non-discrimination policy that is typically announced in their admissions process. As a result of in-depth interviews and document analysis, the following institutional profiles emerged. These profiles include some basic demographic information regarding the institution derived from the interviews of students, administrators, and faculty. The institution’s mission statements, vision statements, and strategic plan also reveal the institution’s commitment to matters of diversity within social justice imperatives.

A goal of this study was to determine what drives these institutions in trying to achieve diversity within social justice imperatives. After each institutional review, I provide a summary of key findings using Smith’s diversity conceptual framework, centering on the indicators that define the vitality and viability dimension. The dimension
of institutional viability and vitality are described by the following characteristics which will be used as a criterion to evaluate these institutions:

1. increasing the racial/ethnic diversity of faculty,
2. a public examination of the institutional history of diversity issues and incidents,
3. strategies being employed to address diversity,
4. the centrality of diversity in the mission and planning process, the monitoring of the work being done on diversity,
5. the perceptions of the public and other constituents of the institution’s commitment, and the governing board’s engagement on the issue (Smith, 1995; Parker & Smith, 2005; Clayton-Pedersen, et al., 2007, Smith, 2009).

Case Study: Peace Theological Seminary

Peace Theological Seminary (PTS) is affiliated with a large mainline Christian Protestant denomination with historical confessional roots in Reformed tradition. It is located in a growing and diverse city in the Southwest U.S. At the time of the study and according to their strategic plan (2014), enrollment was just over 191 graduate students translating into 128 full-time equivalents (FTE). The student enrollment is composed of 26 denominations from 22 states. The student ethnic population at the time of the study included 79% White, 11% African American, 2% Asian, and 5% Hispanic/Latino(a).

According to the U.S. Census, Peace Theological Seminary is located in a city of approximately 885,400 residents, according to the 2010 Census data. Its racial ethnic
composition contains 48.7% White, 35.1% Latino(a), 8.1% Black or African American, 6.3% Asian or Asian American; 49.4% are women.

Peace Theological Seminary opened its doors on October 1, 1902. The judicatory of the historic denomination that PTS is affiliated with had appointed a board of trustees that appointed its first president in 1900. The new president had to raise his own salary plus $100,000 as an endowment, put the property in readiness, engage a faculty, and encourage candidates for the ministry to matriculate. The initial collection for a library was derived from the books of another nearby school of theology. Later, three adjoining geographic judicatories of this denomination joined in the ownership and control of the seminary.

The initial 5¼-acre plot near a well-known institution of higher education was purchased for $5,029 in 1906. The premises were occupied in March 1908. The first buildings included a refectory and a 3½-story dormitory/classroom/administration building.

According to the seminary’s strategic plan 2015-2020, a faculty was assembled and students registered by September 29, 1921. The buildings that had been rented were gradually reoccupied in 1922. The chapel was completed in the spring of 1942. By 1985 the campus had been enlarged to about ten acres. The land and the improvements were worth $10 million, the endowments worth $34 million. Scholarships and grants-in-aid were available. Foreign students were encouraged by scholarships offered through the World Council of Churches, the World Alliance of Reformed Churches, and other such bodies. PTS maintained reciprocal relations with the Episcopal Theological Seminary of the Southwest and with Wartburg Seminary of the American Lutheran Church in
Dubuque, Iowa. PTS is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and by the Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada. Since 1983 it has been owned and controlled by a middle-governing body of this historic Protestant denomination. During the mid-1980s, the student body averaged about 200. The resident teaching faculty numbered about fifteen. The seminary offered master of divinity, master of theology, and doctor of ministry degrees. Proximity to the campus of the University of the Southwest afforded opportunities for allied academic and cultural pursuits. Most alumni became pastors in various denominational congregations in the Southwest.

Mission and Vision

According to the Strategic Plan 2015-2020, Peace Theological Seminary’s Mission Statement declares that:

For the glory of God and to proclaim the gospel of Jesus Christ, Peace Theological Seminary is a seminary in the Reformed tradition whose mission is to educate and equip individuals for the ordained Christian ministry and other forms of Christian service and leadership; to employ its resources in the service of the church; to promote and engage in critical theological thought and research; and to be a winsome and exemplary community of God’s people.

In addition, Peace Theological Seminary’s Vision Statement (2013) mentions the following:

Peace Theological Seminary welcomes people of diverse identities and heritages who come to be educated for leadership in the Church and Christian service. Some students live on campus; some immerse themselves here for short periods of time; some learn on-line. In classes, future pastors sit next to future leaders for God’s work in the world that we cannot yet imagine. Rooted in tradition, students are formed by faculty for bold leadership to grow into the future. They are known for providing
an excellent M.Div. education for pastoral ministry. The Seminary celebrates robust relationships with congregations and campuses, partnering with them to call forth new leaders. We welcome new friends from Hispanic congregations and communities and implement new ways of making theological education accessible for students. Peace Theological Seminary is alive, healthy, and filled with people carrying the hope of Christ for the world.

This vision builds on the PTS’s historical foundations and strengths while recognizing the changed cultural context and the changing needs of the surrounding churches and communities.

The world and the church require many kinds of leaders who will receive training in diverse ways. PTS’s location in the Southwest and its growing Hispanic population impels them to move outside of their cultural comfort zone. Peace Theological Seminary, according to its 2015-2020 Strategic Plan, “seeks to implement their vision in six functional areas: Residential and Distance Learning in Degree Programs; Flexible Non-degree Theological Education; Strategies for Cultivating Potential Students; Distinguished Student Fellowships to Enhance Pastoral Leadership; Curricular Reform; and Hispanic Constituencies as Partners. A female member of the administration who is Caucasian with responsibilities toward the curriculum shared the following:

“One thing that Christian faith teaches us is that place matters and people matter. Word becomes flesh and dwells among us. We encounter Christ in the face of our neighbor and if we’re not attentive to our neighbor and where our neighbor is coming – what’s the point?”

The challenge of understanding and responding to various “cultural codes” is ever-present in a learning environment that honors diversity. Facing the realities and implications of “privilege” is another important consideration PTS is engaging as they define their identity.
PTS has a long-standing commitment to formation and education in community. They continue to offer the Master of Arts in Ministry Practice (MAMP), the Master of Arts in Theological Studies (MATS), the Master of Divinity (M.Div), and Doctor of Ministry (D.Min) as residential educational programs. It is important to note that as they continue to observe and interact with a changing demographic in their surrounding geographic area and beyond, PTS may also add distance-learning to their D.Min program. PTS may also add other degree programs as they continue to pay attention to the landscape around them. As stewards of abundant resources for theological education, PTS will use these resources to educate people who want to learn, but whose goals are not adequately met by a graduate degree. Potential learners for non-degree programs include pastors, church educators, church leaders, lay people, chaplains – and new audiences whose needs for meaning, connection, challenge, and formation are not yet known to the institution. PTS also offers the Certificate in Ministry (CIM) as a blended-learning program. In addition to current non-degree learning opportunities already offered through their Continuing Education efforts, PTS will craft other programs to teach church leaders and other learners, particularly from underrepresented population groups, drawing on their resident faculty and other experts. They will offer instruction in a variety of ways, including intensive cohort learning, residential short courses, and blended learning.

**Diversity Faculty Composition**

In my interview with a Caucasian faculty member at PTS, it was clear from his perspective that PTS is moving in a positive direction regarding diverse faculty
composition. He mentioned the following in relation to faculty composition as it relates to the Seminary’s strategic plan:

I think there’s a clear commitment from our faculty that we recognize that we’re not where we want to be in terms of racial, ethnic and gender diversity and we want to get better. That’s not just because we think numbers matter, but it’s because we want to be more reflective of both this region of the United States and the global church.

As new voices emerge and broader life experiences demand consideration, educational models and foci that were designed to perpetuate cultural exclusivity are now obsolete. The ways in which differences are engaged and respected communicates much about how mission is practiced. Moreover, learning how diverse constituencies use power to control and shape the agenda of theological education and its mission is critical.

A long-standing member of the administration who is Caucasian said the following in this respect:

There’s not a mainline Protestant Seminary between us and the Mexican border. This is a Seminary of the Borderlands. Since its inception in 1902, there have been various attempts, particularly at Hispanic Theological Education – some of those have flopped, some of those have never made it off the planning table – but we want to be more reflective where we are in the U.S.-Mexico Borderlands. That just speaks to us wanting to be grounded in our context. The mono-cultural church is quickly becoming a thing of the past. We don’t want to be a mono-cultural faculty!

In American society, Christianity no longer holds a place of privilege and most people do not understand Christian faith and practice. PTS expects that in coming years, many Christian leaders will not engage in traditional pastoral ministry (e.g., serving one congregation on a full-time basis). Therefore, they are exploring pedagogical formats to reshape their curricula so that they better attend to twenty-first century life. Through
revised curricula, the faculty seeks to prepare leaders, both pastors and persons leading in other arenas of Christian service, who will minister in a multi-cultural, multi-faith, highly networked technological society.

Institutional History

Throughout its history, Peace Theological Seminary has engaged Latino(a) constituencies in various ways. The institution recognizes, with repentance, that they have not always treated Latino(a) constituents in ways that honored their human dignity. PTS also acknowledges that they frequently sought to have Hispanic/Latino(a) students simply conform to their denominational-Western European habits. For instance, a senior Caucasian administrator shared the history of PTS and its relationship with the former Tex-Mex Governing Body. Apparently there were theological courses offered in Spanish to an emerging cadre of pastors and leaders developing and organizing congregations in that city. When the Tex-Mex Governing Body closed its doors due to external pressures to limit the financial and human support for these individuals, this cadre of pastors looked toward PTS to continue its commitment in educating their leaders. PTS contracted Latino/a leaders from around the country to teach on an adjunct basis. Unfortunately, PTS’ board of trustees decided to terminate the financial support for this particular program since they wanted to abide by the judiciary of its affiliated denomination. Without notice the doors to the classrooms were closed on a particular Saturday. When the ministers and laity began to inquire, the officers at PTS did not respond to their calls. This senior administrator further mentioned:

“We need to acknowledge the sins of our past! I can’t imagine how these individuals felt being treated in such an oppressive manner. We who have the
power with our resources, both financial and human, turned our backs on a growing community that enriches our context. We have since made strides in communicating with our Latino/a community and seeking their input instead of assuming their needs and concerns.”

In the last fifty years, new immigrants and their offspring have transformed the racial landscape of the United States. In 2010, Latinos made up almost 16 percent of the total population in the United States and overtook Blacks as the largest non-white minority group. In addition, a multiracial population is increasingly affirming their own identities. Each of these broad groupings contains considerable ethnic variation, further contributing to the country’s growing diversity. This new ethnic and racial diversity is especially apparent in particular states and large metropolitan areas. One of the noticeable features of this mixture of peoples, however, is that those places where this new diversity is most evident sometimes register persistent levels of racial segregation. In many states and metropolitan areas, whites remain numerically dominant, whereas other areas have rapidly diversified. In the Southwest city where Peace Theological Seminary is located, the growing numbers of Hispanic/Latino(a) residents have been a challenge to society, the church, and its institutions. From the latest information derived from the 2010 Census, the data sketches the shifts that are underway in the racial makeup of U.S society and how those vary by space and scale. Immigration is driving the reconfiguration of the countries racial landscapes. It is apparent that the growth of many mainline Protestant denominations is based upon new communities of faith that consist of these immigrant population groups. As such, many of these communities of faith are seeking theologically informed and trained pastors.
A second-year Latina student said this about the new realities of the institution and its surrounding community:

The population of this city is extremely diverse. Within the last few years I have noticed an increase of Latina families. As a result, many new church developments from various denominations are sprouting everywhere. Yet it has been my experience so far that the curriculum here does not provide me with substantive information to prepare for such a new challenge. At times I have felt unwelcomed because the history or theology of my experience is not being discussed in the classroom setting.

Many campus leaders recognize that they are ill equipped to connect their diversity and educational quality efforts; therefore they feel pressure to abandon their efforts to create diverse communities of learners. One of the major findings in this study is how PTS is challenged in matching its mission and pedagogy with the increasing cultural-ethnic diversity of its wider social context. A second-year Latino student at Peace Theological Seminary states:

My frustration with the curriculum is that none of my courses speak to the realities of my context. I am grateful for those who have come before me, yet Church History is taught from a European context and I am concerned that my story is not being valued as I prepare for ministry.

PTS’ recent pivotal moment, according to a member of the executive cabinet, was the formation of a diversity commission that seeks to examine pertinent questions, such as “What are the major challenges, the concerns that need to be addressed, the direction that must be pursued, and the steps that need to be taken?”

**Centrality of Diversity in Mission and Planning**

Based on interviews with students, administrators and faculty at Peace Theological Seminary, a Commission on Diversity was formed to guide the institution in
the transformative process of engaging the complexities of diversity. Yet this Commission on Diversity was organized as a result of a racial incident on campus approximately five to six years ago. This incident took place in the chapel where a white person used the N-word to describe a situation she and her family confronted. This set off a series of arguments and heated conversation throughout the campus. The President of the institution established the Commission on Diversity to explore methods of dialogue and conversation to confront this immediate concern. Since then, the individuals involved have left the institution. A Caucasian and female senior administrator said the following in an interview:

I don’t think this commission can be transformative, frankly. First of all, I think that this institution, half of our students are Presbyterian and half are not. Our donor base is 97% Presbyterian. The Presbyterian Church in the Southwest is not diverse. So that when you say the diversity of the church, the church itself is not diverse. There are exceptions to this, but I think for the most part, it’s not a very diverse church.

Peace Theological Seminary received a grant from the Wabash Foundation on the matter of diversity reconciliation on campus. The grant was used to develop conversations among faculty, students, and administrators about the divisive situation that occurred several years ago. This same senior administrator described the conversations this way:

The first one [conversation on reconciliation] was a disaster because they [the faculty] couldn't get past what were our ground rules. You know how you start a conversation, and you all know what the ground rules are. That’s kind of pro forma, but some of the faculty kidnapped the conversation, arguing over what assumptions we are making. When we assume that, what message are we portraying: lack of trust and confidence. Then the second facilitator that came was simply talking, I think maybe more about curriculum or something. It was much less a failure – it sounds like it was less threatening for whatever reason.
An Asian American second-year student who enrolled at PTS at the time of this racially-induced conflict, said the following about these conversations: “So the faculty have had two conversations since then. They started with students, having what they called Diversity Roundtables, and it was optional. It was at night, the same people didn’t come every time, so it was good as far as it went. But it wasn’t really something that would bring significant change.”

Subsequently, this commission named by the president is composed of the Executive Cabinet (all Vice-Presidents), several students, and several members of the faculty. The Diversity Commission meets periodically to discuss matters pertaining to diversity. Yet it is my understanding that this commission does not meet often and the agendas are not particularly directed or organized with strategic goals and objectives.

**Monitoring of Diversity Work**

Peace Theological Seminary began a required cultural sensitivity program for all incoming students. In partnership with a local social service agency, new students participate in a day-long lecture-style training. This has been met with skepticism from students, faculty, and administration. The presentation methodology and the content of the topics have been questionable. At best, there are questions as to whether these diversity efforts are a façade in light of the real, historical, and social pains of our society at large. These incidents and circumstances are reminders that constituents, policies, and seemingly genuine efforts, even on theological campuses, can diminish the experience of underrepresented population groups. An interview with a second-year, African American Master of Divinity student at PTS revealed these insights:
I feel that Peace Seminary does an admirable job at making sure that everyone – regardless of gender, socio-economics or race – is included in the conversation at the table, if you will. I feel like they go out of their way to make sure that, you know, a white Caucasian male's voice is not more important than a lesbian African American student. And I feel like that's a hallmark that they see – that PTS sees inclusion and equal opportunity an aspect of social justice for all because social justice is at the heart of the gospel. Although PTS does an amazing job in facilitating a space for respect, I think the seminary students themselves need to find a way to communicate with one another that's civil, in spite of our differences.

Negative cross-racial interactions are a component of campus climate for diversity, which refers to the perceptions of, actual experiences with, and quality of interactions between individuals and groups on a campus. Although the climate for diversity impacts all constituents, students, faculty, and administrators of different backgrounds, these experiences impact various aspects of the campus culture differently (Ancis, Seldacek, & Mohr, 2000; Chavous, 2005; Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pederson, & Allen, 1999; Johnson et al., 2007; Rankin & Reason, 2005).

**Perceptions**

What if the dominant group in our communities and institutions really welcomed all to the table and embrace the sharing of power and control? Our society is a multi-color, multi-dimensional mosaic in a patio of sameness. We know so much about sameness. The North American society sings to us, talks to us, screams, points out to us, demands from us to look basically the same, act basically the same, and feel basically the same. Today, there is no denying it. However, our churches and our institutions as well as the wider society in which we live, are becoming living mosaics of differences. The unique driver to Peace Theological Seminary to examine its curriculum in light of an
evolving mission is the changing demographics of the state in which the institution is located and the pressure it is receiving from its constituents and the self-reflective process of its mission and strategic plan. A faculty member from the theology department shared the following in this respect:

The Christian Church from the day of Pentecost on has expressed its extraordinary ability to find a home in multiple cultures. And if our theological curriculum, if the readings that are assigned in courses reflect only one or two of the cultures of the world, or a million of them, then the promise of the Christian Church is lost.

PTS is one of many schools feeling this tension, as institutions realize that the changing demographics of their locations will affect the type of students they will have to recruit in order to provide the revenue they need to operate.

Administrators, faculty and students are confident that Peace Seminary has the capacity to make this vision a reality. Most of the specific initiatives in their efforts match up well with expressed concerns of their historic constituencies, especially their denominational affiliation and context. Thus, according to their strategic plan, it is anticipated that their traditional donor base will continue to give money to fund the work of the Seminary. Initiatives with Hispanic constituencies will develop over time, during which PTS can make new friends in the Hispanic community and carefully interpret efforts to extend their reach beyond a traditional base. To make the vision happen, they will reallocate funds and deploy staff in new ways. The faculty will learn to teach in new ways and new contexts. Several faculty members are already embracing the new techniques of online education as they teach in the Certificate in Ministry program. The faculty sees the value of changing educational programs to serve better the Seminary’s vision.
Major Findings at Peace Theological Seminary

At Peace Theological Seminary, a driver of efforts toward diversity was the pressure that the institution was receiving from its denomination. This was an interesting finding, as it is possible for denominational schools to work closely with their denominations in making progress since many denominations draw their leadership from their institutions and many institutions draw their students, staff, administration, and faculty from the denomination.

Peace Seminary has a number of diversity initiatives that are derived by a response to a campus crisis. Although Peace Seminary is developing certain parameters in the development of a Diversity Commission, this venture was formalized due to a diversity crisis on campus. As a result, the meetings of this commission lack a formalized agenda and action plan.

Another unique driver to Peace Theological Seminary was the changing demographics of the state in which the institution is located. As a seminary in the “Borderlands,” PTS is one of many schools feeling this tension, as institutions are realizing that the changing demographics of their locations will impact the type of students, faculty, administrators, and trustees they will have to recruit in order to provide the revenue they need to operate.

As stated earlier, linking diversity efforts to mission is important to making and sustaining progress over time. Peace Seminary listed mission as a driver. I also wanted to explore the role mission plays in driving change, particularly regarding the documents that directly mention diversity such as their strategic plan 2015-2020. A key finding is that the strategic plan is seen as central to providing the necessary accountability to make
progress in the area of diversity, yet a diversity framework to guide the planning process is not enumerated.

**Case Study: Joy Theological Seminary**

Joy Theological Seminary (JTS) is located in the Mid-Atlantic section of the United States. At the time of the study, enrollment was approximately 113 graduate students with 83 FTE. JTS is affiliated with a Christian Protestant denomination with historical confessional roots in the Reformed, Congregational, and Lutheran traditions. Its student enrollment is composed of 20 denominations from more than 13 states. Sixty-two percent of its student enrollment are Caucasian, 36% are African American, 3% Hispanic/Latino(a), and 1% two or more races. Their core faculty of 8 is 13% persons of color and 21% of their 31 adjunct faculty are persons of color. Joy Theological Seminary is an intimate, inquiring community that draws upon the diverse faith heritages and cultural backgrounds that rarely intersect in enriching ways in the broader culture. The seminary prepares future leaders for service through a rigorous academic program, wide-ranging educational experiences, and interpersonal interactions. It is located in a city where the population is 59,460 residents, according to the 2010 Census, and is comprised of 43.5% White alone, 37.3% Hispanic, 13.3% Black alone, 3.1% Asian alone, 1% Two or more races; 51.2% are women.

Joy Theological Seminary was founded in 1825 by members of the German Reformed Church in the U.S. to provide theological education for prospective clergy and other church leaders. After a failed attempt to open the school in a small town in Maryland and Pennsylvania, the school opened on the campus of Dickinson College on
March 11, 1825 with a class of five students. Later lectures were held in the “old Reformed Church of Carlisle.” At this time the seminary struggled financially and due to an exhaustive fund raising campaign, the seminary was able to relocate to York in 1829. Here attendance averaged between 12-25 students.

In 1836-37, the seminary moved again to a small town in a Mid-Atlantic state under the charter of Marshall College. As the result of many notable professors and practitioners, their efforts gave rise to the “Mid-Atlantic Theology,” noted for its historic concerns for worship, sacraments, and Church in its ecumenical expressions.

In 1853 this institution moved to its current location in the Mid-Atlantic part of the United States, consolidating with another institution. In 1871, the seminary moved to the campus of this newly formed institution of higher education in the Mid-Atlantic. While viewed as a temporary arrangement, the present site of the seminary was not purchased until 1893. The buildings were completed and occupied in 1894.

For most of its history (109 of its 168 years), JTS was the sole seminary of the Reformed Church in the U.S. (German Reformed Church). With the formation of the Evangelical and Reformed Church in 1934, the seminary became one of three seminaries serving that newly united denomination. JTS is currently one of seven seminaries holding full relationship with a denomination formed in 1957 by the union of the E&R Church and most of the Congregational Christian Churches. Joy Theological Seminary is an official Open and Affirming seminary with students and faculty from many Christian traditions and backgrounds studying Christian leadership and values. JTS ensures that each student’s path toward spiritual formation is nurtured and challenged. Students build lasting bonds with their peers and professors as they grow, learn and worship together.
The programs are designed to foster intellectual, spiritual, independent, faith-based and vocational learning.

In the fall of 2011, Joy Theological Seminary and another theological institution partnered together to introduce online coursework in Christian theology and history. This flexibility introduced new emerging technologies, thus allowing participants the option of not relocating or commuting to a seminary.

The youth ministry program of Joy Theological Seminary is a spiritual and leadership program for high school teens called “Leadership Now.” This program includes year-round engagement opportunities for theological learning and inquiry, charitable and philanthropic giving, and a wide array of special faith-enhancing programs varying in intensity, age range, theme and duration. The program introduces the participants to the seminary and allows them to explore their spiritual gifts and how to exercise these gifts within the Church community; it also encourages youth to assert faith as their own. Joy Theological Seminary's Department of Continuing Education caters to theological education and spiritual formation for congregations and pastors to include recently ordained pastors serving their first congregational call.

Mission and Vision

 Created by the Sovereign God, in witness to the cross and resurrection of Jesus Christ, empowered by the Holy Spirit, Joy Theological Seminary celebrates its catholic and evangelical heritage in the reformed tradition and participates in the ecumenical ministry of Christ’s church by: educating and strengthening leaders for congregations of the United Church of Christ and other denominations; enabling other Christian vocations in church and society; fostering lifelong learning; stimulating critical theological reflection; nurturing a worshiping and caring community; and working for the justice and peace which mark the reign of God, to whom be the glory forever! Amen.”
According to its Strategic Plan, “By 2020, Joy Theological Seminary will be the choice theological institution in the greater Mid-Atlantic region for individuals seeking a theological education characterized by academic rigor, the celebration of differences with Christian traditions, and a commitment to the spiritual formation of students.” All who study at Joy Theological Seminary with diligence and prayerfulness will gain the theological acumen and the necessary ministerial leadership skills to serve well in the contexts to which they are called. Joy Theological Seminary will have a sound financial foundation that includes a growing tuition stream and increased support from donors and other institutional partners.

The attributes by which Joy Theological Seminary defines its Value Proposition are based on the description that it is a “small and intimate community where students will be known; a commitment to diversity in all of its forms is cultivated; distinguished faculty are accessible and student centered; and multiple faith traditions are respected and taught” (2013). Every seminary offers community, however, the environment at JTS transcends any typical definition. The level of caring, support, open and honest conversation and intimacy with fellow students, faculty and staff create a unique experience that will appeal to prospective students who desire “to be known.” JTS may not be the best fit for the seminary student who has a transactional view of the seminary, i.e., “I just want to attend and get a degree.” Leveraging this attribute of one’s value proposition will draw the type of student who would thrive in such a communal environment.

Respect for all human beings and diverse existences is at the heart of JTS values. The administration and faculty at JTS hold diversity as a key value, for it is woven into
JTS’ DNA that has to be part of the seminaries value proposition. JTS’ commitment to diversity is integrally aligned with the learning and self/discovery journey that marks a successful JTS graduate. The academic environment at JTS is one of open and honest assessment/dialogue, self-discovery, respect for all peoples, ideas, and faiths. Respect for diversity, therefore, is an essential attribute of the academic environment at JTS. When communicating the diversity aspect of JTS’ value proposition, JTS needs to convey that diversity is important not simply for diversity’s sake, but as a cornerstone of the learning experience.

**Challenges and Opportunities**

At JTS, the combination of a truly distinguished faculty (based on credentials) and the intimate, personal relationship that the students have with this faculty defines a key element of the institution’s value proposition. This is a significant driver of value to graduate level students who want a deep, immersive seminary experience. JTS is also a location where multiple faith traditions are respected and taught. It is because of the respect for multiple faith traditions, that the learning experience at JTS is so rich and life changing. This is the difference between a narrow learning experience and an expansive learning experience. Yet, as a historical institution, JTS finds itself in a quandary as it meets the challenges of a culturally, ethnically, and religiously plural world. In a conversation with a tenured member of the faculty regarding the matter of intellectual equity and honoring the stories of difference, the following was said:

Equity in the sense that everyone has ownership but also equity in the sense that everyone receives a fair share, this is where that becomes a challenge. The challenge is where you have an institution that has a history and an ethos that really shapes how things are done whether it’s
financial aid, curriculum development, and the individual instruction of a classroom where it’s very easy in a school like ours which has been mainline white in its history. To try to start from that core and say how can we be inclusive, that’s not exactly equity. It extends to relationships, it extends to things like when faculty come and they’re arriving at a new institution – how does the seminary embrace them, the staff, and the students. So for me, equity is relational, which isn’t to say that there wouldn’t be policies and practices, but it starts with relationship-building!

“The one-sided history of American theology continues to downplay the insights of those who are the main driving forces of theological enterprise in this highly racialized world, a world increasingly made of people of color” (Matsuoka, 2014). The matter of diversity and inclusion within social justice imperatives is about understanding and appreciating the differences between people based on their cultural backgrounds. It is described as a sustainable approach that includes all persons in organizations and that provides a climate that supports all types of experiences. JTS continues to wrestle responsibly with this paradigm as it seeks to prepare women and men for active and relevant ministries.

Strategies

In my interview with a Caucasian senior administrator, he mentioned the following regarding the substance of the institution’s diversity efforts:

Joy Theological Seminary has always been diverse – because of its history and Mid-Atlantic theology and in that sort of reformed Catholic tradition, it’s always had kind of an ecumenical framework for the work that it’s done. It’s always been about bringing together multiple voices. So over the years, of course, those numbers of theological voices has increased. But it started with that kind of sensitivity I would say fairly early on.
During my two days at JTS, I was able to observe the dynamics between faculty and students, administrators with peers, and an overall dynamic of an institution with a solid theological history and mission. A key finding is that JTS listed mission as a driver and its diversity efforts are based on an action plan established by the Seminary Task Force on Diversity. This senior administrator mentioned in the interview that the challenges of diversity include areas of cultural, philosophical, racial, denominational, and doctrinal differences. He further posits:

The challenge is having students from a variety of experiences – as many as 20 different traditions and denominations are coming into this community and trying to get them to appear as they are, whatever that tradition is. So we want Methodists to be Methodists. We want Presbyterians to be Presbyterian. We want United Church of Christ people to be United Church. We want the Catholics to stay Catholic. And that is a major task because we know that we’re also trying to teach. So we need a student to know their tradition. But we also need them to know other traditions. We want them to be able to articulate perspectives from those traditions, even if – whether they agree with them or not and to be able to do that in a non-judgmental way, in a way that understands the kind of differences from within. I think that’s really the basis of everything that happens here.

From this perspective JTS and its student population has come to realizations about issues of gender and sexual orientation, issues of race and ethnicity, issues of disabilities and disabilities awareness, and issues of class. The challenge of inclusion then becomes more vivid because it has “common roots in terms of their originators” (Senior Administrator, 2014).
Centrality of Diversity in Mission

One of the administrators described the commitment to diversity as:

There is no such thing as a single version of Christianity. So we’re not seeking to find that or to create it. And secondly, we believe that the diversity within Christianity is an asset. It’s a gift. It’s not a problem to be solved. Unfortunately there is a natural resistance to change. We do it, matters of diversity because everybody is doing it, but these old protestant institutions have not yet awoken. They’re waking up due to their existing financial constraint and it’s hurting to get students. But they have not woken up to the global implication of the need for connectivity of theological education.

A special Task Force on Diversity was formed not more than a couple of years ago. This Task Force identified several recommendations on core elements of the institutions structure. These elements are “Faculty Composition and Interpersonal Issues”; “Curriculum”; and “Interpersonal Issues among Students.” The recommendations identified the resources needed to comply with the task, accountability regarding committee or staff to develop and implement the recommendations, and indicators of success, target completion date, and actual completion date. A second-year African American female student shared the following about this effort:

It is my perception that we are trying to focus much into defending, or convincing, rather than educating, and having the population take a stand and embrace diversity. Yet, life at Joy Theological Seminary looks at diversity, not just from the cultural perspective, but from sexual orientation as well. I have a gay son, a very male gay son, and it was very difficult for me to reconcile my conservative traditional background with that. However, life at Joy Theological Seminary has eased that process. Learning to look, and helping me to look, beyond the barriers of sexual orientation, to honor them, to acknowledge them, but to acknowledge that there’s something bigger that brings us together has been life-changing for me.
Diversity Issues and Incidents

Prior to the arrival of the new and current president a racial incident occurred on campus relating to and with a prominent faculty of color. After many attempts of reconciliation, the faculty member resigned without any explanation. This caused a stir within and among the student body as the individual was very much admired and beloved. This situation raised the consciousness of the institution as to the realities and complexities of diversity and inclusion, which highlighted elements of institutional racism. As a result, Joy Theological Seminary has been in an intentional trajectory to incorporate diversity issues at various levels of the institution.

In the spring of 2014 Joy Theological Seminary held a weeklong workshop on campus for faculty entitled “Identifying and Dismantling White Privilege in Pedagogy,” facilitated by consultants from the Wabash Center for Training and Learning in Theology and Religion in Indiana. According to the seminary dean, “We understand this workshop as the next step of our ongoing anti-racism work. We need to identify the cultural time mentions of our own assumptions of how students learn and how we evaluate their learning. And we need to modify our educational practices and lights of such knowledge.”

The workshop was held in conjunction with the five-day master class ”theology from the Black Perspective,” course attendees, including degree students, continuing education students, and faculty members were exposed to an enormous amount of resources and materials to further study. Guided by this education, faculty began developing new measures of student success for all degree programs and drafted a revision of the student learning outcomes and rubrics among other actions. The seminary
continues to require students, faculty, staff, and trustees to complete anti-racism training during an intensive three-day workshop designed to unmask the hidden forms of white privilege. JTS’ strategic plan calls for faculty to be trained toward greater understanding of students of color and their ecclesial communities.

Perceptions

Joy Seminary must be inclusive “and diverse,” was the provocative comment of a pastor of a local African Methodist Episcopal Church who joined the faculty and administration to reflect on the lessons learned from the class held on campus in May 2014 called “Theology from the Black Perspective.” Joy Seminary has been stretching in its foundational tenets by examining to what degree they live up to the value of racial ethnic diversity on campus. The percentage of students of color enrolled at Joy Seminary has increased over the past three years from 12% to 36%, in large part due to the intentional recruiting of the admissions team. However, inclusion is not the same thing as diversity: inclusion means that all are welcome; diversity means that the institution fosters a learning environment for all individuals, especially their race, nationality, gender, gender orientation, and theology. I had a very interesting conversation with a Latina student, who was impassioned about the difference between diversity, inclusion, and tolerance. She shared with me that her concern was not so much being in an environment that supports diversity for the sake of numbers, but in a place where real life stories of discrimination and oppression are valued and not simply tolerated:

My mentor in the United Methodist Church is an African American, and I have learned I cannot say I’m color blind, because that is offensive, because I am not acknowledging the culture. By being inclusive, I am acknowledging their race. I am acknowledging their heritage, and that is
more important than acknowledging what I can see, but I am acknowledging what I can experience from them and we can then embrace each other.

As mentioned previously, admitting and enrolling a student body with various racial and ethnic backgrounds is a function of achieving a diverse student body; climate for diversity refers to the experience and quality of interaction between individuals and groups on campus. A second-year, second-career student shared the following regarding the transformative experience of her theological studies in preparation for ministry:

As an African American woman, particularly in the black church, and an AME church specifically, it’s okay for a black woman to lead the choir and to teach Sunday school and to direct Women’s Day and to arrange the pastor’s schedule. But it’s very rare, in this particular black community and this church, for a black woman to be leading as the preacher. And so when I came to seminary, to have white professors and white professionals in the ministry tell me that I’m good enough and that I can do this was huge because I never heard that before.

This is a measure of the real experience of students, faculty, and staff when a teaching/learning environment goes beyond discussion of numeric representation and into the multiple dimensions of experiences, customs, values, and spirituality. As research has demonstrated the link between climate and educational outcomes for students in majority and minority groups, addressing the campus climate for diversity benefits all members of the community (Milem et al., 2005). JTS is poised to develop such a process as it is intentionally seeking culturally-relevant pedagogical practices and increasing the opportunities for students, as well as all members of the Seminary community to take an active role in conversations regarding race and racial justice.
Governing Board’s Engagement on the Issue

In the interim, during the summer of 2014, the faculty read and discussed together 
*The Cross and the Lynching Tree* by James H. Cone. In the fall of 2014 the faculty and administration turned to reading and dialoguing on *The Divided Mind of the Black Church* by Rafael G. Warnock. A Professor of Systematic Theology said about diversity that:

Everywhere you look in Christianity you bump into this unity-in-diversity pattern. We have two testaments, not one, as inconvenient as this often is. And we have four Gospels, not one, and they resist harmonization. And Jesus is proclaimed to be a colossal instance of the unity of two natures, in one person, without admixture.

This same Professor continues to state that: “The inconceivable perfect fellowship of sheer Otherness is built into our understanding of God, the eternal Trinitarian dance of differentiation and integration.”

Major Findings at Joy Theological Seminary

Being comfortable and accepting of tension that comes about with determining the areas of diversity is important. Diversity at theological institutions only includes certain areas. For many, diversity does not include sexual orientation, religious diversity, or, for some, denominational diversity. Joy Seminary acknowledges this tension, clearly articulate what they will and will not include under the umbrella of diversity, expect difficult conversation to occur, and are willing to accept that tension as a healthy way to have dialogue. Further research is needed in the area of sexual orientation as it relates to diversity and how theological institutions are addressing this tension.
Institutional leadership is seen as an important factor in making progress in becoming a more diverse community at every level of the institution. The moral transformative leadership imperative, which views education from a progressive critical perspective and focuses on power in institutions is a viable social justice underpinning that is guiding the conversations at JTS. Students, administrators, and faculty interviewed indicated that if executive leadership did not communicate the importance of these efforts, it is unlikely that Joy Theological Seminary will continue to make progress. Key leaders needed to rebuild trust within this institution and model the type of change they would like to see on campus, not simply for the sake of diversity and its material benefits, e.g., opening funding streams, improving diversity recruitment and enrollment numbers, but to embrace diversity as an integral element of inclusive excellence.

One of the major points of discussion with faculty and administrators was the concern about maintaining the current theological “canon” and the tensions around broadening the dialogue to include other voices. This very critical issue is much deeper than simply adding racial/ethnic scholars to the syllabi. It has major implications for the shape of theological discourse within the social justice praxis imperative; the redefining of who should be the “gatekeepers,” and the “de-colonialization” of curriculum, as one faculty member described it; “Because we live in a racist and kyriarchal society, the overall result of these concepts is that “difference” is often equated with “inferior,” “bad,” “impure,” “tainted,” and even “mindless.” It is not only the dominant culture that imbibes and believes such distortion and lies. People of color, according to Martell-Otero (2014), internalize this bombardment of misinformation/malformation as well.
A driver of efforts at Joy Theological Seminary toward diversity was the pressure that the institution received from its denomination and a variety of constituencies as a result of an incident that occurred a few years ago. Yet the institution is affiliated with a denomination that is progressive in their positioning within social justice matters. This was an interesting finding, as it is possible for denominational schools, based on their ecclesial theological confessions, to work closely with their denominations in making progress since many denominations draw their leadership from their institutions and many institutions draw their students, staff, administration, and faculty from the denomination.

Joy Theological Seminary has good intentions in ascribing to matters of diversity within social justice imperatives (see Chapter Two) at all levels of the institution. A crucial finding was JTS moving forward with intentional conversations on cultural competencies among faculty, requiring students to attend cultural competencies orientation prior to the academic year, and developing a number of value propositions are all invaluable efforts in developing an atmosphere of inclusive excellence.

**Case Study: Unity Theological Seminary**

Unity Theological Seminary is located in the Northeast. At the time of the study, enrollment was 396 graduate students in various programs of which 249 are FTE. It is a nondenominational institution that serves existing pastors and second/third career students who are actively involved in ministry. UTC’s student enrollment is composed of 24 denominations and 3 non-Christian faiths; Jewish, Islam, and Buddhist. Unity Theological Seminary is located in a large urban city of 8,175,136 residents as of the
2010 Census. It is composed of 33% White alone, 25.5% Black or African American, 28.6% Hispanic/Latino(a), 12.7% Asian alone, and 52.5% of the residents are women.

History

Unity Theological Seminary (UTS) has long been recognized for its innovative programs, its pioneering spirit, and its commitment to training women and men for ministry in the real world. For more than a century UTS has been offering theological education that is accessible, inclusive and transformative. Unity Theological Seminary believes that God calls people from all walks of life and that each person has a unique ministry to fulfill. The task of the institution is to help each one discover what that means and to help students prepare for the next stage of their journey of faith. Their students are involved in the business world, public service, education, the legal field and more. They come from cultures and traditions from around the globe. Some are already retired, while others have only recently graduated from college. Many in their certificate and first professional degree programs are pursuing ministry as a second career, or are already fully bi-vocational. Others in the Master of Divinity or Doctor of Ministry degree programs are full-time pastors who seek to further their professional development and competencies. In all of their programs UTS seeks to accommodate the busy schedules of working men and women without compromising the intellectual rigors or the demands of academic excellence in the education that they receive.

UTS was founded in 1900 as the Bible Teacher’s College. A gifted scholar and teacher, the president of Bible Teacher’s College developed a curriculum that combined the study of the Bible in one’s own language with practical training for ministry. After
moving to a large metropolis in the northeast in 1902, the school became known as The United Biblical Seminary, and then in 1966 the name changed to Unity Theological Seminary. The Seminary through the years has been characterized by its emphasis upon ministry and mission, its openness to both women and men, and its diversity in denominational and cultural traditions represented among its student body.

In 1969, UTS became more intentional in responding to the needs of urban churches and urban pastors, many of them without formal academic training. As this metropolis became more internationally diverse through the 1980s, the Seminary kept pace, opening programs in Spanish and Korean, and working with an increasingly global constituency. In the early 1980’s, the Seminary opened an accredited Master’s degree program inside a correctional facility to train people who were incarcerated within the state’s correctional system for ministry from within.

UTS currently offers a Master of Professional Studies (in the correctional facility only), a Master of Arts in Religious Education, a Master of Arts in Pastoral Care and Counseling, a Master of Arts in Religious Leadership and Administration, a Master of Arts in Youth Ministry, a Master of Divinity, a Doctor of Ministry, an ACPE accredited Certificate in Clinical Pastoral Education, and a non-accredited Certificate in Christian ministry. Students attending classes in these various programs work full-time and go to school evenings and/or weekends. Instruction is offered in English, Spanish, Korean and French. Graduates have distinguished themselves around the world in a variety of ministries in churches, educational institutions, faith-based organizations, government service, and secular professions. They serve as pastors, bishops, chaplains, teachers, business leaders, university and seminary presidents, executives, lawyers, medical
doctors, missionaries, and more. UTS is often cited as a model for institutions around the world seeking to address the educational needs of those living in urban centers and facing the challenge of contemporary global economic and social context.

UTS collaborates with partnering non-profit organizations, city agencies, neighborhood groups, and others in a variety of ways to offer resources to the churches and wider religious community in areas such as affordable housing, community organizing, or economic development. Their partnerships with churches, other religious organizations, other educational institutions, public agencies, and corporations helps UTS bring theological education into a more dynamic interaction with life in the world.

**Mission and Vision**

According to its mission statement:

Unity Theological Seminary is a diverse and inclusive community of learning with a historic urban focus. With Christ at its center, and with a curriculum informed by Biblical witness and Christian thought and tradition, the Seminary prepares women and men for the practice of ministry in congregations, the city, and the world. Led by the Spirit, and in active partnership with churches, we seek to heed God’s call for reconciliation, justice, evangelism, and transformation. In line with this mission, the Seminary seeks to prepare men and women for ministry who are: informed biblically, steeped in Christian thought and tradition, skilled in the practice of ministry for personal, ecclesial and social transformation, committed to the call of the Gospel for reconciliation, justice, evangelism and transformation, equipped for diverse and inclusive partnerships in congregations, the city, and the world, centered in a spiritual tradition which is dynamic in its formation and open to God’s continuing revelation.

The Seminary’s mission statement places Christ at the center of all that they do.

However, UTS finds that following Christ leads them out into a complex multi-faith
world where God is at work transforming lives and bringing about a new creation in ways they have not yet begun to imagine.

Unity Theological Seminary will remain true to its historic commitment to providing theological education that is both relevant to the needs of practical ministry and accessible to women and men called by God. Continuing the tradition of the Unity Biblical Seminary, UTS will ground its curriculum and life in the Bible. It will continue to engage the city as its primary campus, taking theological education in new directions for urban ministry. At the same time, the Seminary will expand its horizons globally to meet the needs of an increasingly global church. The vision of UTS will continue a commitment to radical inclusion and passionate transformation. The Seminary will embrace increasingly diverse constituencies and communities, while challenging them to achieve a greater degree of love and justice in the world. It will foster among students, faculty, alumni/ae, and the wider religious community a greater degree of personal, professional and academic excellence.

To accomplish these tasks over the next five years, UTS will increase current enrollment; add innovative and responsive new programs; and continue to develop strategic relationships with other institutions, churches and individual partners. It will achieve a new level of institutional development that will assure long-term financial sustainability. The Seminary is guided in these efforts by the Christian vision of a city that is to come, in which the glory of God is made manifest to all and through all.

Throughout the conversations with students, administrators and faculty it was apparent that UTS has long been challenging the historic divides in theological education
between theory and practice, between the academy and the church, or between theology and other disciplines of learning. A tenured professor shared the following:

Because I think part of the strength of our program is that we see every person as diverse – as a different person that you could be a Baptist born, Baptist all your life in the same congregation, but you’re still in a place where there is diversity. You can then understand that your ministry is going to be much more effective. And then it goes to the other spectrum where you are in the space with different faith communities.

To implement its mission and vision, the Seminary has often developed partnerships with various other institutions of education or with organizations committed to practical training and learning. Already in the 1920s, UTS was offering a joint degree program with another institution of higher education that led to a PhD in psychology with an emphasis on spiritual counseling. That program was succeeded by a long-standing relationship with the Blanton-Peale Institute that continues today. Some collaborative efforts are tied to specific degree programs, such as the Doctor of Ministry in Multi-faith Ministries offered with a sister theological institution in the area. Others are intended to provide further resources for students, partner churches, and others in the wider religious community. As one observer has put it, “with these efforts UTS is actively seeking to redefine theological education as we know it.”

An example of these collaborative efforts in the development of the Seminary’s strategic plan is The Fund for Community Leadership Initiatives (FCLI). FCLI is the social-action arm of Unity Theological Seminary. FCLI serves the Seminary’s alumnae and alumni, partner congregations and friends as they identify the social and human needs of their communities and create and sustain community-based organizations and programs to address these needs. FCLI is an intermediary. It gives foundations,
individual philanthropists and government funders access to an already existing network of community-based hubs and leaders. It brings UTS-linked organizations together with others to explore opportunities for collaboration and to structure partnerships that advance a shared program initiative. FCLI may then seek to link the partnership with sources of funding and even provide fiscal-agency services. As it fosters partnerships, FCLI provides a suite of incubation services for start-up organizations and technical-assistance services for existing organizations. In its first years, FCLI has a special interest in programs for people returning from prison, community health and children of poverty.

**Pedagogical Strategy: Education for Ministry**

Education at Unity Theological Seminary is a process of dialogue. Moving back and forth between action and reflection, UTS seeks to bring questions and concerns that arise out of real life experience (both individual and collective) into dialogue with the disciplines of theological study. The result is a dialogue that centers on the Bible. UTS begins with the assumption that Scripture is authoritative for engaging, criticizing, and reformulating the issues of ministry in contemporary society. Keeping to the tradition of the United Biblical Seminary, UTS does not argue for any particular method of biblical interpretation, rather they believe that the Bible is read best from a variety of perspectives and methods. These perspectives and methods include:

- A dialogue that is multidisciplinary. UTS believes that the issues and problems of ministry require the best insights of history, theology, ethics, and the social sciences.
• A dialogue that is evangelical, ecumenical, and increasingly multi-faith. The authenticity and integrity of one’s own faith tradition is best treated and developed in dialogue with other faith traditions. UTS believes that diversity intensifies learning in a manner that encourages creativity and presses students toward greater clarity in their own confessions and commitments.

• A dialogue with brokenness and bondage. Education must take sin seriously. Understanding the brokenness of individuals and the demonic forces that are loose in society is essential to understanding and experiencing change, forgiveness, and healing. For this reason education requires dialogue with the reality of sin at both the personal and systemic levels.

• A dialogue with the reality of God’s presence and reign in the world. UTS believes that education is to be in service to the living Christ who sought to serve others, guided and empowered by the Holy Spirit, and committed to the values by which the reign of God is governed. UTS believes students learn from and teach one another to gain a liberating perspective on themselves, their lives, their task, and their calling in this world. Above all, education is experienced in an environment of prayerful openness that reflects the openness of God.

UTS is committed to theological education that engages the congregation as the basis for ministry as it seeks to transform the city and the world. Among the student body one will find individuals seeking ordination; working clergy who are currently serving as pastors of churches; religious professionals who serve in a variety of faith based settings; and lay persons looking to utilize their gifts for ministry more effectively. The purpose of UTS is to help men and women find answers to personal, theological, and
vocational questions, to enable them to achieve the highest level of excellence and faithfulness. A conversation with a second-year African American student included this comment:

I was born in Jersey City, and it was dangerous for you to be African American on the west end of town. And so to be here, and to be in seminary, and living in this area of the country has definitely been an immersion for me culturally. So while learning about the mind of God more, and how God thinks, and learning to be quiet so I can hear what God wants, not just in my life but in the lives of his children, this has been wonderful. It has been life changing. But there are still things that hurt me around the issues of race, even in this setting.

Programs of study at UTS are designed for mature, working men and women who are already in ministry or who are contemplating a shift from a secular to a religious vocation. Classes are offered in the evening or at other times making these accessible to those who work in secular employment. Students will find the emphasis upon learning in community a recurring theme in the curriculum. The rich diversity of cultural, racial, and denominational identities found within the classrooms of UTS is seen as an important resource in this regard. Students also find a strong emphasis is placed upon the churches and congregations of the city that are the Seminary’s partners in the educational venture. These churches and congregations are regarded as being primary locations for developing pastoral identity, as well as being active or potential agents for transformation. Ninety-five percent of the faculty is of color and there is also a substantial number of women who serve on the faculty.
Challenges and Opportunities

As UTS reinvented itself during the 1970s and 1980s, paying attention to the diversity of its context and constituency by hiring faculty from among the constituency, it’s viability as an institution was greatly improved with Black and Latino(a) theologians and church historians on staff. UTS has always been a seminary on the edge: tight budgets, reaching out for soft grants and foundation money to help support its efforts and with a limited endowment from which to draw from. Nonetheless, UTS survives with these commitments and with a diverse faculty pool.

Strategies

Although UTS has “cutting edge” theological education because that’s what the context demands and what its student body need because they come from cutting edge ministerial situations, its pedagogy and curriculum has not been examined for quite some time. According to faculty and administrators at UTS, the term “cutting edge” refers to the social justice dimensions of pedagogical method and presentation. The active engagement of theory and praxis is entertained as faculty intentionally supports students of color, from denominational and experiential variety, through diverse teaching strategies and a varied curriculum. The other praxis item is broader and includes helping White students to examine their ignorance and misperceptions about other groups.

Faculty have identified as necessary a curriculum review and reform to evaluate if its current format is still viable and relevant to the changing demographics and current ecclesial realities. UTS is currently challenged with taking advantage of the fresh voices
of newer faculty with certain kinds of experiences to help reinvigorate their very good curriculum without feeling defensive or challenged by such a process.

The Centrality of Diversity

UTS is one of the most exciting centers of theological education in the world. Unity Theological Seminary (UTS) has long been recognized for its innovative programs, its pioneering spirit, and its commitment to training women and men for ministry in the real world. For over a century they have been offering theological education that is accessible, inclusive and transformative. UTS believes that God calls people from all walks of life and that each person has a unique ministry to fulfill. Their task is to help each one discover what that means for each student, and to help the student prepare for the next stage of their exciting journey of faith. The president of UTS framed the institution’s understanding of diversity eloquently when he said:

God is not about a church in history. God is about a new world. The church exists for the gospel, for the mission to the world, not the other way around. What we’re about is the city. And the city is diverse and inclusive. What churches have done over the last 500 years, is that churches existed inside themselves, existed for their own sake. And this is particularly true of the evangelical church that thinks that church planning is the goal and at the end is creating a church so that ministry is what happens inside the church. At UTS, ministry is what happens outside the church. And it includes liturgy, which worship goes on inside a church, but it’s not for the inside of the church. It’s for the world outside. And so once we start there, then inclusion and diversity are expected. They’re the norm!

The history of diversity efforts at UTS is a powerful force in providing the rationale for it to become more diverse. UTS is leveraging their history and context to convey the importance of the work that is being done and the work that needs to be done.
Perceptions

As a result of where UTS is located – in a huge metropolis consisting of over 8 million residents – diversity is the norm. At UTS there is radical inclusion and diversity. This is a place where they practice a radical kind of inclusion and a radical diversity. They have done a lot of work self-reflecting on this with the help from the Carpenter Foundation. This research found that UTS invites people as an institution who don’t believe in diversity and inclusion. According to the president of UTS, “We don’t expect everybody to embrace the commitment to inclusion around LGBT identity, for instance. Yet, what is expected is a respectful exchange of ideas, theological interpretations, and recognition of each other’s gifts.”

This radical perception of inclusion and diversity is directly related to social justice imperatives. Dan Aleshire has talked about it with the school and has said that there are schools with cultural diversity, but they’re usually theologically, ideologically homogenous. Therefore, they’re all either conservative or liberal, even if they have different cultures. UTS has a wide range of students from Pentecostals, Apostolic Pentecostals, Deliverance Church folks, Assemblies of God, Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, currently a half dozen Zen Buddhists working through their Master of Arts program. UTS will be graduating another Imam this year from their Master of Divinity Program. It will be their third Muslim Imam graduating with the Master of Divinity degree. Included in UTS’ student body is a half dozen Muslims in the doctorate ministry program. Although UTS is a Christian seminary, Muslim students are enrolled and the challenges of this reality do exist. UTS does not want to do what other schools do and create a Muslim identity program.
Monitoring the Work

A conversation with an African American faculty member who directs one of the institution’s theological degree programs included this comment:

We do have the multi-faith cohort and those are persons who recognize that the world that we live in is a diverse world and how do I do ministry in this diversity and maintain the integrity of who I am. And that’s what we encourage. Students come together to learn about other faith communities and to do a project that may intersect with them in the community. We also have a community organizing cohort where students’ projects are launched in the community, which sort of in itself says that they are going to be working with other faith communities and addressing the issue in the community at large. We see every person as diverse – as a different person! You could be a Baptist born, Baptist all your life in the same congregation, but you’re still in a place where there’s diversity. If you can understand that reality, your ministry is going to be much more effective. And then it goes to the other spectrum where you are in the space with different faith communities.

It is interesting to hear this professor explain a concept that monitors this understanding of diversity. She mentions “mutualism” as a key driver in having students, faculty, and administration fully embrace matters of diversity with social justice imperatives. In researching the term, mutualism is “the doctrine or practice of mutual dependence as the condition of individual and social welfare” (Barker, 2006). A Latino, male faculty member in practical theology speaks about mutualism as a concept in her framework of understanding diversity within social justice imperatives:

Mutualism works when the person is deeply embedded in who they are in a positive way because then it gives the other person, I believe, permission to be who they are. One of the examples is the tree and the moss, that they have a mutualistic relationship. In order for that relationship to work, the moss can’t try to be the tree and the tree can’t try to be the moss. So that’s sort of how we look at each one of our professionals that come in. You have to know who you are. If you don’t know who you are, it’s going to be very difficult for you to work with someone else because you’re going to either always feel threatened by them, always feel like you need to be like them and so the relationship is not going to be one that is strong.
Major Findings at Unity Theological Seminary

At UTS the role of the faculty in designing a culturally relevant pedagogy is crucial in monitoring the work of diversity. As Adrienne Rich (1979) writes, it is crucial to “understand the assumptions in which we are drenched” (p. 35). Among the powerful assumptions that need to be understood are the ways various disciplines are implicating issues of diversity and privilege and how this has shaped the curriculum.

The history of radical diversity efforts at UTS is a powerful force in providing the rationale for the institution to become more diverse, and that history should be leveraged. UTS is actively leveraging these efforts and subsequently they are challenged by the very nature of their theology and ideology.

An important finding is the emphasis upon collegiality. Peer relationships with other students and close working relationships with faculty are expected to be developed. A commitment to mutual respect, trust, and cooperation is nurtured throughout the program. This commitment to collegiality is extended beyond the immediate participants of the classroom to those with whom the candidate is involved in ministry through the formation of a Site Team, a committee of persons selected from the context of the student’s ministry that works with the student for the duration of his/her program. Equally important is a commitment to the creation of pastoral leadership and identity, particularly as a practice of spiritual formation, through critical analysis, evaluation, and assessment.

A major finding is that UTS is not a residential campus and the demographics of the student body is composed of non-traditional students who are in active ministry service, and reflect the demographics of this major cosmopolitan city. As such, its
campus is the city and this context brings to bear the varying denominational and socio-cultural influences that are engaged in the classroom setting. Faculty engage intentionally within a culturally-relevant pedagogy that is embraced by a concept of “mutualism.” Yet, it is interesting that UTS does not function within the parameters of a formal diversity framework.

Summary

Linking diversity efforts to mission is important to making and sustaining progress. In addition to a relative lack of diversity, with the exception of UTS, across institutional lines, all of the institutions listed mission as a driver. All of the three schools identify campus diversity as an institutional priority, yet exhibit a lack of allocated resources or the basic policies and practices necessary to promote a multicultural learning experience for students (Paredes-Collins, 2009), and working environment for administration and faculty.

I also wanted to explore the role mission plays in driving change, particularly regarding the documents that directly mention diversity. At all institutions, these documents were seen as central to providing the necessary accountability to make progress in the area of diversity. None of the institutions demonstrated effectiveness in monitoring and coordinating efforts.

Another important part in making progress in the area of diversity is selecting a framework to guide efforts (Smith, 2009). None of the institutions was using a specific framework, although their strategic plans did offer goals and objectives in the matter of diversity and inclusive excellence. Although there were signs that the diversity efforts at
these institutions exemplified unconscious or at times conscious efforts of social justice, formal imperatives in this area was not being entertained or integrated in the curriculum or campus climate. In Chapter Five an analysis of the findings will provide critical themes that were identified as a result of the qualitative case studies examined in this chapter.
CHAPTER FIVE: ANALYSIS AND INSTITUTIONAL APPLICATIONS

This study focused on the benefits of promoting increased engagement with diversity through the curriculum, campus climate, and policies affecting students and staff in theological higher education. Promoting increased engagement with diversity must be sustainable beyond the life of individual programs and more central to the institutional culture and leadership—possibly even to make diversity part of the ethos of their institutions. Theological education characterized by integrity includes institutional and educational practices that "promote awareness of the diversity of race, ethnicity, and culture widely present in North America" (ATS, 2015). Social Justice relates to an institution enhancing participation of persons of underrepresented population groups, in institutional life according to the data received from interviews and observations. The schools selected in this study seek to address the concerns of underrepresented population groups and to increase their participation in theological education. In all cases, the theological institutions are seeking, in various ways yet with limited scope and consistency, to assist students in gaining particular knowledge, appreciation, and openness needed to live and practice ministry effectively in changing culture and racially diverse settings. The reasons why these institutions are pursuing diversity initiatives vary from responses to incidents of racism and oppression in their recent history; mission and vision reviews as a result of changing demographics; sustainability of institutional life as a result of a diminishing donor base; or, critical mass formation for the sake of improving diversity percentages in student enrollment, staff hires, and/or faculty composition. With
the exception of Unity Theological Seminary, social justice is not considered as an imperative that can create long-term sustainable change.

Based on the study findings, what follows is an analysis of the findings categorized within Smith’s (2009) vitality and viability dimension and the social justice imperatives identified in this research: *leadership for social justice, moral transformative leadership, and social justice praxis*. The social justice imperatives are integrated in the analysis of the major consistent themes identified from the findings in Chapter Four of this qualitative study to respond to the overall research question: What are the benefits of promoting increased engagement with diversity through the curriculum, campus climate, and policies affecting students and staff in theological higher education? The themes that emerged from this research are - race/racism and social justice; healthy campus climate; institutional history, culture and identity; institutional mission; culturally-sensitive pedagogy; administrative leadership; strategic planning. Recommendations are listed at the conclusion of the identified themes and will serve as possible benchmarks that can navigate diversity and inclusion within social justice imperatives in the theological academy. Each institution can seek to develop customized solutions that fit its peculiar situation.

**Race/Racism/Social Justice**

At all three institutions, conversations regarding race, racism, and racial discrimination that occur via “aversive racism” or “implicit bias” were key elements in identifying circumstances that have jolted the institution in many ways. These types of racism are difficult to identify, quantify, and rectify because of their subtle, nebulous, and
unnamed nature. Yet at Joy and Peace Theological Seminaries critical issues of racism prompted the institution to react in “crisis” mode. At Unity Theological Seminary, matters of race and micro-aggressive tendencies were discussed among some faculty interviews. Although the civil rights movement had a significant effect on changing racial interactions in this society, racism continues to plague the United States (Thompson & Neville, 1999). Racial micro-aggressions are brief and commonplace daily verbal, behavioral, and environmental indignities, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicates hostile, derogatory, or negative racial slights and insults to the target person or group. They are not limited to human encounters alone but may also be environmental in nature, such as when a person of color is exposed to an office setting that unintentionally assails his or her racial identity (Gordon & Johnson, 2003; D. W. Sue, 2003). For example, one’s racial identity can be minimized or made insignificant through the sheer exclusion of decorations or literature that represents various racial groups. A Latina student at Peace Theological Seminary stated, “I am concerned that I have arrived to this institution seeking to be prepared to serve the Latino(a) population and I have yet to attend a class where scholarship from the global south is included in the syllabi. I feel excluded and marginalized.”

Racism affects every community and every person’s quality of life. It shows up in inequities between groups and in tensions among people from different ethnic backgrounds. In order to have healthy communities and a strong country, we need to face racism head-on. In a democracy, there must be ways for everyone to have a voice in finding the solutions and in carrying them out. Communities across the U.S. are becoming more and more diverse. Many communities are looking for better ways to
manage the changes. They want to create places where all people can thrive. More and more people see that racism is not just an issue for “blacks” and “whites.” It affects all everyone – African Americans, European Americans, Native Americans, Asian Americans, Latinos, Arab Americans, those of mixed backgrounds, and those who just describe themselves as “American.” No longer is the racial debate between “Black” and “White,” for there is a multiplicity of cultures and values that elevate difference in the midst.

One important analysis from recent years is that it is not simply the presence of ethnic and racial diversity on campus, but rather the active engagement with that diversity that is critically important for fostering student learning and development (Gurin et al. 2002). As such, informal interactions with diverse peers may prove to be as important as the formal curriculum in terms of promoting the student development and learning that comes from intercultural interactions (Gurin et al. 2002). Such interactions must also be included in the indicators developed to assess inclusive excellence. For some of us, it can be difficult to talk about racism. These conversations will touch on issues of power and privilege, fear and anger, hope and disappointment. But they are well worth the effort. I have seen that many people are ready to take the risk. They tell me that honest listening and sharing are powerful forces for making change – in themselves, in their relationships, in their organizations, and in their communities.

Race and racism are, indeed, very broad and complex subjects. Contributing to this complexity is how race continues to be a decisive factor in how people are viewed, evaluated, and provided social advantages or disadvantages. The historical roots of institutionalized racism reach back to the founding of our country and racism is still
resident in every community throughout this nation. The struggle to end racism has an equally long and tenacious history and today, in every community, large and small, there are people working to dismantle racism.

Americans have traditionally had a tendency to view issues of race and racism within a Black/White paradigm. Given the fact that slavery was a foundational economic and political reality in this country for more than 300 years, it is understandable that racism is often cast in Black/White terms. However, limiting the discussion to Black/White relations can render invisible the many other racial/ethnic communities that experience racism on a daily basis, including Latino/a communities, Asian Americans, Arab Americans, Native Americans, and new immigrant communities. Dionardo Pizana (2010) mentions that there are “four realms in which racism is manifest in this society: personal, interpersonal, institutional, and cultural” (p. 22). For change to be genuine and lasting, it must encompass all four of these realms. There are age-old debates about where change must begin or which realm is most important, but these four realms are inextricably related. They feed into one another and, even though change in one realm does not guarantee change in another, all are important and deserving of our time and attention.

According to the Population Reference Bureau (2010), the United States is growing increasingly diverse and will continue to do so into this century. The bureau projects that by 2050, non-Hispanic Whites will no longer be the majority. Because of such demographic shifts, the religious and societal norms established by the White majority at faith-based colleges need to be examined. The following are
recommendations within this particular theme utilizing the social justice imperatives noted in this study:

**Recommendations**

*Leadership for Social Justice*

1. As it might be difficult for institutions to self-identify school norms that favor the majority, schools should engage in purposeful conversation with diverse churches and community agencies in the surrounding area on the matter of race, racism and social justice.

2. Institutions could diversify their chapel and worship experiences by including speakers from a variety of ethnic and racial backgrounds and integrate diverse worship styles into chapel programs, small groups, Bible studies, and campus ministry retreats.

3. To address possible areas of disconnect between the White religious norm and the minority groups on campus, it could be helpful to invite a faith-based racial reconciliation group to facilitate dialogue among the community and to conduct diversity training over a period of 2-3 years.

4. To enhance the sense of belonging in students of color, facilitate positive cross-racial interactions, and improve the overall climate for diversity, space must be created for students of color to have a seat at the table. Intentionally create forums where students, faculty, and administrators can participate in the development of sustainable programs and initiatives.

5. Wrestle with the history of discrimination against women and racial/ethnic minority groups and their participation in discriminatory systems. In completing
the history of Christianity, the Church and its institutions has not known what to do with the differences between us, they have been systematically labeled “pagan” or “heathen” and have been destroyed. Womanist ethicist, Joan M. Martin rightly states that when we take seriously the fact that we are made in the image of God, then we take the differences between us seriously (1993). She further maintains that if we fail to recognize and value difference as part of what makes creation, then we cannot claim to be ethical people. “We can either make difference that which kills us, or that which enlivens us. It’s as simple as that” (p.10-11).

_Elevate Moral Transformative Leadership_

6. Engage students to grow through cross-cultural experiences as they prepare to work in an increasingly diverse world. Valuing differences, developing intercultural competence, and being globally minded are essential skills in today’s church environment. In order for students to experience the developmental and educational benefits of a diverse learning environment, a positive, constructive educational community that is supportive of all students is necessary (Allen, Bonous-Hammarth, & Teranishi, 2006; Anderson, 2007; Bok, 2006).

_Cultivate Social Justice Praxis_

7. Institutions can clearly and tangibly communicate support for all of its constituents. Several students from each of the three institutions agreed that educators, administrators, and staff “must be willing to share the responsibility in
facilitating an environment where all students can succeed.” As such, assessing the climate for diversity is vital for institutions that desire to create healthy, diverse learning environments for students.

8. Organize with local civic and community organization in the engagement of justice struggles and the risks associated with such commitments.

Healthy Campus Climate

To improve the behavioral and psychological climate for diversity on campus, which includes positive cross-racial interactions, sense of belonging, and overall satisfaction, the establishment of infrastructure and the active engagement of trustees, faculty, staff, and students are essential. Collaboration across functional lines needs to be cultivated. Too often in the theological academy, administrators, faculty, trustees, executive leadership and students work in “silos” never having the opportunity to embrace each other’s gifts and experiences. This fractured institutional ethos is no longer viable during the 21st century. The silo mode of operation, in my contention, brings a disruptive understanding of our individual and corporate value. As mentioned in this study, our theology of a corporate entity where all persons of the body is valued needs to be lifted in practical ways.

All three institutions have made some progress in enrolling students from underrepresented population groups. The institution that has made the most progress in enrollment statistics is Joy Theological Seminary. Within the dimension of campus climate, all three institutions have made progress, although only Joy Theological Seminary is actively trying to measure progress in this area with a specific diversity plan.
that includes recruitment, diversification of faculty, and campus climate initiatives. Abadeer (2009) observes that diversity and intercultural engagement should be among the leading forces and objectives in theological higher education institutions, not out of a posture of fear, protection, or political correctness, but based on a biblical perspective of “redemptive diversity” (p. 188). Although a considerable amount of research has been conducted on the topic of the campus climate for diversity (e.g., Ancis et al., 2000; Johnson et al., 2007; Kuh & Umbach, 2005; Park, 2009; Pike & Kuh, 2006), little exploration has concerned the climate for diversity at religious schools, or how ministry formation, a core objective of the theological academy, might be affected by the climate for diversity – especially for students of color.

Distinctive experiences foster spiritual growth for different students, and for underrepresented population groups, sense of belonging is of utmost importance. Facilitating a sense of belonging is key for these three campuses to work toward building a community that fosters spirituality for students from various racial and ethnic backgrounds, gender, and gender identities. Both positive and negative cross-racial interactions affect sense of belonging (Paredes-Collins, in press). Research has identified several factors that can promote sense of belonging. For example, a smooth college transition processes, positive perceptions of campus racial climate, socially supportive residence halls (Johnson et al., 2007), and frequent positive interactions with diverse peers are all significant predictors of sense of belonging (Locks, Hurtado, Bowman, & Oseguera, 2008). Not surprisingly, perceptions of racial tension and discrimination are negatively associated with both sense of belonging and overall satisfaction (D’Augelli & Hershberger, 1993; Hurtado & Carter, 1997; Johnson et al., 2007; Locks et al., 2008;
Nora & Cabrera, 1996). Although increasing a sense of belonging among students is a difficult task, it is a worthy venture for theological institutions—especially because of its relationship with spirituality, social justice, and preparation of service for the realities students will engage in the world of ministry.

Hurtado et al. (1998, 1999) are widely credited as the first to provide a conceptual framework for campus climate for diversity that was based on empirical research. The framework addresses the myriad forces, policies, reactions, perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors that affect campus climate. Hurtado et al.’s (1998, 1999) multidimensional structure offers four interrelated components within the institutional context that impact climate: compositional diversity (diversity of student body, faculty, and staff); the behavioral dimension (e.g., intra- and cross-racial social interactions, diversity in the curricular and co-curricular); the psychological dimension (e.g., perceptions of racial/ethnic tension, discrimination, and prejudice); and the historical legacy of inclusion/exclusion (e.g., history of discrimination). Two external forces affect the aforementioned dimensions: (a) government policy, programs, and initiatives (e.g., financial aid reform and affirmative action), and (b) the larger socio-historical context. This context refers to the ways in which public policy, societal events, attitudes, behaviors, and changes thereof might impact the institutional environment. According to Hurtado et al., the combination of these dimensions and external forces constitute the campus climate for diversity.
Recommendations

Leadership for Social Justice

1. Establish an Institutional Diversity and Equity office to support student organizations to facilitate subgroup belonging and to educate the general population about diverse backgrounds and cultures. This office can also serve the entire institution in relating to issues such as internationalizing the campus, Titles VI and IX procedures, and the development of a campus-wide cultural proficiency and diversity competency initiative. This office would need to be directly responsible to the office of the president giving the seriousness within the institutional infrastructure it deserves.

2. Develop a cross-sectional campus-wide diversity council where matters of race, racism, gender equity, learning and physical disabilities can be discussed in an intentional fashion with administration, faculty, staff, and students. Such councils can review policies related to equal opportunity, identify best practices for improving the climate for diversity on campus, make policy recommendations to campus leaders, and hear diversity-related grievances from faculty, staff, and students.

Moral Transformative Leadership

3. Develop communal initiatives that foster relationships that can examine systemic social change where all students can value their gifts, experiences, and abilities. Small group seminars and intentional conversations on crucial matters can provide for student’s self-reflection and mutual affirmation.
Social Justice Praxis

4. Develop relationships with community groups, societal organizations, and movements outside of the academy, such as local agencies involved in advocacy or specific social justice issues. These may or may not be church-based, but they have the potential to inspire students to justice commitments; to help them to do social analysis; and to offer examples of concrete contexts where groups or organizations accomplish justice work. Interfaith, ecumenical, and global justice, human rights, and environmental organizations may have the potential to offer educational opportunities that include outreach to the community.

5. Women must be given the tools to respond to sexual harassment that may occur on campus, during field education, or when they enter the ministry. Conversations about these and other critical concerns may take place at the informal level among women students and more formally through student events, lectures, or specialized courses. However, in the interest of preparing women and men for ministry, “women’s issues” should become community issues, addressed openly at all levels of the institution. Women on campuses, I visited confirm the need for greater sensitivity to their concerns, signaling that work in this area is not complete, despite the institution’s positive achievements for women. The aim of this recommendation for the theological academy is for the institution not only be capable of responding to issues as they arise, but one that will maintain an on-going conversation with the women it serves and will make women’s viewpoints a factor in institutional decision-making.
**Institutional History, Culture and Identity**

The role of identity, both individually and institutionally, is central to diversity-related issues. There is growing recognition that individuals have multiple identities (e.g., gender, race, ethnicity, class, and abilities) and these identities must be understood as they intersect with each other (Smith, 2009). Individual identities emerge, in part, based on their historical, social, political, and economic context. “People live multiple, layered identities derived from social relations, history and the operation of structures of power. People are members of more than one community at the same time, and can simultaneously experience oppression and privilege” (Symington, 2004, p. 23). Likewise, institutional identity is shaped over time by history, context, location, and mission. Institutional culture, as reflected in values, norms, and practices, represents “one of the deepest and most important elements of how institutions admit, value, and reward people. It is directly related to identity” (Smith, 2009, p. 26). The relationship among individual identity, institutional identity, and culture is complex and multidimensional and is an area that would benefit from further research.

The institutions in this study have adequately leveraged their histories to convey the importance of the work being done and the work that needs to be done. They have been genuine in their self-reflection and are in active discernment, understanding certain realities as to the reason(s) their institution must be concerned about diversity. The history of diversity efforts at an institution can be a powerful force in providing the rationale for institutions to become more diverse, and that history should be leveraged. The institutions in this study have begun to leverage their histories to convey the importance of the work that is being done and the work that needs to be done.
Recommendations

Leadership for Social Justice

1. The institution’s leadership should evaluate how their history in engaging diversity efforts could be leveraged to show their commitment diversity and inclusion. Employing an effective marketing strategy could possibly do this. Internally, institutions could use negative moments to continue to demonstrate how far they have come and how far they still need to go.

2. Faculty, administrators, student affairs professionals, and other campus leaders must find ways to affirm the identity of students of color, women, and persons with varying gender roles, and build an intentionally inclusive community. To build an inclusive community and disrupt the prevalence of the White norm, institutions need to acknowledge their histories of exclusion. According to Hurtado, Milem et al. (1998), “acknowledging a past history of exclusion implies an institutional willingness to actively shed its exclusionary past” (p. 284). When institutions acknowledge their exclusionary past in conjunction with a clear commitment to move forward, it can pave the way for a shift in both consciousness and culture.

3. Examine individual and organizational decisions to assess their impact. All three institutions had a non-discrimination policy statement. A commitment to nondiscrimination goes beyond a policy statement. It goes beyond even avoiding intentional discrimination. It also means examining patterns of decisions for signals that might indicate that something is amiss. For example, if nearly 50% of a workforce is female but less than 10% of managers are women there may be a
discriminatory process in place. This is not to encourage quotas or preferential treatment. Rather, as Wilson (1997) describes it, the numbers are merely the “oil light” suggesting that it is time to take a look under the hood.

*Moral Transformative Leadership*

4. Re-examine and revise the institution’s Mission Statement. Without clear purpose, or a mission, the organization’s constituents face the challenge of losing its direction. Many changes have taken place in the local, national and global landscape that impact pedagogy, governance, enrollment, and institutional capacity.

5. Develop greater opportunities of racial, gender, and denominational diversity in the composition of the Board of Trustees and Administrative Offices. It is critical to understand the conditions needed within the infrastructure for the benefits of diversity to be fully realized as part of the institution’s mission. The literature (Wheeler, 2002; Bowen, Kurzwell, & Tobin, 2005; Paredes-Collins, 2009; Smith, 2009) suggests that board governance and administrative structure plays a vital role in promoting excellence, diversity, and equity at an institution.

*Social Justice Praxis*

6. Develop particular policies and grievance procedures regarding matters of discrimination and harassment. The role of identity, both individually and institutionally, is central to diversity-related issues. There is growing recognition that individuals have multiple identities (e.g., gender identity, race, ethnicity,
class, and abilities) and these identities must be understood as they intersect with each other (Smith, 2009). “People are members of more than one community at the same time, and can simultaneously experience oppression and privilege” (Symington, 2004, p.23). By developing a process that will identify circumstances of discrimination and harassment and all types of discrimination across the campus appropriate steps for mediation and resolution can be an integral component in the validation of all stories and experiences. Rooting out discrimination also means being vigilant and intolerant of it wherever it emerges. People throughout the institution must be willing to take a stand against prejudiced acts, injustices, and unfairness, intentional, or otherwise.

**Institutional Mission**

The theological institutions in this qualitative study offers a strong theology of diversity in its mission statement, which affirms the triune God’s sovereignty over all creation, Christ’s saving work for all people, the renewing power of the Spirit in all of life, and the church’s calling to serve throughout the world. Rooted in an ecclesiology that affirms the unity of the church throughout the world, this Trinitarian articulation impinges directly on the constitution and the work of the church. It reveals that the church’s calling to “keep the unity of the Spirit through the bond of peace” (Eph. 4:3) extends to Christ’s followers in “every tribe and tongue and people and nation” (Rev. 7:9).

All of the institutions studied listed mission as a driver. Yet connecting the diversity driver to an imperative of social justice was lacking. Unity Theological
Seminary, given its location in a multi-ethnic and global city, is intentionally integrating diversity and social justice in their curriculum and governance. At all institutions, their mission statements, vision statements, and strategic plans are documents that were seen as central to providing the necessary accountability to make progress in the area of diversity.

Theological higher education institutions are facing various challenges as they seek to protect their distinctive religious mission and sense of identity while responding to a rapidly changing landscape. Through observations and conversations at all three institutions, I noted that they were passionate about their history and mission. The dynamic interplay of history, changing contexts, and relationships with one’s religious tradition highlights the central role of institutional mission and identity in the discourse on diversity at each of these fine institutions. A culturally responsive community supports and rallies around groups that may be verbally or physically threatened or misunderstood, and works to improve and educate the community. The transformation to being culturally proficient and diversity competent requires time to think, reflect, assess, decide, and change. To become culturally proficient, administrators, managers, staff, students, and faculty participate actively in work sessions, contributing their distinctive ideas, beliefs, feelings, and perceptions.

Increasing structural diversity in institutional settings improves intergroup attitudes and behavior. Structural diversity is a critical factor in bringing people from diverse groups together. At the same time, however, structural diversity is insufficient for facilitating the maximum benefits of diverse interactions: people from different
groups must have opportunities to learn about each other in order to ameliorate any negative thoughts or attitudes people hold about others.

**Recommendations**

*Leadership for Social Justice*

1. Collaboration across functional lines needs to be cultivated. To improve the behavioral and psychological climate for diversity on campus, which includes positive cross-racial interactions, sense of belonging, and overall satisfaction, the establishment of infrastructure and the active engagement of trustees, faculty, staff, and students are essential. Too often in the theological academy, administrators, faculty, trustees, executive leadership and students work in “silos” never having the opportunity to embrace each other’s gifts and experiences. This fractured institutional ethos is no longer viable during the 21st century. The silo mode of operation, in my contention, brings a disruptive understanding of our individual and corporate value. As mentioned in this study, our theology of a corporate entity where all persons of the body is valued needs to be lifted in practical ways.

2. To achieve long-term success, change must be understood through institutional mission and acted upon at multiple levels of the institution. Damon A. Williams maintains that “The power of an organizational change vision is unleashed when many people within the institution understand and share it. Plans called for by the board of trustees or president and crafted by task forces can mean very little to the various academic and student affairs units of an institution – even if these areas
are represented on the planning committee” (2006, p.14). The vision for change must be communicated to stakeholders at multiple levels so that they can define, reframe, adapt, and implement the vision according to their unique vantage points.

At Peace and Joy Theological Seminaries, a cross-sectional entity consisting of faculty, administrators and students have been formed to collectively engage in matters of diversity and inclusion at all levels of the institution. It is important that these structures have particular agenda items to constructively dialogue and create an environment where all persons find themselves being valued. At the same time, these individuals should want to participate and actively contribute to the well-being of the institution. It is important to develop safe havens for students of diverse backgrounds. Tatum (2003) notes that “having a place to be rejuvenated and to feel anchored in one’s cultural community increases the possibility that one will have the energy to achieve academically as well as participate in the cross-group dialogue and interaction many colleges want to encourage” (p. 80).

*Moral Transformative Leadership*

3. Every student who graduates must be able to articulate (and to help other Christians articulate) what Christ’s Gospel is, why we believe it, how it addresses the realities of the increasingly scientific culture of the 21st century world, and how it engages individual and social problems of life in this world. Social and cultural changes are driving such swift and radical change in churches that demand for competence and vision from seminary graduates are greater than ever
before. In the theological academy, there is a distinctive obligation to equip graduates with the foundations to become competent and visionary leaders of churches within today’s radically changing landscape. Active participation by all institutional constituents can be a key ingredient in transforming campus climate.

4. A theology of diversity for the 21st century must be explored and translated into every component of the institution’s make-up to open up the table of theological discourse to include members of various backgrounds. Commitment to embracing the racial and ethnic diversity within Christianity is an implicit recognition of the valuable theological contributions that continue to be made by pastors and theologians of the global church, by women, and by others whose voices traditional Western theology has not included. As the geographical center of Christianity has shifted to the so-called “Global South,” such voices have challenged Eurocentric Christian perspectives and revealed the fullness and richness of the body of Christ.

**Social Justice Praxis**

5. There is a need to link diversity initiatives and the institution’s mission and theology. A way to make this link is to author an official theological position paper/statement on diversity. This exercise should include members from every constituency of the institution. As stated earlier, linking diversity efforts to mission with social justice imperatives is important to making and sustaining progress over time.
6. The development of a series of Presidential cross-sectional (faculty, trustees, administration, alumnae/i, and students) conversations on defining “Academic Excellence” in relation to “Diversity, Religion, and Responsibility in Theological Education.” These forums would provide a theological and practical framework for an enrollment strategy that takes into account the socio-economic, political, and religious realities of the day.

Culturally-Sensitive Pedagogy

Based on the interviews and data gathered prior to and during the campus visits at these three institutions, I conclude that all three institutions demonstrate progress and desire within each of the four dimensions in Smith’s (2009) framework. In terms of a diverse workforce with regard to faculty, Unity Theological Seminary had the most ethnic diversity. The faculty is key in sustaining diversity efforts (Smith, 2009).

Theological schools’ faculties are one of the greatest strengths of theological institutions (which are themselves often identified as some of the strongest religious institutions in North America). According to Barbara G. Wheeler (2003), “Current faculty members are publishing more. At the same time, they remain deeply committed to teaching and give evidence of being competent and resourceful teachers.” While ethnic diversity among students is increasingly evident on the campuses of these three theological institutions, statistics indicate, with the exception at Unity Theological Seminary, that higher education continues to reflect a predominantly White professoriate (Broido, 2004; Cochran-Smith, 2000; Vacarr, 2001). Current demographic patterns indicate that students of color represent a growing percentage of the population at
theological institutions across the country (Wheeler, 2013). Researchers and educators agree that in light of an increasingly pluralistic society, it is important to equip students with the appropriate cultural competency skills to navigate and thrive in the culturally diverse environments of the 21st century (Anguiano & Harrison, 2002; Chennault, 2005; Edwards, Carr, & Siegel, 2006; Smith, 1997). Furthermore, the body of literature indicates that faculty members play a critical role in this process, thus underscoring the need for all faculty to develop a culturally relevant pedagogy (Goebel, 1995; Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002; Tinto, 1997). Consequently, training White faculty members, who statistically are the majority tenured academicians in the theological academy (ATS, 2014), in the appropriate pedagogical skills to communicate effectively in diverse environments is of strategic importance to the future of the theological academy. However, discussions about multiculturalism and cultural competency have traditionally been met with a significant degree of resistance from White faculty (Allen, 2000; Elhoweris, Parameswaran, & Alsheikh, 2004).

All three institutions have a diversity component as part of the general education requirement and/or orientation programs, yet none of the institutions is assessing the impact these courses were having on the students. This is an area for improvement at all theological and secular institutions. A specific resource could be the work that is being done by the Association of American Colleges and Universities on assessing general education and the Wabash Center who supports teachers of religion and theology in higher education through meetings and workshops.
Recommendations

Leadership for Social Justice

1. Faculty development can go a long way in making progress as well as laying the foundation for sustaining the change. The only institution that was intentionally providing faculty development opportunities in the area of curriculum and pedagogy was Joy Theological Seminary. It is one thing for institutions to require diversity courses, but developing faculty to teach these courses as well as identifying ways that diversity could be better integrated into existing curriculum is another. Institutions must seek ways to provide faculty development opportunities for their faculty. Joy Theological Seminary has put a strategy into place to assist faculty in engaging the issue of diversity in the classroom by offering workshops through the Wabash Foundation. These workshops are to help the faculty members increase their skill set in effectively integrating diversity into their classes.

2. Where possible in the theological curriculum and in appropriate theology courses, attend to current events and societal issues and incorporate social analysis and action-reflection models of learning including the “praxis” of conscientization, which is a reflective and ongoing process of coming to awareness of issues, doing social analysis, and actions that contribute to positive social change (see Freire 1970).

3. Include interdisciplinary studies in the social sciences and liberating theologies that attend to justice, human rights, and equality issues and practices. The curriculum is another significant area of infrastructure. Courses that integrate
diverse perspectives and major-specific courses and even degree programs that value and celebrate diversity communicate the validity of multiple viewpoints and facilitate respect for difference (Schreiner, 2010). The task is not, ultimately, to impart an abstract body of knowledge; it is to form leaders for ministry.

4. Integrate learning and diversity outcomes in curriculum development. The student learning and development area is closely related to the curricular area and focuses on both learning and outcomes (Gurin et al. 2002). Learning outcomes include active thinking skills, intellectual engagement and motivation, effective written and oral communication, and group problem-solving ability. Diversity outcomes include the ability to take the position of another person, racial and cultural understanding between and among groups, acceptance of conflict as a normal part of life, capacity to perceive differences and commonalities both within and between social groups, and interest in the wider social world and civic engagement (Gurin, et al. 2002). For example, Peace Theological Seminary will move forward with existing and emerging Hispanic-focused educational programs recognizing and valuing the cultural and socio-economic realities of this constituency. Furthermore, through my observations over a period of three days on their campus, they seemed to listen and gather information to become better able to serve Latino(a) Christian communities as the seminary continue to establish new partnerships. They are also forging new partnerships with external experts, including Hispanic/Latino(a) leadership from the denomination of which they are affiliated.
5. Creating a safe classroom atmosphere. At both Peace and Joy Seminaries, a concerted recognition is being made where faculty are substantiating the fundamental connection between spiritual life and practice and are concerned with the entire ecology of formation, especially one anchored in residential learning, a unique aspect of seminary life that is not fully used to its fullest extent. Unity Theological Seminary is not a residential campus institution, yet the city that they inhabit is the foci of their pedagogical goal for competent ministry formation. In varying ways, all three institutions recognize the emerging need to develop strategies that enable them to embrace and to utilize techniques and practices of virtual communication and learning to provide access beyond their walls. At UTS, it is important to note how they are actively integrating their theology of inclusion by creating safe space for a multi-faith education. Researchers (Howard, 2006; McIntosh, 2005; Vacarr, 2001) agree that the effectiveness of general strategies, such as creating a safe classroom atmosphere, building trust relationships, designing collaborative learning assignments, and focusing on students’ strengths and learning styles are but some of the elements that need to be considered. Many of these key characteristics of culturally relevant pedagogy paralleled instructional techniques that have been identified as contributing to the success of all students, thus developing culturally responsive faculty will not necessarily require an entirely new set of instructional strategies. However, this does not diminish the importance of creating specific assignments geared toward
increasing cultural understanding, exploring ethnic identity, and wrestling with multiple perspectives on issues.

6. Culturally-sensitive behaviors are to be advocated. An overarching theme that was repeatedly expressed by the interviewees, particularly the students at all three institutions, was that teacher behaviors are as important as teaching strategies, if not more so. Issues such as attitude, body language, relational skills, communication, humility, and vulnerability have been identified as major factors when identifying culturally responsive instruction (Davis, 2006; Talvacchia, 2002). However, limited research has been conducted that examined the personal attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors of seminary faculty in order to investigate the relationship between their beliefs and their desire to become more culturally competent (Howard-Hamilton, 2000; Ukpokodu, 2002).

7. Develop and require as credit-bearing experiences colloquia as spaces for guided topical discussion, among them, Ecclesiological and Practical Theology, and their relationship to theological training, the church, and multiple contexts of ministry (This would be a different learning experience from Field Education).

8. Provide curricular, co-curricular and post-curricular opportunities for cross/intercultural dialogue, theological engagement, and contextualization. Fostering dialogue and program development opportunities regarding tooling for contextualizing and discussing how this would look in all curricular, co-curricular, and post-curricular offerings will be advantageous in the short and long-term.
9. Incorporate the expertise of activists, practitioners, and community groups committed to systemic social change by inviting them to courses as guest speakers and resource people. People who work in social justice ministries or in community groups that are committed to social change are often willing to share their stories and their commitments. A potentially key area for developing socially conscious theological education is the inspiration of models and witnesses who live a commitment to social change in their lives. At both Peace and Joy Theological Seminaries, there are indicators providing clear evidence that these two institutions are progressing in this area. At the time of my visit at Peace Theological Seminary, there was a conference on Race, Power, and Privilege opened to all members of the seminary community. This event was part of a series of seminars throughout the year where difficult issues were being discussed for the sake of enhancing the learning environment with pertinent information. At Joy Theological Seminary, a Preacher’s series was underway where different academicians and practitioners were invited to speak on societal issues of race, discrimination, and gender equity. The faculty, students, and administration organized these events. At Unity Theological Seminary, a number of initiatives are being developed. UTS has the Center for the Study and Practice of Urban Religion, Resource Center for Women in Ministry, and a master’s program at a correctional facility. Contextual learning and interaction is a prominent fixture to their understanding of campus life, student learning, and civic engagement.
10. Revision of the curriculum as an imperative. The need for constant revision of the institution’s curriculum is controlled by a series of assessment outcomes agreed with the faculty at the curriculum level, and reflecting expectations of what students should know today and what they should be able to do upon graduation. The goal for students is to convey an awareness that wisdom is not an abstract possession, but a living discernment of the ways of God at each situation. The emphasis throughout a curriculum review is to move beyond the assimilation of fact-like information and encourage the acquisition of wisdom, growth, and maturity. This process has to do with spiritual formation! Thus, the revision of a curriculum in an institution that seeks to be diverse within imperatives of social justice examine honestly a set of habitable values or applied competencies for living in the 21st century. There will always remain a need for the acquisition of hard skills, finely honed judgments, and detailed knowledge that may only be gained from immersion in particular cross-cultural and inter-cultural disciplines. It is noteworthy to understand that the revision of a curriculum within the theological academy is reap with many exciting possibilities for ministry as the needs of congregations and the church- at-large require cross boundaries and inter-disciplinary approaches as it is being experienced at both Peace and Joy Theological Seminaries. UTS is pursuing an educational pedagogy that is centered on the city from which it serves.

Possible questions that can be examined or explored in the development of a cross-disciplinary curriculum can be: how has the institution responded to the changing identity of the contemporary seminary student relevant to the changing
church and cultural contexts from which they call? How effective do we anticipate the new breath of requirements and degree programs to be in preparing leaders for the church? How adequately have we dealt with the paradigm shifts that are taking place in different parts of the world? What core elements of the Biblical, theological, historical, and practical disciplines need curricular revisions at your school? At your institution, are there issues that can be identified regarding race, gender, and sexual orientation primarily interrelated or in competition with one another? Within your institution, would you agree that the curriculum is a specific way racism occurs? If so, in what ways does racism, sexism, ageism, etc., manifest itself? Expanding the faculty composition to greater inclusiveness of faculties of color and women, and increasing course offerings in other-than-typical-denominational-seminary courses can also change the theological academy dramatically.

11. Increasing the racial/ethnic diversity of faculty at all institutions may assist in the teaching/learning attributes of the educational environment. If commitment is the first step and new attitudes set the pace, policies and practices are the actualized outcomes of honest and authentic efforts toward diversity.

12. Connecting pedagogy, theological scholarship, and diversity issues by creating an environment where scholarly research can be equitably encouraged in the areas of social justice and present-day diversity issues (Lynn & Wheeler, 1999, Conde-Frazier et al., 2004; Emerson & Smith, 2002; Kratt, 2004). For instance, at the academic level, both male and female students would benefit from increased
course offerings in Women’s Studies and the incorporation of readings by and about women in courses that are not specifically focused on women in ministry.

13. Women’s voices must be welcomed on campus. Despite the high percentage of women enrollment in the theological academy, women students face the challenge of finding a safe space in the classroom or in other community forums to offer their thoughts and opinions. There is a need for broad attentiveness at all levels of the institution to the needs of women who come from a variety of backgrounds and life experiences. Mentorship and networking are important, especially for women of color. Theological institutions should be attentive to the needs of women students who are pregnant and families with children.

**Administrative Leadership - Governance**

In their review of governance research in higher education, Kezar and Eckel (2004) found that early research focused predominantly on structural perspectives. Governance structure, while important for designating authority, establishing lines of accountability and communication, and facilitating access, has “limited analytic capacity for understanding how governance functions or in addressing challenges facing campuses” (p. 381). Birnbaum’s (1988) major study focused on the political aspects of governance and acknowledged the deep human dimension of governance. One of Birnbaum’s underlying assumptions was that good governance varies by institution and campus context; no single model or structure is sufficient in explaining or improving governance. As such, the local context, history, values, and leadership need to shape the strategies used to improve governance. Kezar and Eckel (2004) argue that the emphasis
of structure and systems perspectives in governance should be balanced with human, social cognition, and cultural theories to create a richer understanding of governance. A more robust understanding of governance is needed to deal with the complexity facing higher education institutions and their boards, including diversity-related concerns. With an increasingly diverse student population, achieving institutional outcomes requires greater success in attracting, engaging, and retaining diverse faculty, administration, and staff.

Carver (2010) suggests the fundamental purpose of the governing board is to represent owners in the governance of the institution. In short, he argues the Board exists to ensure owner-accountable institutional performance. As such, the board has three primary tasks in accomplishing its purpose: (a) ownership representation and linkage; (b) policy development; and (c) assurance of effective organizational performance. Carver emphasizes policies as one of the primary tools for boards to effectively do their work. Chait, Ryan, and Taylor (2005) frame governance as leadership and argue that boards need three different modes of governance to fulfill their responsibilities: (a) a fiduciary mode, primarily concerned with stewardship of the organization’s assets; (b) a strategic mode, working in partnership with executive management to set long-term direction and strategy; and (c) a generative mode that provides a crucial source of leadership for the organization. In its oversight capacity, governance plays a strategic leadership role in risk management, asset protection, and stewardship of the organization’s mission, identity, and reputation.

As noted earlier, the challenges of diversity and equity in theological institutions related to student, faculty, board composition, senior administrative diversity, campus
climate, and student outcomes remain salient issues. It is critical to understand the conditions needed within the theological academy for the benefits of diversity to be fully realized as part of the institution’s mission. The literature suggests that board governance plays a vital role in promoting excellence, diversity, and equity at an institutional level. How do we build board governance capacity to effectively address the emerging challenges related to diversity in ways that reflect the distinctive mission, values and ethos, and commitments of theological institutions?

**Recommendations**

*Leadership for Social Justice*

1. Embracing Social Justice Imperatives. Acknowledge that diversity is a matter of justice and not of tolerance. The institution’s leadership should evaluate how diversity within social justice imperatives could be leveraged to show their commitment to their efforts. Monitoring and evaluating the administrative hiring practices, board of trustees’ selection, and faculty composition are several key components in acknowledging social justice imperatives within the infrastructure of the institution. Leadership for social justice is “action-oriented and transformative, committed and persistent, inclusive and democratic, relational and caring, reflective, and oriented to a socially just pedagogy” (Furman, 2012, p. 5). Leadership for social justice requires confronting contentious issues in order to bring about necessary change within institutions and communities (Lumby & Coleman, 2007). While acknowledging the challenges in addressing institutional disparities, leaders can achieve change “if only in that a persistent and consistent
attempt to do so is in itself a powerful communication of challenge to inequity” (p. 122). Lumby and Coleman (2007) argue that a stance of permanent mindfulness and navigating uncomfortable realities requires moral courage and stamina on the part of institutional leaders and student alike.

2. A qualified, diverse pipeline of future administrative leaders is needed as a significant number of students from varying socio-cultural experiences are enrolling at theological institutions across the country. Importantly, as part of its sacred trust, “higher education must be a model for society in promoting equity, excellence and diversity” (Allen, 2005, p. 18). Christian theological higher education institutions have a unique contribution to make in promoting diversity and social justice in American higher education, the ecclesia, and society as part of their distinctive institutional missions. Increasingly, the importance of institutional leadership in developing a strong, sustainable commitment to diversity in higher education is recognized (Bowen, Kurzwell, & Tobin, 2005; Paredes-Collins, 2009; Smith, 2009). Despite real gains over the past decades, racial, ethnic, and gender disparities continue to persist in higher education. Disparities remain in boards of trustees (Association of Governing Board of Universities and Colleges, 2010; Fain, 2010), administrative leadership (Dominici, Fried, & Zeger, 2009; Gander, 2010; King & Gomez, 2008; Longman & Anderson, 2011; Longman & Lafreniere, 2012), faculty (Turner, González, & Wong, 2011; Turner, González, & Wood, 2008), and students (Bowen et al., 2005; Chang, Astin, & Kim, 2004; Darling-Hammond, 2010; Smith, 2009).
Moral Transformative Leadership

3. Institutional leadership at the executive level must be seen as an important factor in making progress in becoming a more diverse community. Participants at the three seminaries in this study indicated that if the executive leadership did not communicate the importance of these efforts, it was unlikely that their institutions would make progress. Key leaders need to build trust within their institutions and model the type of change they would like to see on their respective campuses. While the leadership of the seminary cannot do the work by itself, the leadership must take the lead! The balancing cannot be relegated to mid-level managers or lower level staff members; the struggle cannot be placed upon the shoulders of those who are from underrepresented population groups. Neither can the responsibility be given to the newest members of the community. Those who attempt to balance the competing tensions and increased stress must be persons with both the authority to support change and the community credibility that allows them to make difficult decisions as to how the dismantling process is to proceed and how the tensions are to be managed.

4. Seminaries need to broaden the conversation of what matters to their wider constituencies of church leaders, board members, students, and community leaders as was done at Peace Theological Seminary and UTS. The answers will be particular, exploring a particular theological tradition, context, and school – a particular story of mission – and the impact of theological education on that mission. How these differences are engaged and respected communicates much about how mission is practiced. Moreover, learning how diverse constituencies
use power to control and shape the agenda of theological education and its mission is critical.

Social Justice Praxis

5. Communicating the Benefits of Diversity. It is critical to understand the conditions needed within the institution for the benefits of diversity to be fully realized as part of the institution’s mission. The literature (Wheeler, 2002; Bowen, Kurzwell, & Tobin, 2005; Paredes-Collins, 2009; Smith, 2009) suggests that board governance and administrative structure plays a vital role in promoting excellence, diversity, and equity at an institution. While legal and institutional policy issues remain critical, the work of diversity as an enabler of institutional mission requires reframing diversity of thought, experience, and perspective as central to institutional mission and effectiveness, rather than programmatic or marginalized activity.

6. Monitoring Progress on Diversity. One of the practical implications for governing boards is in the area of monitoring progress on diversity. Ask the fundamental question: How do we know if we are making progress at an institutional level? Smith (2009) suggests three areas to consider in monitoring progress. The first is to understand the context and background for diversity on campus. What is the status of diversity on campus? What reports and data are currently available? As noted earlier, how is diversity reflected in the institution’s mission, vision, values, strategic plan, and policies? Does the institution have a theological statement on diversity? What level of transparency is there on diversity outcomes? What is the
institution’s history and progress with board diversity? Second is to ensure the institution has an overall framework with a set of indicators that will enable the board to monitor progress over time and learn from the experience. Third is developing a means for regular reporting, similar to the institution’s annual financial audit report. Increasingly, constituents and prospective students/parents expect transparency and reporting of institutional diversity outcomes (e.g., faculty diversity, board diversity, and disaggregated institutional graduation rates).

**Strategic Planning**

Within the institutions in this qualitative study, employing a diversity framework that can guide the institution with a sustainable approach to matters of diversity and social justice is missing. In my interactions with the administration, faculty, and students, there is an apparent seriousness in these diversity efforts. Yet these efforts seem to employ a traditional or temporal approach characterized by a reactionary dynamic. Damon A. Williams (2006) in his advocacy of a sustainable approach, mentions that “These types of incidents, as well as the growing frequency of racially themed campus parties, focus new energy on the tacit and explicit diversity challenges that an institution must address. These incidents are impossible for senior institutional leadership to ignore and often activate the diversity crisis model approach to planning and implementation” (p. 12). The major problem confronting institutions trying to enact inclusive learning and professional environments is not the lack of good ideas, but the inability to implement them successfully (Tierney 1999). Yet in many instances across the theological academy, these plans result in new senior administrative structures, more inclusive admissions
policies, and funding sources designed to enhance the campus climate for diversity-related teaching, learning, and research (Garcia et al. 1995). Too often, however, diversity plans produce changes that are superficial or isolated. As a result, high profile plans are quickly forgotten, shelved, or abandoned as the realities of implementation short-circuit the change process.

Although very little empirical work has been done on institutional change related to diversity (Peterson et al. 1978; Richardson and Skinner 1991; Siegel 1999), anecdotally, I know that static or narrowly construed plans prove to be less than effective in achieving comprehensive institutional diversity goals. The diversity crisis planning process often begins with a campus incident that brings new attention to campus diversity issues (Williams and Clowney 2007). This process usually involves stakeholder responses, a high-profile declaration of support from senior leadership, the commissioning of a planning group, deliberation and discussion by diversity planning teams, and the development of a diversity plan.

**Recommendations**

**Leadership for Social Justice**

1. Going Beyond a Traditional Approach. The encouragement here is to examine a model that goes beyond crisis to inclusive excellence: “Inclusive Excellence re-envision both quality and diversity. It reflects a striving for excellence in higher education that has been made more inclusive by decades of work to infuse diversity into recruiting, admissions, and hiring; into the curriculum and co-curriculum; and into administrative structures and practices” (Williams et al.,
It also embraces newer forms of excellence, and expanded ways to measure excellence, that take into account research on learning and brain functioning, the assessment movement, and more nuanced accountability structures. In the same way, diversity and inclusion efforts move beyond numbers of students or numbers of programs as end goals. Instead, they are multilayered processes through which we achieve excellence in learning; research and teaching; student development; institutional functioning; local and global community engagement; workforce development; and more.

2. Embrace and Cultivate Substantive Strategic Points. Even though diversity is often associated with equal opportunity and affirmative action employment and admissions policies, it is almost limitless in its definition and includes any number of identities. There are substantives strategic points why theological institutions need to be intentional in engaging matters of diversity and inclusion with social justice imperatives in a systemic fashion:

- Institutions of higher education continually interact with their environments and must respond to these dynamics if they are to remain viable when circumstances and trends change (Alfred, 2005).
- Disparities in race and ethnicity, where the haves and have-nots are more distinct and sharply structured along racial and ethnic lines than ever before, make it challenging for institutions of higher education to capitalize on increasing demographic diversity.
• Economic inequities especially impede access to and graduation from higher-
education institutions for many students of color (Massey & Denton, 1993).

The problem with meeting the challenges of the strategic points is that our
institutions often resist change (Aleshire, 2011, pg. 2). In the past, the response to
legitimate demands for effective diversity changes has been to ignore them;
respond only in the face of exigent legal forces; create change efforts that are
symbolic and lacking in human, financial, and technical resources; or leverage
new initiatives only when academic leaders are faced with powerful incidents of
campus unrest and social upheaval.

*Moral Transformative Leadership*

3. Creating a Decentralized Diversity Model. Damon A. Williams claims that “too
many diversity-planning efforts follow a reactive pattern that emerges when the
campus is disrupted by a diversity crisis. For many institutions, this is the only
time they engage in a serious conversation about campus diversity issues” (2006,
p. 2). However, because of the need for a rapid response, these efforts often lack
continuity and focus. Consequently, many institutional diversity initiatives are
largely symbolic and fail to deeply influence organizational culture and
institutional behavior (Williams, Berger, and McClendon 2005). Most diversity
planning efforts follow a similar reactive pattern (Figure 6) that often launches
from some type of disruption in the culture of the institution and, in many
instances, ends in less-than-meaningful change (Williams, 2006; Matlock, Wade-
Golden, & Monts, 2004). Consequently, many diversity plans are quickly shelved, because institutions fail to adequately explicate how change will happen over time (Williams, 2006). The process of implementing change rests at the center of the Inclusive Excellence Model of organizational diversity, and its propositions are outlined later in this study.

The diversity crisis model process usually involves stakeholder responses, a high-profile declaration of support from senior leadership, the commissioning of a planning group, deliberation and discussion by diversity planning teams, and the development of a diversity plan. What happens after the plan as developed is contingent on the institution’s seriousness and commitment to implementing a powerful and evolving diversity change project. Change is difficult in higher education, and if past performance is used as a guide, change to create diverse learning and professional environments is particularly hard. Consequently, senior leadership often receives diversity plans that have wonderful recommendations and analyses, but are less than clear when it comes to implementation strategy and the change management process. This may be one of the reasons why long delays often result once the plan has been developed, leading to superficial and incomplete diversity implementation efforts, particularly after the diversity crisis has been averted (Williams, 2007). In analyzing the interviews from my research that included the disclosure of incidents whereby reactions from the institutions were elicited from various levels within a traditional centralized approach, I support Damon A. Williams’ argument that a more powerful decentralized diversity-planning model (sustainable approach) should replace the diversity crisis
model (traditional approach) currently employed at many institutions. Damon A. Williams and Charmaine Clowney (2007, pgs. 3-7) provide the following overview of a typical Diversity Planning and Implementation Scheme in Higher Education that can serve as a foundation in evaluating and implementing particular models for diversity strategic planning. Figure 8 provides an overview of this eight phrase process.

**Figure 8**
(Phases of Diversity Planning and Implementation in Higher Education)

Phase 1: A campus incident or, in some cases, the hiring of new senior leadership interrupts the nor-mal process of diversity activity on campus. Some typical actions might be a racial or sexual assault on campus, a hate crime, activity of insensitivity, or an embarrassing statement made by senior leadership regarding some issue of diversity (2007, pg.3).
Phase 2: As a result of the event in Phase 1 an internal and external stakeholder response is galvanized from some combination of students, faculty, staff, parents, government officials, alumni, governing boards, and others (2007, pg.3).

Phase 3: Often, the response in Phase 2 leads to a series of campus protests and demands made to senior leadership for diversity changes. This phase may feature high-level local, regional, and national media involvement, escalating the pace of change (2007, pg.3).

Phase 4: In response to the demands made in Phase 3, the president, provost, or some other senior academic leader makes a symbolic statement regarding the institution’s support of diversity. This may take the form of a letter to the community, a press release, or a lecture presented to the entire campus community (2007, pg.4).

Phase 5: Senior leadership commissions a planning group or task force to examine issues of diversity, inclusion, and climate on campus (2007, pg.4).

Phase 6: Deliberation and discussion regarding campus diversity issues take place. Data are analyzed, forums are conducted, and peer institutions are benchmarked to develop a set of institutional diversity recommendations (2007, pg.4).

Phase 7: The campus diversity plan often includes recommendations to (1) increase the diversity of the student, faculty, staff, and administrative bodies; (2) improve the campus climate for all members of the community; (3) establish a senior or chief diversity officer (CDO) role to guide the institutional change effort
and “hold people accountable”; and (4) implement diversity training and education programs for students, faculty, and staff (2007, pg.4).

Phase 8: After the plan is written, the process follows a similar pattern for many institutions: The diversity committee makes a presentation to the president, board, faculty senate, or some other governing body. The president or, in some instances, the provost then makes a broad public statement about the importance of diversity that appears as splashy columns in the university, student, local, and perhaps national newspapers announcing the new plan. (2007, pg.4)

4. Establishing a Diversity Planning Cycle. In agreement with Damon A. Williams, I propose a three-year diversity planning cycle, because it is long enough to allow for implementation of a meaningful project, but not so long that participants will lose sight of the original charge. The higher education literature on organizational culture and change suggests that transformative change may take as long as 10 to 15 years to achieve (Simsek and Louis 1994). Consequently, a one-time cycle is probably not enough, and the planning and implementation process should continue for several years (Cox 2001). This type of ongoing initiative requires an institutional commitment that can overcome changes in leadership and is anchored in the institution’s mission, values, and overarching strategic documents (Williams, Berger, and McClendon 2005; Williams and Clowney 2007). In short, the proposed diversity planning process should be positioned as one subcomponent of the strategic planning cycle for the entire institution. Table 4 is an adaptation of Damon A. Williams’ decentralized model for Diversity Planning and Implementation. This model can be adapted to the world of the theological
academy based on the premise that many of these institutions are smaller, and its infrastructure is not as vast as a secular institution of higher education.

### Table 4: Diversity Planning and Implementation Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Social Justice Imperatives</th>
<th>Institutional Vitality and Viability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>The diversity planning process is launched with a powerful launch letter from the president; creation of a theological statement of diversity; nomination of an executive diversity steering group; and events and activities designed to focus attention to the seriousness of the diversity change effort as a meaningful and high-profile institutional priority</td>
<td>Leadership for Social Justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2: Creating the Diversity Planning Team</td>
<td>The deans from each department nominates a member for his/her area to form part of the Diversity Planning Team</td>
<td>Moral Transformative Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3: Establishing Readiness</td>
<td>A series of readiness activities is implemented by the diversity planning team. Readiness activities are also implemented for the entire seminary community</td>
<td>Social Justice Praxis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4: Establishing a Culture of Evidence</td>
<td>This includes establishing a culture of evidence to track progress during the change journey, examining the diversity challenge; leveraging a confluence of quantitative and qualitative data that will establish whether important benchmarks are met, and tracking change</td>
<td>Strategies being employed to address diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 5: Writing the Diversity Plan</td>
<td>The diversity plan should have some common elements but not limited to a statement of the challenge; indicators for success; and recommendations in the areas</td>
<td>Increasing the racial/ethnic &amp; gender diversity of student, faculty, administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Phase 6: Reviewing the Plan</td>
<td>After the diversity plan is written, the executive cabinet will review it and provide recommendations to the president, who will then issue recommendations for further revision or move directly to implementation.</td>
<td>Centralization of diversity in the mission and planning process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Phase 7: Implementing the Plan</td>
<td>The plan will be developed through the efforts of a seminary-wide task force on diversity or Diversity Council. This Diversity Council would be responsible to the President. This Diversity Council will be composed of faculty, students, administrators and trustee members</td>
<td>Leadership for Social Justice Social Justice Praxis Institutional Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Phase 8: Reviewing Quality</td>
<td>A one-year diversity progress report is developed by the Diversity Council that details the progress made during the first year of implementation. This report is provided to the president, board of trustees.</td>
<td>Moral-Transformative Leadership Monitoring diversity work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>Phase 9: Evolving the Implementation</td>
<td>The continuing implementation effort may be refined based on the results of Phase 8 and further technical assistance. In addition, a major event may be held to bring new energy to the implementation’s next cycle.</td>
<td>Social Justice Praxis Perceptions and involvement of the public and other constituents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>Phase 10: Reviewing Accountability – Assessment and Celebrating Successes</td>
<td>Each goal is reviewed and assessed based upon the progress in implementing the diversity plan. This assessment will be one measure used to determine efficiency and relevance.</td>
<td>Leadership for Social Justice Strategies being employed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Examining the Inclusive Excellence Model. According to Williams and Clowney, “nationally, a conversation is building regarding the development of a powerful diversity change process that the Association of American Colleges and Universities refers to as the Inclusive Excellence Model. The language and tenets of the Inclusive Excellence Model are under consideration and at some level of implementation at San Jose State University, the University of Akron, Wesleyan University, Winona State University, the University of Connecticut, the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education (PASSHE), St. John’s Fisher College, and others” (2007, pg. 7). Although implemented differently across each of these institutions, the Inclusive Excellence Model is grounded in the following six core assumptions which include elements of the social justice imperatives described in this study:

- Political and legal dynamics, changing demographics, the emergence of the knowledge economy, and persistent inequalities create the strategic context for a diversity rationale.
- Diversity is an important institutional resource that should be enhanced, institutionalized, and leveraged toward the goal of institutional excellence.
- Focus needs to be on ensuring student intellectual and social development and offering the best possible educational environment for all students, irrespective of identity and background.
• Organization resources need to be used strategically to ensure that a diverse student body achieves academically at high levels and that those on campus who contribute to that goal are acknowledged and rewarded.

• Attention needs to be paid to the cultural differences that learners bring to the educational experience, and it must be recognized that these differences are to be used in the service of learning for all students.

• The intentional study of topics such as race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, power, privilege, and the interdisciplinary nature of these topics and others advances the strength of the academy and better situates postsecondary and theological institutions to address emerging challenges and dynamics presented by our evolving environmental context.

• The Inclusive Excellence Model combines aspects of the models mentioned in the next page of this study and frames the diversity and inclusion journey as an intentional effort to change institutional culture. It is a philosophy designed to activate a combination of strategic levers for changing strategy, organizational structure, human performance enhancement programs, reward systems, and processes of the institution (Galbraith, 2002).

The other models that can be examined are the Affirmative Action and Equity Model (Williams & Clowney, 2007, pg. 4), which was developed to eliminate overt barriers of exclusion to higher education and increase the numbers of minorities, women and other protected groups enrolled in and working on college and university campuses (Washington & Harvey, 1989). The Multicultural Model,
follows the integrationist ideology of the Affirmative Action and Equity Model flowed from legal and political rulings and focused on breaking down barriers to full participation in U.S. society. By comparison, the Multicultural Model flowed from the cultural politics of the 1960s and 1970s and is anchored in the ideology of Black Power and similar nationalist cultural movements such as the Chicano, Native American, and women’s movements (Hale, 2004; Ogbar, 2005; Peterson, Blackburn, & Gamson, 1978; Smith & Wolf-Wendel, 2005; Wilson, 2005). These movements focused on the expression of political ideas and, for many, embracing ethnic or identity-specific values, politics, traditions, cultures, and behavior (Ogbar, 2005). The Academic Diversity Model, is grounded in theories of cognitive and social psychology. The Academic Diversity Model argues that the discontinuities associated with diverse educational environments are essential to enhancing the relational and cognitive abilities of all students (Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002). The model is distinctive from previous models be-cause of the intentional way that diversity is framed as important for whites and students of color, not because of the need to fulfill a moral or social obligation, but for educational purposes (Chang et al., 2005; Gurin et al., 2002; Milem, Chang, & Lisling, 2005).

6. Incorporating a Diversity Action Blueprint. In order to substantiate the aforementioned diversity models that can elicit indicators from a diversity framework with social justice imperatives, a Diversity Action Blueprint is highly recommended. By establishing a systemic approach that incorporates all levels of the institution, the driver for such initiatives is guided by a practice that is not
reactionary and peripheral to the overall activities of the institution. A Diversity Action Plan provides a sustainable framework based on critical dimensions of diversity and is organized with specific goals, objectives, strategies, timelines, responsible parties, and assessment protocols over a three-five year period. This document will provide a comprehensive set of strategies to assist the seminary community as it works toward an institutional environment that goes beyond managing diversity to one that values and capitalizes on diversity in all areas.

7. Assessment Protocols. The final component of the practical recommendations for change is *assessment*. Assessment enables an institution to identify if and how it is moving forward on various diversity initiatives. Institutions should establish strategic goals with performance indicators and implement monitoring practices and measurement mechanisms so that progress can be assessed, and areas in need of improvement can be identified. Beyond strategic goals, student-learning outcomes should be created in the areas of diversity and spirituality. Learning outcomes explicitly state what students are expected to learn after completing an activity, course, or degree program. For example, a student learning outcome related to diversity could denote that students can engage in a multicultural society, interact respectably with diverse others, and develop a global perspective. Institutions should also assess the climate for diversity on campus through quantitative surveys and qualitative focus groups. It would be helpful for institutions to develop a comprehensive integration plan for communicating the value of diversity in courses, co-curricular activities, faculty development opportunities, chapel programs, new student orientation, and other settings.
utilized to communicate institutional priorities. Although such cultural shifts will not be without challenges, the benefits of a diverse learning community where all students feel as if they are valued members far outweigh the cost.

It is important that the institution creates a set of strategies that span different areas of campus functioning, using a diversity framework in this task, as in goal-setting. Strategies can build on previous efforts, expanding or amending them so that they will have increased impact, or they may be adapted from practices that have been successful on other campuses.

**Conclusion**

What are the benefits of promoting increased engagement with diversity through the curriculum, campus climate, and policies affecting students and staff in theological higher education? The biblical image of the great banquet highlights the importance of diversity—a banquet open to strangers, concretely sharing the gifts of the table, and expecting fulfillment. The commitment to diversity honors Christians seeking to live faithfully within their situations. The commitment honors the impulse in Christian faith to witness and evangelism. The commitment expands the content of historical, theological, and practical scholarship available to theological education. Too often our excuses and our guilt get in the way of risking new practices of hiring, of enhancing the ways we nurture and affirm our colleagues, and of reaching out to learn more about how the faith is concretely lived and practiced in various communities. This study *can* be a challenge to begin to converse openly and genuinely within the constituencies of the theological
academy about the missional claim and vision reflected in the call for diversity. It can also be a challenge to invite and support persons to become colleagues, leaders, confidants and friends as we prepare to serve vocations where undoubtedly we all will confront the stranger, the outcast, those who have and those who have nothing.

Ministry is the active response to God’s call. Christian ministry is more than simply feeling good. Rather, it is something that Christ does in us and through us and that we do in and through Christ. We act not on our own but on the authority of God who calls us. Jesus said, “You did not choose me, but I chose you. And I appointed you to go and bear fruit, fruit that will last . . .” (John 15:16). The focus on diversity is faithful to the methods of historical theology. It enlivens the communities that witness to God’s action in Jesus and their efforts to make their faith real in their context. Therefore, learning the practices of the people of God as they seek to be faithful is a key task in the preparation for ministry and this study can serve as an instrument to provide a framework for healthy dialogue.
CHAPTER SIX: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Change is an ongoing moving target. It is hard to maintain our institutions evolving toward a renewed capacity to serve, at a pace that connects to the new and developing social context while maintaining our steadfastness of purpose. Nevertheless, I have confidence in outcomes-based assessment to gauge the relevance of the degree programs that flow from the identity and mission of the theological academy. Through this study, I recognize that the trajectory of theology is changing, most especially as it serves faith communities. Biblical studies, theology, and theological reflection on the practices of ministry, all stalwarts of a theological curriculum, will be increasingly impacted by interdisciplinary approaches that will incorporate attention to the social, human and natural sciences.

I have found that most seminaries already embody forms of diverse cultures. The culture of denominational affiliation is present; the faculty shares an academic culture with varied expectations; the practices and perspectives of academic research define what methods are taught and what content is important. Members of the board of trustees presumably demonstrate the culture of the church, or a part of it while exercising the culture of the business world. How these differences are encountered and embraced communicates much about how mission is practiced. Moreover, learning how diverse constituencies implement the power to control and shape the trajectory of theological education and its mission is critical.

According to the ATS Folio (2011, pg. 3) “Christian unity must be established and sustained in the classroom setting and in common life together. The theological academy can become a welcoming environment for students of all backgrounds by
encouraging loving sensitivity to one another’s needs and by inviting all members of the Seminary to contribute their unique gifts to community and academic life.” In addition, the cultivation of a diverse community that is united in Christ is essential for preparing women and men for ministry in a multicultural and global society that is often divided by prejudice and inequality. The theological academy can train pastors, academicians, social service providers, missionaries, Christian educators, community organizers, etc., for this difficult task by modeling unity through a sustainable diversity framework of vitality and viability that incorporates social justice imperatives at all levels of the institution.

Further Research Opportunities

One of the challenges of thinking through what theological institutions have to say about diversity is the fact that the very notion of diversity, especially regarding race, is epistemologically, analytically, and empirically malleable. The relationship between the institution and its respective denomination is an area that needs to be further explored. In the case of Joy Theological Seminary, the affiliated denomination was seen as a driver for diversity efforts. A factor could be that, for many denominations, their majority White congregations are decreasing in number. Denominations and their institutions should partner in identifying how this relationship can work so that both entities can make progress in this area.

An additional area for further research is how ethnic diversity is defined based on geographic region of the country. For many of the participants at Peace Theological Seminary, ethnic diversity was viewed as a Black versus White issue when the demographic shifts in the area was majority Latino(a). This was not the case at the other
institutions. Additional research could be conducted at institutions that have a president who is seen as a leader in this area and how trustees at these institutions empower the leader to have the freedom to lead.

Finally, further research should be done concerning how theological institutions do or do not support members of their communities who are gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender. Practical steps such as the review of core institutional documents, review of institutional diversity data, and board education are important ways governing boards can partner with presidents in advancing diversity at an institutional level. I encourage scholars to explore further ways to support research that advances understanding, theory, and practice on diversity-related social justice, board governance, and institutional leadership, specifically in the context of theological higher education.

Conclusions

For theological higher education institutions, the distinctive mission and biblical mandate of justice serves as a compelling rationale for promoting diversity, equity, and inclusive excellence. This research challenged me to think deeply about the nexus of diversity and social justice. Micah 6:6–8 continues to call us to the work at hand in our respective institutions as we seek “to do justice, love mercy, and walk humbly with your God.” While more questions surfaced than conclusions, the study supports my basic premise that strong institutional leadership is needed for theological institutions to embrace diversity and realize social justice imperatives as an integral part of their mission, institutional values, and ethos. I believe the distinctive mission of theological institutions and biblical/theological foundations are tremendous assets that can be
cultivated and developed in new ways to address the emerging diversity-related 
challenges facing our institutions. The complexity and significance of these challenges 
shifts diversity from a programmatic emphasis to a “systemic, institutional agenda” 
demanding a completely new level of thinking and transformation of our institutions.

Every tribe, tongue, and nation are noted as surrounding the throne of God in 
Revelation 7:9, which is an indication that diversity is by God’s design. Theological 
institutions have a compelling interest, and perhaps even a mandate to navigate diversity 
responsibly within certain social justice imperatives that represent the imago-Dei (the 
image of God) on earth as it is in heaven.

The research presented here can create the discourse necessary to stress the 
importance of starting with mission and theology, acknowledging the tension that exists, 
and recognizing the importance of monitoring and coordinating sustainable efforts 
beyond people and programs, helping institutions navigate diversity by integrating social 
justice imperatives within a viable conceptual framework of vitality and viability.
APPENDIX A: SAMPLE ASSOCIATION OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Introduction

You have been invited to speak with me today because you have been identified as someone who has a great deal to share about matters of diversity, inclusion, and social justice on this campus. My research project as a whole focuses on the development of diversity and inclusion at all levels of the institution in a framework of social justice. I am trying to examine the intersection of diversity practices and the concepts of social justice in the context of mission and its implementation in the theological academy. Particular interest is focused on understanding how faculty, students, and administrators in the theological academy are engaged in this activity, and whether we can begin to develop models of inclusion and equity across institutional lines while making a difference in theological education. With a deeper understanding of the issues confronted by leadership of the theological academy in relating to matters of diversity in a social justice framework, this study will be a qualitative exploration of the desire, motivation and challenges institutions face in becoming more relevant in a pluralistic and multicultural society.

Introductory Protocol

To facilitate note-taking, I would like to audio tape our conversations today. Please sign the release form. For your information, only researchers on the project will be privy to the tapes, which will be eventually destroyed after they are transcribed. In addition, you must sign a form devised to meet our Informed Consent Form. Essentially, this document states that: (1) all information will be held confidential, (2) your participation is voluntary and you may stop at any time if you feel uncomfortable, and (3) we do not intend to inflict any harm. Thank you for your agreeing to participate.

I have planned this interview to last no longer than one hour. During this time, I have several questions that I would like to cover. If time begins to run short, it may be necessary to interrupt you in order to push ahead and complete this line of questioning.

My central research questions are:

1. What are the practices for linking diversity to theological convictions of social justice?

2. Where is the evidence of these practices for linking diversity in the mission statements to the curriculum and in the campus climate?

3. How can institutions committed to cultivating institutional diversity transform so that all students might thrive during their studies, become well prepared to enter their vocation and profession as educators, chaplains, pastors,
missionaries, community organizers, and be equipped to integrate into their teaching the quotidien issues that our societies face?

A. Interviewee Background
How long have you been at this institution: ___________________, _______ in your present position?

B. Interesting Background Information on Interviewee
What is your highest degree? ________________________________

What is your field of study? ________________________________

1. Briefly describe your role (office, committee, classroom, etc.) as it relates to student learning and assessment (if appropriate).

2. How can faculty transform the campus into healthy and respectful communities and promote the core values of the institution?

3. Is conflict an occasion for institutional growth, and if diversity might lead to conflict, why embrace it in the first place?

4. What are some of the characteristics of your understanding of social justice within a theological framework?

5. What are the characteristics of an environment that promotes healthy inclusivity in a framework of social justice?

6. What are the common themes in the literature and research on preparing leaders for social justice?

7. How can this framework serve as a guide for developing a course, set of courses, or an entire program toward preparing leaders to lead socially just ministries?

8. While increasing the numbers of minority faculty and training regular faculty, students, and staff in anti-racism and multicultural skills, what more might be done to increase the recruitment, admission, and retention of students of color?

9. Are there any particular characteristics that you associate with faculty who are interested in innovative teaching/learning initiatives in the areas of diversity and inclusion?

10. What types of faculty development opportunities do you see emerging on your campus that focus on teaching and learning strategies for a diverse classroom? (Institutional or disciplinary?)
Appendix B: Sample Student Interview Protocol

Introduction
You have been selected to speak with me today because you have been identified as someone who has a great deal to share about matters of diversity, inclusion, and social justice on this campus. My research project as a whole focuses on the development of diversity and inclusion at all levels of the institution in a framework of social justice. I am trying to examine the intersection of diversity practices and the concepts of social justice in the context of mission and its implementation in the theological academy. Particular interest is focused on understanding how faculty, students, and administrators in the theological academy are engaged in this activity, and whether we can begin to develop models of inclusion and equity across institutional lines while making a difference in theological education. With a deeper understanding of the issues confronted by leadership of the theological academy in relating to matters of diversity in a social justice framework, this study will be a qualitative exploration of the desire, motivation and challenges institutions face in becoming more relevant in a pluralistic and multicultural society.

Introductory Protocol
To facilitate note-taking, I would like to audio tape our conversations today. Please sign the release form. For your information, only researchers on the project will be privy to the tapes, which will be eventually destroyed after they are transcribed. In addition, you must sign a form devised to meet our Informed Consent Form. Essentially, this document states that: (1) all information will be held confidential, (2) your participation is voluntary and you may stop at any time if you feel uncomfortable, and (3) we do not intend to inflict any harm. Thank you for your agreeing to participate.

I have planned this interview to last no longer than one hour. During this time, I have several questions that I would like to cover. If time begins to run short, it may be necessary to interrupt you in order to push ahead and complete this line of questioning.

My central research questions are:

1. What are the practices for linking diversity to theological convictions of social justice?

2. Where is the evidence of these practices for linking diversity in the mission statements to the curriculum and in the campus climate?

3. How can institutions committed to cultivating institutional diversity transform so that all students might thrive during their studies, become well prepared to enter their vocation and profession as educators, chaplains, pastors, missionaries, community organizers, and be equipped to integrate into their teaching the quotidian issues that our societies face?
A. Interviewee Background
How long have you been at this institution_______________________, _______ in your present position? _______ at this institution?

B. Interesting Background Information on Interviewee
What is your highest degree? ___________________________________________

What is/are your vocational interests? ____________________

1. Briefly describe your experiences as they relate to issues of diversity and inclusion prior to your enrollment at this institution?

2. Briefly describe your experiences thus far as to your engagement in matters of diversity and inclusion on campus.

3. How can students transform the campus into healthy and respectful communities and promote the core values of the institution?

4. In what ways may the student body unintentionally contribute to the problems the institutions as a whole is trying to solve in matters of diversity, inclusion, and equity of resources for all matters of institutional life.

5. What are the characteristics of an environment that promotes inclusiveness and cultural proficiency?

6. Can members of different groups find common ground in addressing today’s campus challenges as they relate to matters of diversity?

7. What skills and understandings are needed to provide leadership on these issues on campus and in the larger community?

8. What are some of the characteristics of your understanding of social justice within a theological framework?

9. What are the characteristics of an environment that promotes healthy inclusivity in a framework of social justice?

10. What types of efforts in the institution’s mission structure and strategic plan are being made to facilitate change in the area of diversity in relation to matters of race, racism, sexism, and other forms of oppressive social ills?

11. Are there factors in the institution’s curriculum and administrative practices that either hinder or help change in the area of diversity and inclusion? If so, can you name a few and provide reasons?
APPENDIX C: SAMPLE ADMINISTRATION INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Introduction
You have been selected to speak with me today because you have been identified as someone who has a great deal to share about matters of diversity, inclusion, and social justice on this campus. My research project as a whole focuses on the development of diversity and inclusion at all levels of the institution in a framework of social justice. I am trying to examine the intersection of diversity practices and the concepts of social justice in the context of mission and its implementation in the theological academy. Particular interest is focused on understanding how faculty, students, and administrators in the theological academy are engaged in this activity, and whether we can begin to develop models of inclusion and equity across institutional lines while making a difference in theological education. With a deeper understanding of the issues confronted by leadership of the theological academy in relating to matters of diversity in a social justice framework, this study will be a qualitative exploration of the desire, motivation and challenges institutions face in becoming more relevant in a pluralistic and multicultural society.

Introductory Protocol
To facilitate note-taking, I would like to audio tape our conversations today. Please sign the release form. For your information, only researchers on the project will be privy to the tapes, which will be eventually destroyed after they are transcribed. In addition, you must sign a form devised to meet our Informed Consent Form. Essentially, this document states that: (1) all information will be held confidential, (2) your participation is voluntary and you may stop at any time if you feel uncomfortable, and (3) we do not intend to inflict any harm. Thank you for your agreeing to participate.

I have planned this interview to last no longer than one hour. During this time, I have several questions that I would like to cover. If time begins to run short, it may be necessary to interrupt you in order to push ahead and complete this line of questioning.

My central research questions are:

1. What are the practices for linking diversity to theological convictions of social justice?

2. Where is the evidence of these practices for linking diversity in the mission statements to the curriculum and in the campus climate?

3. How can institutions committed to cultivating institutional diversity transform so that all students might thrive during their studies, become well prepared to enter their vocation and profession as educators, chaplains, pastors, missionaries, community organizers, and be equipped to integrate into their teaching the quotidian issues that our societies face?
A. Interviewee Background
How long have you been an administrator? ________, _______ in your present position? _______ at this institution?

B. Interesting Background Information on Interviewee
What is your highest degree? ________________________________________________________________________

What is your administrative role? ________________________________________________________________________

1. Briefly describe your role (office, committee, classroom, etc.) as it relates to student learning and assessment (if appropriate).

2. How can administration transform the campus into healthy and respectful communities and promote the core values of the institution?

3. In what ways may administration unintentionally contribute to the problems the institutions as a whole is trying to solve in matters of diversity, inclusion, and equity of resources for all matters of institutional life.

4. What are some of the characteristics of your understanding of social justice within a theological framework?

5. What are the characteristics of an environment that promotes healthy inclusivity in a framework of social justice?

6. Can your institution assess its own history regarding diversity and use that history in a helpful way that is supportive of the hiring and retention of faculty and administrators of color?

7. Are there the personal and institutional resources in your school to effect, over time, the kind and depth of changes that occurred at this school?

8. What types of efforts in the institution’s mission structure and strategic plan are being made to facilitate change in the area of diversity in relation to matters of race, racism, sexism, and other forms of oppressive social ills?

9. Are there any particular characteristics that you associate with administration who are interested in innovative professional development initiatives in the areas of diversity and inclusion?

10. Are there factors in the institution’s or denomination’s history that either hinder or help change in the area of diversity and inclusion?
APPENDIX D: SAMPLE FACULTY INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Introduction
You have been invited to speak with me today because you have been identified as someone who has a great deal to share about matters of diversity, inclusion, and social justice on this campus. My research project as a whole focuses on the development of diversity and inclusion at all levels of the institution in a framework of social justice. I am trying to examine the intersection of diversity practices and the concepts of social justice in the context of mission and its implementation in the theological academy. Particular interest is focused on understanding how faculty, students, and administrators in the theological academy are engaged in this activity, and whether we can begin to develop models of inclusion and equity across institutional lines while making a difference in theological education. With a deeper understanding of the issues confronted by leadership of the theological academy in relating to matters of diversity in a social justice framework, this study will be a qualitative exploration of the desire, motivation and challenges institutions face in becoming more relevant in a pluralistic and multicultural society.

Introductory Protocol
To facilitate note-taking, I would like to audio tape our conversations today. Please sign the release form. For your information, only researchers on the project will be privy to the tapes, which will be eventually destroyed after they are transcribed. In addition, you must sign a form devised to meet our Informed Consent Form. Essentially, this document states that: (1) all information will be held confidential, (2) your participation is voluntary and you may stop at any time if you feel uncomfortable, and (3) we do not intend to inflict any harm. Thank you for your agreeing to participate.

I have planned this interview to last no longer than one hour. During this time, I have several questions that I would like to cover. If time begins to run short, it may be necessary to interrupt you in order to push ahead and complete this line of questioning.

My central research questions are:

1. What are the practices for linking diversity to theological convictions of social justice?

2. Where is the evidence of these practices for linking diversity in the mission statements to the curriculum and in the campus climate?

3. How can institutions committed to cultivating institutional diversity transform so that all students might thrive during their studies, become well prepared to enter their vocation and profession as educators, chaplains, pastors, missionaries, community organizers, and be equipped to integrate into their teaching the quotidian issues that our societies face?
A. Interviewee Background
How long have you been at this institution: ___________________, _______ in your present position?

B. Interesting Background Information on Interviewee
What is your highest degree? ___________________________________________
What is your field of study? ____________________________________________

1. Briefly describe your role (office, committee, classroom, etc.) as it relates to student learning and assessment (if appropriate).

2. How can faculty transform the campus into healthy and respectful communities and promote the core values of the institution?

3. In what ways may faculty unintentionally contribute to the problems the institutions as a whole is trying to solve in matters of diversity, inclusion, and equity of resources for all matters of institutional life.

4. What are some of the characteristics of your understanding of social justice within a theological framework?

5. What are the characteristics of an environment that promotes healthy inclusivity in a framework of social justice?

6. What are the common themes in the literature and research on preparing leaders for social justice?

7. How can this framework serve as a guide for developing a course, set of courses, or an entire program toward preparing leaders to lead socially just ministries?

8. What types of efforts in curriculum development are being made to facilitate change in the area of diversity in relation to matters of race, racism, sexism, and other forms of oppressive social ills?

9. Are there any particular characteristics that you associate with faculty who are interested in innovative teaching/learning initiatives in the areas of diversity and inclusion?

10. What types of faculty development opportunities do you see emerging on your campus that focus on teaching and learning strategies for a diverse classroom? (Institutional or disciplinary?)

11. Could this school be compromising academic freedom to support its commitments to institutional justice and the students’ ministerial formation?
Cover Letter

Introduction and Purpose of Interview

I am a doctoral candidate in the Doctorate of Education in Higher Education Administration at the University of Pennsylvania’s Graduate School of Education. I am in the process of writing my doctoral dissertation and am collecting data for that purpose. For my doctoral dissertation I am very interested in examining the intersection of diversity practices and the concepts of social justice in the context of mission and its implementation in the theological academy, particularly in three member schools of the Association of Theological Schools (ATS). Additionally I am interested in exploring new and effective pathways in advancing social justice as a compelling rationale and powerful enabler of institutional mission.

The purpose of this letter is to ask for your assistance in participating in this research through a one-hour conversation with me. The title of the research is “Navigating Diversity: Integrating Social Justice In Mission Development and Implementation in Theological Institutions.” The following is a Consent Form from the University of Pennsylvania’s Graduate School of Education. Please ask any questions that you have about participating in this project at any time. I want you to have the information you need to make a decision that is best for you.

University of Pennsylvania Informed Consent Form

Contact: Victor Aloyo, Jr.,
36 Stony Path Drive
Dayton, NJ 08810
609.462.1460
vic27jr@gmail.com.

You are being asked to take part in a research study. This is not a form of treatment or therapy. It is not supposed to detect a disease or find something wrong. Your participation is voluntary which means you can choose whether or not to participate. If you decide to participate or not to participate there will be no loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Before you make a decision you will need to know the purpose of the study, the possible risks and benefits of being in the study and what you will have to do if you decide to participate. If you do not understand what you are reading, do not sign it. Please ask the researcher to explain anything you do not understand, including any language contained in this form. If you decide to participate, you will be asked to sign this form and a copy will be given to you. Keep this form, in it you will find contact information and answers to questions about the study. You may ask to have this form read to you.
What is the purpose of the study? The purpose of the study is to examine the intersection of diversity practices and the concepts of social justice in the context of mission and its implementation in the theological academy, particularly in three member schools of the Association of Theological Schools (ATS). Additionally I am interested in exploring new and effective pathways in advancing social justice as a compelling rationale and powerful enabler of institutional mission. This study is being conducted to fulfill the dissertation requirement for a Doctorate in Higher Education Administration from the University of Pennsylvania’s Graduate School of Education.

You will be asked to participate in an interview, which will focus on your experiences of diversity and social justice at your institution. Interviews will be tape recorded and transcribed, and the audiotapes and transcriptions will be kept in a secure location. All publications and presentations will ensure your confidentiality.

RISKS AND BENEFITS: There are no anticipated risks associated with this study. As a participant of this study, you may request to receive a copy of the summary findings upon completion of this project. Upon your consent this interview will be audio taped. The audiotape will be transcribed for research purposes, but will never be played for any audience other than the researchers directly involved in the project. Upon completion of the project audiotapes will be erased. Your participation in this research will take approximately sixty minutes and follow-up interviews or telephone conversations may be conducted as needed. You will be invited to review the interview transcript and make corrections. Although your assistance is greatly appreciated, there will be no payment for your participation.

If you have read this form and have decided to participate in this project, please understand that your participation is voluntary and you have the right to withdraw your consent or discontinue participation at any time without penalty. You have the right to refuse to answer particular questions. Your individual privacy will be maintained in all published and written data resulting from the study. If you have questions about your rights as a study participant, or are dissatisfied at any time with any aspect of this study, you may contact anonymously, if you wish, the Office of Regulatory Affairs with any question, concerns or complaints at the University of Pennsylvania by calling 215.898.2614.

I give consent to be audio taped during this study; please initial: ___Yes ___No. The extra copy of this consent form is for you to keep.

Signature: ________________________  Date___________________

Print Name_____________________.
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APPENDIX F: REQUEST LETTER TO THE THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTION

Dear ,

I am a doctoral candidate in the Doctorate of Education in Higher Education Administration at the University of Pennsylvania’s Graduate School of Education. I am in the process of writing my doctoral dissertation and am collecting data for that purpose. For my doctoral dissertation I am very interested in examining the intersection of diversity practices and the concepts of social justice in the context of mission and its implementation in the theological academy, particularly in three member schools of the Association of Theological Schools (ATS). Additionally I am interested in exploring new and effective pathways in advancing social justice as a compelling rationale and powerful enabler of institutional mission.

The purpose of this letter is to ask for your assistance in identifying 10 second-year students from various racial backgrounds and equal gender representation, as well as five faculty and three administrators to participate in this research. It is my understanding that these participants are inundated with their particular responsibilities, yet I only wish to take one-hour of their time for a qualitative interview approach. Once the participants have been identified, an appropriate Informed Consent Form will be used with an accompanying letter detailing the scope of the study and the questions involved. Please be assured that confidentiality of the responses shared by all the participants will be honored AND only researchers on the project will be privy to the tapes, which will be eventually destroyed after they are transcribed. The names of the participants will be disguised to protect their privacy and to ensure that they feel comfortable in sharing their experiences with me.

Your assistance and prompt response will be greatly appreciated. Thank you in considering this request. If I can respond to any question please do not hesitate to contact me at 609.688.1943 or vic27jr@gmail.com.

Respectfully,

Victor Aloyo, Jr.
Ed.D. Candidate in Higher Education Administration
University of Pennsylvania
Graduate School of Education
APPENDIX G: DIVERSITY TERMS

The following glossary is an introduction and an educational resource provided by The National Multicultural Institute.

A.

Ableism (n.): Discrimination against persons with mental and/or physical disabilities and/or social structures that favor able-bodied individuals.

Achievement Gap (n.): A term used to describe a persistent trend in the U.S. educational system in which white students achieve greater academic success than students of color. This term can also refer to the gap between girls’ and boys’ academic achievement.

Acculturation (n.): The process of learning and incorporating the language, values, beliefs, and behaviors that make up a distinct culture. This concept is not to be confused with assimilation, where an individual, family, or group may give up certain aspects of its culture in order to adapt to that of their new host country.

Affinity Group (n): Also known as employee networks, or employee-resource groups, affinity groups are groups of people who share a common interest. These entities can support organizational and business objectives by serving as liaisons between a company and the community.

Affirmative Action (n): Proactive measures for remedying the effect of past discrimination and ensuring the implementation of equal employment and educational opportunities. Affirmative action is undertaken only for certain protected groups of individuals: Females, blacks, Latinos/Hispanics, Asians, American Indians, people with disabilities, and covered veterans.

African American (n): Of or related to African Americans. The U.S. Census Bureau defines black or African American as “people having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa. It includes people who indicated their race or races as ‘black, African American, or Negro’ or wrote in entries such as ‘African American,’ ‘Afro American,’ ‘Nigerian,’ or ‘Haitian.’ According to Census 2000, African Americans make up approximately 12.3% of the total U.S. population, and 12.9% of persons of mixed race.

Ageism (n): Discrimination against individuals because of their age, often based on stereotypes (e.g. senior citizens are not able to perform tasks such as driving, or all young people are irresponsible).

American Indian Movement (AIM) (n.): AIM was founded in 1968 by Dennis Banks, Clyde Bellecourt, and George Miller, three American Indian activists who brought together other activists in their communities to combat issues such as police brutality, slum housing, high unemployment, the neglect of Indian education, discrimination and the government treatment of Indian affairs and relations. The Movement also focused on the importance of protecting treaty rights and preserving the culture of Native peoples.
Alaska Natives (n.): Aboriginal peoples of Alaska, including American Indians, Eskimo, and Aluet peoples. Eskimo people, also called Inuit, are racially distinct from American Indians and are more closely related to peoples of East Asia.

Alien (n.): The United States Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services define an alien as “any person not a citizen or national of the United States.” However, many people take offense at the use of this term because it places emphasis on difference. Preferable terms might be “immigrant” or “refugee,” and for those who have entered the United States illegally, “undocumented workers” as opposed to “illegal aliens.”

Amerasian (n.): A term that refers to individuals born in Asian countries whose biological father is a U.S. citizen. The Amerasian Act of 1982 granted permission to certain Amerasian individuals to immigrate to the United States. Those who qualified had to have been born in Cambodia, Korea, Laos, Thailand, or Vietnam after December 31, 1950, and fathered by a U.S. citizen. Family members such as children, spouses or parents, and guardians of the individual were also granted entry. Amerasian is not synonymous to Asian American or Eurasian.

American (n., adj.): Of or related to the Americas (North, Central, and South America). This term is commonly misused as a synonym for U.S. citizens and residents, as well as their values, beliefs, and behaviors.

American Indian (n., adj.): Of or related to American Indians. The U.S. Census Bureau defines “American Indians” as “people having origins in any of the original peoples of North and South America (including Central America), and who maintain tribal affiliation or community attachment. According to Census 2000, American Indians and Alaska Natives are approximately 0.9 percent of the total U.S. population, and 1.5% including persons of more than one race.

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) (n.): On July 26, 1990, President George H. W. Bush signed into law the most sweeping legislation in the history of disability rights, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), prohibiting discrimination against, and mandating equal opportunity for, persons with disabilities, in “state and local government services, public accommodations, commercial facilities, and transportation.” The ADA defines a person with a disability as someone with a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits a major life activity, who has a record of such an impairment.

Anglo or Anglo - Saxon (adj.): Of or related to the descendants of Germanic peoples (Angles, Saxons, and Jutes) who reigned in Britain until the Norman conquest in 1066. Often refers to white English - speaking persons of European descent in England or North America, not of Hispanic or French origin.

Anti - Semitism (n.): Hatred of or prejudice against Jews and Judaism.
Apartheid (n.): Institutional system of racial segregation and subjugation in which whites exercise political, economic, and legal discrimination on racial/ethnic minority groups. Although racial segregation had been enforced for decades prior, the official policy of apartheid was practiced in the Republic of South Africa from 1948 until 1994, when black South Africans were first given the opportunity to partake in a democratic vote, resulting in the election of Nelson Mandela, a social activist and political leader who had been imprisoned for 27 years.

Appreciative Inquiry (n.): Appreciative Inquiry is a way of thinking, seeing and acting for powerful, purposeful change. It operates on the assumptions that whatever one wants… already exists. Appreciative Inquiry generates images that affirm the forces that give life and energy.

Arab (n., adj.): Of or relating to the cultures or people that have ethnic roots in the following Arabic-speaking lands: Algeria, Bahrain, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Oman, Palestine, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, the United Arab Emirates, and Yemen. “Arab” is not synonymous with “Muslim.” Arabs practice many religions, including Islam, Christianity, Judaism, and others.

Asian American: Of or related to Asian Americans. The U.S. Census Bureau defines “Asian” as “people having origins in any of the original peoples of Asia or the Indian subcontinent. It includes people who indicated their race or races as ‘Asian,’ ‘Indian,’ ‘Chinese,’ ‘Filipino,’ ‘Korean,’ ‘Japanese,’ ‘Vietnamese,’ or ‘Other Asian.’ Asian Americans are approximately 3.6 percent of the total U.S. population, and 4.2% including persons of mixed race.

Assimilation (n.): The process whereby an individual of a minority group gradually adopts characteristics of the majority culture. This adoption results in the loss of characteristics of one’s native culture, such as language, culinary tastes, interpersonal communication, gender roles, and style of dress. Some individuals of immigrant communities take offense to the notion that all immigrants should “assimilate” to U.S. culture, because it implies that they must give up some of who they are to become “Americans.” Instead, many immigrant communities assert the notion of biculturalism, which enables them to acculturate to the U.S. culture while maintaining characteristics of their native culture.

Asylum (n.): Protection sought in another country for fear of persecution in an individual’s race, religion, nationality, political opinion or membership of a particular social group.

B.

Baby Boomers (n.): Term used to describe the generation born during the two decades following World War II, from the 1940’s through the ‘60’s, when the United States experienced a significant rise in birth rates.
Barrio (n.): The Spanish word for “neighborhood” that can also refer to a predominately Latino/Hispanic area of a neighborhood, city or town. In some contexts, “barrio” may refer to the inner - city or street culture.

Bicultural (adj.): Of or related to an individual who possesses the languages, values, beliefs, and behaviors of two distinct racial or ethnic groups. Bicultural individuals may also be bilingual and/or biracial.

Bigotry (n.): Intolerance of cultures, religions, races, ethnicities, or political beliefs that differ from one’s own.

Bilingual (adj.): Of or related to proficiency in two distinct languages.

Biracial (adj.): Of or related to more than one race. Biracial individuals may choose to identify with only one race, especially if they find that they are more accepted by one group than another. Historically, biracial individuals who had one black parent and one white parent were considered black and were not acknowledged by the white community.

Bisexual (n., adj.): The term “bisexual” is most often used to describe a person whose sexual orientation is to persons of either sex. This term can also be used to describe a person who has both reproductive organs, known as “hermaphrodites.”

Black (n., adj.): Of or related to persons having ethnic origins in the African continent; persons belonging to the African Diaspora. Some individuals have adopted the term to represent all people around the world who are not of white European descent, although this usage is not common. “Black” is often used interchangeably with “African American” in the United States.

Bobo (n.): Bourgeois bohemian is a recent term used to refer to the upper - middle and upper class sector of “Generation X” (children of the baby - boomers). Bobos are characterized as a highly educated, politically active, environmentally responsible, art friendly, well - traveled, and technology savvy group that has merged the pre - 1950’s concepts of “bourgeois” with a new 1990’s “bohemian.”

Brown (n., adj.): A term most often used to refer to people of Latino/Hispanic descent, or of the Latin American Diaspora (Mexico, Central and South America, Puerto Rico, the Dominican Republic, Cuba, as well as Latinos/Hispanics in the United States and Canada). Some individuals may use the word to refer to all people of color.

C.

Caucasian (n., adj.): Of or related to the Caucasus region, a geographic area between the Black and Caspian seas; a former racial classification that included indigenous persons of Europe, northern Africa, western Asia, and India, characterized by light to brown skin and straight to wavy or curly hair. In the U.S., “Caucasian” is often used interchangeably with “white.”
**Chicano/a (n.):** A term adopted by some Mexican Americans to demonstrate pride in their heritage, born out of the national Chicano Movement that was politically aligned with the Civil Rights Movement to end racial oppression and social inequalities of Mexican Americans. Chicano pertains to the particular experience of Mexican-descended individuals living in the United States. Not all Mexican Americans identify as Chicano.

**Chicano Movement (n.):** Mexican American individuals and organizations across the country united for the common purpose of increasing educational opportunities, workers rights for farm laborers, land allocation, and resources to Mexican American communities.

**Christianity (n.):** A religion based on the life and teachings of Jesus of Nazareth, a Jew, born around 7 B.C. Jesus became known as a miracle worker who taught about the kingdom of God, loving God and one’s neighbor, and the importance of justice and repentance of sins. After his execution, he was believed to be Christ, the Messiah, and many claimed witness to his resurrection.

**Civil Rights Movement (n.):** The Civil Rights Movement (n.): The Civil Rights Movement is known as the events that took place between 1955 and 1965 when minority groups across the United States, primarily in the South, rose up against all forms of institutional racism that perpetuated political, economic, and educational disparities within their communities. It served as the catalyst for the restructuring of institutionalized policies and practices that had legally enforced racial segregation, subjugation, and discrimination.

**Classism (n.):** Biased attitudes and beliefs that result in, and help to justify, unfair treatment of individuals or groups because of their socioeconomic grouping. “Classism” can also be expressed as public policies and institutional practices that prevent people from breaking out of poverty rather than ensuring equal economic, social, and educational opportunity.

**Colorblind (adj.):** Term used to describe personal, group, and institutional policies or practices that do not consider race or ethnicity as a determining factor. The term “colorblind” de-emphasizes, or ignores, race and ethnicity, a large part of one’s identity.

**Cross - Cultural (adj.):** Relating to more than one culture. Often refers to practices that deal with more than one culture and incorporate the belief and value systems of the cultures involved.

**Cultural Ally (n.):** An individual who actively supports others who experience racism and/or discrimination.

**Cultural Competence (n.):** “A process of learning that leads to an ability to effectively respond to the challenges and opportunities posed by the presence of social cultural diversity in a defined social system.”
Culture of Poverty (n.): The concept that the conditions of poverty (e.g., unemployment, out of wedlock births, teen pregnancies, welfare dependency, etc.) creates within individuals and groups a socially pathological state of mind that perpetuates these same conditions and eventually increases the number of dependents on the state. A culture of poverty assumes that there is a social, pathological or cultural deficiency inherent to members of certain groups that make them prone to being poor which may make the phrase offensive.

D.
Daily Indignity (n.): Refers to the experiences of individuals and groups brought about by behaviors of members of the majority or dominant culture who may willingly or inadvertently assert their unearned privilege or power in a manner that offends, discriminates against, or subjugates another individual.

Deportation (n.): Forced removal of an individual who is not a citizen of the United States when that individual has been found to violate immigration law.

 Discrimination (n.): Unfavorable or unfair treatment towards an individual or group based on their race, sex, color, religion, national origin, age, physical/mental abilities, or sexual orientation.

Diversity Council (n.): An internal organizational structure whose purpose is to support and direct an organization’s diversity initiative. A diversity council can be made up of individuals who represent a cross section of the community or organization involved and are committed to the initiative. It is also instrumental in building support for a diversity initiative and implementing it successfully.

E.
Emigrant (n.): A person who voluntarily and or legally migrates from one country to another. Emigrant and emigration refer to the country from which the migration is made. An Irishman who migrates to the U.S. is an emigrant of Ireland and an immigrant to the U.S.

ESL (n.): (E)nglish as a (S)econd (L)anguage. A term used to describe language learning programs in the U.S. for individuals for whom English is not their first or native language.

Environmental Racism (n.): The concept that members of certain groups are deliberately located in less desirable geographic areas or that undesirable businesses and activities are deliberately located in range of or within neighborhoods of certain groups, particularly racial minorities and the urban poor.

Essentialism (n.): The practice of categorizing an entire group based on assumptions about what constitutes the “essence” of that group (e.g., assuming that women are better nurturers due to something that is innate in their being). Essentialism prevents individuals from remaining open to individual differences within groups.
**Ethnic (adj.):** Of or related to a particular race, nationality, language, religion or cultural heritage. “Ethnic” in the context of the U.S., has also come to represent concepts, characteristics or cultural values and norms that are not typical of persons of white/European ancestry.

**Ethnocentrism (n.):** The practice of using a particular ethnic group as a frame of reference, basis of judgment, or standard criteria from which to view the world. Ethnocentrism favors one ethnic group’s cultural norms and excludes the realities and experiences of other ethnic groups.

**Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) (n.):** Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. (Title VII) prohibits employment discrimination based on an individual’s race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

**Equity (n.):** Fairness and justice, especially pertaining to rights and protection under the law.

**Eurocentrism (n.):** The practice of using Europe and European culture as a frame of reference or standard criteria from which to view the world. Eurocentrism favors European cultural norms and excludes the realities and experiences of other cultural groups.

**F.**

**Feminism (n.):** Theory and practice that advocates for educational and occupational equity between men and women and undermines traditional cultural practices that support the subjugation of women by men and the devaluation of women’s contributions to society.

**FOB (n.):** A derogatory term used to refer to recent immigrants to the U.S., meaning “fresh off the boat.”

**G.**

**Gay (n., adj.):** A homosexual. This term was said to originate in Paris during the 1930’s and referred to the male homosexual underground community. The term was reclaimed during the Gay Liberation Movement as a source of pride. “Gay” is commonly used only to refer to homosexual men and not women.

**Gay Bashing (v.):** Term used to describe forms of harassment and hate crimes directed towards homosexuals, such as verbal and physical threats and assault and vandalism.

**Gay Liberation Movement (n.):** The Gay Liberation Movement is generally understood to have begun at the start of the 1969 Stonewall riots in Greenwich Village of New York City. The catalyst for the riots was a police raid of a gay bar on Christopher Street, near the Stonewall Inn. The patrons decided to fight back and were quickly joined by others who supported “Gay Power.” Word and wake of the riot rippled through the gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender (GLBT) community and some individuals came together to
form the Gay Liberation Front (GLF), which was politically aligned with gay rights and the anti-imperialist struggle overseas.

**Gender (n.):** Sexual classification based on the social construction of the categories of “men” and “women.” Gender differs from one’s biological sex (male or female) in that one can assume a gender that is different from one’s biological sex.

**Gender Identity (n.):** A term used to describe “a person’s internal sense of being male or female.”

**Gentrification (n.):** The process whereby a given urban area or neighborhood undergoes a socioeconomic transition from a previously low-income, working class neighborhood to a middle-class or affluent neighborhood.

**Ghetto (n., adj.):** Term used to represent the social and physical isolation of urban blacks, or communities of color in general, as well as the dire conditions these communities endure – densely populated slums, economic hardship, and racial discrimination in the central city.

**Glass Ceiling (n.):** Term used to describe the “unseen” barrier that prevents women and people of color from being hired or promoted beyond a certain level of responsibility, prestige, or seniority in the workplace.

**GLBT (LGBT) (adj.):** acronym for “Gay Lesbian Bisexual Transgender.”

**Green Card (n.):** Official documentation obtained by immigrants from the United States government that grants legal permission to work within the country.

**Gringo (n., adj.):** A derogatory term used in Latin American countries to refer to a foreigner, particularly one of (North) American or English descent.

**H. Harassment (n.):** Unwelcome, intimidating, or hostile behavior.

**Hazing (v.):** Verbal and physical testing, often of newcomers into a society or group, that may range from practical joking to tests of physical and mental endurance. This behavior is common among some U.S. fraternities and sororities.

**Hispanic (n., adj.):** The U.S. Census Bureau defines Hispanics as “those people who classified themselves in one of the specific Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino categories listed on the Census 2000 questionnaire (Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano, Puerto Rican, or Cuban.

**Homophobia (n.):** A fear of individuals who are not heterosexual. Homophobia often results in people distancing themselves from and/or psychologically/physically harming people who are gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered. The literal meaning of the word is “fear of same.”
**Human Rights (n.):** A set of inalienable rights, as declared by the thirty articles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948, that all human beings possess and are protected by law.

**I.**

**Identity Group (n.):** A particular group, culture, or community with which an individual identifies or shares a sense of belonging.

**Ideology (n.):** The way in which a given society “talks and thinks about itself.” Ideology can also be thought of as a shared belief system in which the knowledge shared is considered unquestionable “common sense,” knowledge that seems “obvious and natural” regardless of societal reality.

**Illegal Alien (n.):** The official term used by the United States Federal Government to refer to citizens of foreign countries whose entry into the United States is prohibited by law, or those who reside in the United States without evidence of legal documentation where permission for entrance has been granted.

**Immigrant (n.):** A person who voluntarily and/or legally relocates to a country different from that in which he or she was born. For example, an Irishman who migrates to the United States is an emigrant of Ireland and an immigrant to the U.S.

**Inclusive Language (n.):** Words or phrases that include both women and men if applicable. Inclusive language does not assume or connote the absence of women. For example, “police officers” instead of “policemen” or “humankind” instead of “mankind.”

**Inuit (n. or adj.):** Eskimo people who are distinct from American Indians and are more closely related to peoples of East Asia.

**K.**

**KKK (n.):** The Ku Klux Klan was an organization originally founded in Pulaski, Tennessee in 1866 that functioned as a “secret society organized in the South after the Civil War to reassert white supremacy by means of terrorism.”

**L.**

**Linguistic Isolation (n.):** May be used to describe the experience of feeling confused or alienated when one is unfamiliar with the language spoken by those around them.

**Linguistic Profiling (v.):** The practice of making assumptions or value judgments about an individual based on the way he or she speaks and/or the language he or she uses, and then discriminating against that individual because of these factors.
M.
Mainstream (n., adj.): Refers to the dominant cultural norms of a given society. In the United States, the “mainstream” culture encompasses the language, values, beliefs, and behaviors of the white/European population.

Marginalization (n.): The placement of minority groups and cultures outside mainstream society. All that varies from the norm of the mainstream is devalued and at times perceived as deviant and regressive.

Minority: A minority is defined by the social majority, i.e., those who hold the positions of power in a society. The defining characteristics of a minority group are generally based on one or more observable characteristics, including ethnicity, race, gender, sexuality, religion, age, and able-bodiedness.

Miscegenation (n.): The mixing of races.

Multicultural (adj.): Of or pertaining to more than one culture.

Multiculturalism (n.): Theory and practice that promotes the peaceful coexistence of multiple races, ethnicities, and cultures in a given society, celebrating and sustaining language diversity, religious diversity, and social equity.

N.
Naturalization (v.): The U.S. Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services define naturalization as “the conferring, by any means, of citizenship upon a person after birth.

Nuyorican (n.): Of or related to a person born in New York City of Puerto Rican ancestry.

O.
Orishas (n.): The various gods and goddesses of Caribbean and Latin American religion of Santeria, a spiritual practice originating from blended religious aspects of African cultures as well as the Roman Catholic Church.

Other or Otherness: Technical terms used in the social sciences and humanities for the way people tend to view others (people or nature) that are dissimilar and separated. The terms imply a complex system of devaluation.

P.
Pacific Islander (n.): The term “Pacific Islander” refers to persons whose origins are of the following nations: Polynesian, Melanesia, Micronesia, or any of the Pacific Islands.

Paddy (n.): A derogatory term for persons of Irish descent.
**Polack (n.):** Derogatory term for persons of Polish descent.

**Pro-choice (adj.):** Of or related to the belief that it is a woman’s right to choose whether or not to give birth or to have an abortion once impregnated.

**Pro-life (adj.):** Of or related to the belief in an unborn child’s right to life. Pro-life advocates believe that a human life is formed at the moment of conception and support statutory restrictions on abortion.

**Q. Quaker (n.):** A member of the Society of Friends, a Christian sect founded by George Fox in the 1600s. Quakers historically have been outspoken critics of slavery and violence.

**Queer (n., adj.):** Term used to refer to people or culture of the gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender (GLBT) community. A term once perceived as derogatory is now embraced by some members of the GLBT community.

**Quota (n.):** A number or percentage particularly of people designated as a targeted minimum for a particular group or organization. A term often used in reference to admission to colleges and universities and organizational hiring practices.

**R. Race (n.):** A grouping of human beings based on a shared geographic dispersion, common history, nationality, ethnicity, or genealogical lineage. Race is also defined as a grouping of human beings determined by distinct physical characteristics that are genetically transmitted.

**Racism (n.):** Racism can be understood as individual and institutional practices and policies based on the belief that a particular race is superior to others. This often results in depriving certain individuals and groups of certain civil liberties, rights, and resources, hindering opportunities for social, educational, and political advancement.

**Reverse Discrimination (n.):** A term used by opponents to affirmative action who believe that these policies are causing members of traditionally dominant groups to be discriminated against.

**S. Safe Space (n.):** A space in which an individual or group may remain free of blame, ridicule and persecution, and are in no danger of coming to mental or physical harm.

**Semitic (adj.):** Of or related to the language and culture of Semites. Semitic languages are characterized as Afro-Asiatic languages that include Arabic, Hebrew, Amharic, and Aramaic.
Sexual Harassment (n): The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission defines sexual harassment as “a form of sex discrimination that violates Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.”

Sexual Orientation (n.): Term used to refer to an individual’s sexuality and/or sexual attraction to others.

Stereotype (n.): A positive or negative set of beliefs held by an individual about the characteristics of a certain group.

T.
Terrorism (n.): The use or threat to use, unlawful acts of force or violence to intimidate or coerce another person, group, or government, often for ideological, religious, or political reasons. The U.S. Department of State defines terrorism as “premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against noncombatant targets by sub-national groups or clandestine agents, usually intended to influence an audience.”

Tokenism (n.): The policy of making only a perfunctory effort or symbolic gesture toward the accomplishment of a goal, such as racial integration; the practice of hiring or appointing a token number of people from underrepresented groups in order to deflect criticism or comply with affirmative action rules.

Tolerance (n.): Recognition and respect of values, beliefs, and behaviors that differ from one’s own.

Transgender (adj.): This term is often used to describe persons whose gender identity “differs from conventional expectations for their physical sex.” “Transgender” is a term that can be used to refer to “transsexuals, masculine women, feminine men, drag queens/kings, cross-dressers, butches, etc.” Transgender persons can be heterosexual, homosexual, or bisexual.

Transracial Adoption (n.): The adoption of a child of a race different than that of the parent or guardian.

Transsexual (n.): A term used to describe a person whose gender identity differs from that of their physical/biological sex. Transsexuals can be heterosexual, homosexual, or bisexual.

U.
Undocumented Workers (n.): A term used to describe the populations of laborers in the United States who do not possess legal documentation of residence and/or who did not receive proper authorization to enter into the country.

Unearned Privilege (n): Privileges accorded to some individuals because they possess or demonstrate certain characteristics associated with the dominant culture in society, such as being heterosexual, white, or male. These privileges are ingrained into U.S. culture.
**W. WASP (n.):** The acronym translates to (W)hite (A)nglo (S)axon (P)rotestant, a term used in the United States to refer to the demographic of people who are of this ancestry.

**Welfare (n.):** Economic assistance provided by the government to persons in need.

**Worldview (n.):** The way in which an individual views the outside world, influenced by his or her beliefs, values and behaviors, and determined by his or her unique experiences.

**Y. Yellow (n.):** A term used to refer to people of the Asian Diaspora. Although the use of this word finds its roots as derogatory slang birthed in the era of exploration and colonialism, it has recently become more prevalent in academia and among Asian communities in the U.S. who use the word to embrace their ethnic origins and express pride in their identity.

**Yuppie (n.):** “Yuppie” is commonly used to refer to an 1980’s and early 1990’s term for financially secure, upper-middle class young people in their 20’s and early 30’s. It translates to “(y)oung (u)pwardly-mobile (p)rofessionals” of the baby-boomer generation.
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