



Program & Reports 47th Biennial Meeting

June 23–25, 2010
Montreal, Quebec

ats The Association of Theological Schools
The Commission on Accrediting

Contents

Meeting Agenda	1
Participants in the Program	6
Officers and Professional Staff	7
ATS Presidents	8
Meeting Registrants	9
Rules for the Conduct of Business	15
Minutes of the 2010 Biennial Meeting	16
Message from the Executive Director	24
Opening Address.	25
 COMMISSION ON ACCREDITING	
Report of the Board of Commissioners	33
Approved Revisions to the Procedures	44
Approved Revisions to Standards 1 through 9	65
Report of the Commission Treasurer	105
Report of the Commission Nominating Committee	108
 THE ASSOCIATION	
Report of the Board of Directors	110
Approved New Policy Guidelines	113
Striving for Culturally Competent School Communities	113
Faculty Reductions During Financial Crisis	115
Faculty Resignations, Leaves, and Retirements	116
Student Financial Aid	117
Plan for the Work of ATS: 2010–2016.	119
Report of the Association Treasurer	124
Report of the Association Nominating Committee	128
 COMMITTEE REPORTS	
Council on Leadership Education.	132
Committee on Race and Ethnicity.	135
Women in Leadership Advisory Committee	137
Faculty Development Advisory Committee	140
Henry Luce III Fellows in Theology Program.	141
Lilly Theological Research Grants Program	143
<i>Theological Education</i> Editorial Board.	147
Student Resources Advisory Committee	148
Institutional Viability and Financially Stressed Schools	150
Christian Hospitality and Pastoral Practices in a Multifaith Society	151
 Report of The Fund for Theological Education, Inc.	 152

Agenda of the ATS/COA 47th Biennial Meeting

Wednesday–Friday, June 23–25, 2010

*The Future Has Arrived:
Changing Theological Education in a Changed World*

Wednesday, June 23

- 7:30 a.m.** **PC(USA) THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION BREAKFAST** . . . *Huronie AB~Niveau Plaza Level*
(by prior registration)
Convener: *Lee Hinson-Hasty*
- 8:30–10:00 a.m.** **BREAKFAST AND DISCUSSION OF NEW INITIATIVES
OF KERN FAMILY FOUNDATION** (by invitation) . . . *Maisonneuve D~36th Floor*
- 9:30 a.m.–1:30 p.m.** **REGISTRATION** *Lower Lobby*
- 10:00 a.m.–Noon** **OPEN FORUM** *Viger ABC~Lower Lobby*
**Discussion of Proposed Changes to Institutional Stan-
dards and Accrediting Procedures, and Proposed ATS
Policy Guidelines**
- Noon–1:30 p.m.** **AFRICAN AMERICAN PRESIDENTS’ LUNCH** *Habitation B*
(by prior registration)
- FELLOWSHIP OF EVANGELICAL SEMINARY** *Huronie AB*
PRESIDENTS’ LUNCH
Convener: *Bryan Chapell*
- 1:45–3:00 p.m.** **OPENING PLENARY SESSION**. *Salle De Bal~Lower Lobby*
Hymn and Prayer ~ *Donald Senior*
Call to Order and Welcome ~ *John Kinney*
Greetings ~ *Ellen Aitken and John Simons*
Opening Address ~ *Daniel Aleshire*
- 3:00–3:30 p.m.** **BREAK**

AGENDA

- 3:30–5:00 p.m.** **BUSINESS SESSION I** *Salle De Bal-Lower Lobby*
 Joint Association and Commission Business
 John Kinney, President of the Association
 Anne Anderson, Chair of the Commission
 Adoption of Rules for the Conduct of Business
 Appointment of Parliamentarian
 Appointment of Committee on Reference and Counsel
 Nominating Committee Reports
 for the Association ~ *Myron McCoy*
 for the Commission ~ *Barbara Mutch*
 Treasurers' Reports
 for the Association ~ *Mary McNamara*
 for the Commission ~ *Chris Meinzer*
 Association Business
 John Kinney, President of the Association
 Board of Directors Report
 President's Report
 Presentation and action on applicants for Associate
 Membership
 Presentation and action on applicants for Affiliate Status
- 5:30–6:30 p.m.** **WELCOMING RECEPTION** *Salons Maisonnewève~36th Floor*
 Hosted by the Faculty of Religious Studies at
 McGill University, Montreal School of Theology,
 and the Kern Family Foundation
- 7:00 p.m.** **BANQUET** *Salle de Bal-Lower Lobby*
 Presentation of Distinguished Service Award

Thursday, June 24

7:00–7:45 a.m. **CONTINENTAL BREAKFAST** *Salle De Bal~Lower Lobby*

8:00–9:30 a.m. **WORKSHOPS I**

1. Outcomes Assessment

John VerBerkmoes, Grand Rapids Theological Seminary of Cornerstone University
Lacey Warner, Duke University Divinity School

2. The Choices We Made to Stay Alive and Flourish in the Lean Years

David McAllister-Wilson, Wesley Theological Seminary
Myron McCoy, Saint Paul School of Theology

3. Delivering Quality Academic Programming with Fewer Resources

Gail O’Day, Candler School of Theology of Emory University
Michael Martin, Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary

4. A Missional Model of Education

Richard Mouw, Fuller Theological Seminary
Donald Senior, Catholic Theological Union
Leanne VanDyk, Western Theological Seminary

5. Stabilizing a Tuition-Driven Institution

Bryan Chapell, Covenant Theological Seminary
Howard Wilson, Ambrose Seminary of Ambrose University College

6. Declaring Financial Exigency

James Johnson, Lexington Theological Seminary
Molly Marshall, Central Baptist Theological Seminary

7. Strategies for Enhancing Institutional Capacity to Support Racial/Ethnic Diversity

Nancy Ramsay, Brite Divinity School at Texas Christian University

8. Creative Resource-Sharing Among Schools

Angela Bauer-Levesque, Episcopal Divinity School
Nick Carter, Andover Newton Theological School
James Donahue, Graduate Theological Union

9:45–10:45 a.m. **MORNING HYMN AND PRAYER ~ Tite Tienou** *Salle De Bal~Lower Lobby*

BUSINESS SESSION II

Association Business

John Kinney, President of the Association
 Election of ATS officers, directors, and committees
 Presentation of proposed policy actions

10:45–11:00 a.m. **Break**

11:00–11:45 a.m. **Commission Business**

Anne Anderson, Chair of the Commission
 Board of Commissioners Report
 Election of Commission board and committees
 Standards and Procedures Revision Phase I: Presentation of proposed changes to Procedures

AGENDA

- 11:45–1:30 p.m.** **OPTIONAL LUNCH FOR ALL BIENNIAL REGISTRANTS**
(by prior reservation) *Cartier ABC~Main Lobby Level*
Plenary Presentation of Research on Women in Leadership
Barbara Brown Zikmund
- 1:30–3:00 p.m.** **BUSINESS SESSION III** *Salle De Bal~Lower Lobby*
Commission Business
Anne Anderson, Chair of the Commission
Standards and Procedures Revision Phase I: Presentation of proposed changes to Standards 1–9
- 3:00–3:30 p.m.** **BREAK**
- 3:30–5:00 p.m.** **WORKSHOPS II**
Repeat of Thursday morning workshops 1–4 plus the following:
- 9. What Have We Learned about Distance Learning?**
Gregory Bourgon, formerly of Bethel Seminary of Bethel University
- 10. Presidential Leadership that Works**
Anthony Ruger, Auburn Center for the Study of Theological Education
- 11. Mission-Focused and Margin-Aware: Building Boards for Good Governance in Demanding Times**
William Cahoy, St. John's University School of Theology-Seminary
Byron Klaus, Assemblies of God Theological Seminary
Christa Klein, In Trust
- 12. Educating Racial/Ethnic Students**
Dorcas Gordon, Knox College
Alvin Padilla, Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary
- 13. Training for Prospective Accreditation Evaluation Team Members**
Alice Hunt, Chicago Theological Seminary
ATS Accrediting Staff
- 5:00–6:00 p.m.** **RECEPTION FOR IN TRUST MEMBER SCHOOLS** . . . *Maisonneuve D~36th Floor*
- 6:00–7:30 p.m.** **RECEPTION FOR WOMEN PRESIDENTS AND DEANS** . . . *Maisonneuve BC*
(by prior registration)
Convener: *Phyllis Anderson*
- RECEPTION AND DISCUSSION OF NEW INITIATIVES OF KERN FAMILY FOUNDATION (by invitation)** *Cartier A~Main Lobby*
- EVENING** **Free Time**
- 8:00–10:00 p.m.** **Room Available for Informal Participants' Gatherings.** . . *Huronie AB~Niveau Plaza Level*

Friday, June 25

- 7:00–7:45 a.m. **CONTINENTAL BREAKFAST** *Viger ABC~Lower Lobby*
CANADIAN SCHOOLS BREAKFAST (by prior registration) *Neufchatel~Main Lobby*
 Conveners: *Dorcas Gordon and Anne Anderson*
- 8:00–8:15 a.m. **MORNING HYMN AND PRAYER** ~ *Cynthia Campbell* . . . *Salle De Bal~Lower Lobby*
- 8:15–9:45 a.m. **BUSINESS SESSION IV**
 Association Business
 John Kinney, President of the Association
 Action on Policy Proposals
 Commission Business
 Anne Anderson, Chair of the Commission
 Action on Standards and Procedures Revision Phase I
- 9:45–10:00 a.m. **BREAK**
- 10:00–11:30 a.m. **FORUM OF KEY EDUCATIONAL ISSUES** *Viger ABC~Lower Lobby*
 Commission Business
 Anne Anderson, Chair of the Commission
 Standards and Procedures Revision Phase II:
 Beginning to Evaluate the Educational Issues Under-
 girding the Degree Program Standards
 Benediction ~ *Richard Mouw*
 Adjournment
- 11:45 a.m. **HTIC GENERAL COUNCIL MEETING**
 Convener: *Joanne Rodriguez*

Participants in the Program

Ellen Aitkin, Faculty of Religious Studies, McGill University
Anne Anderson, University of St. Michael's College Faculty of Theology
Phyllis Anderson, Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary
Angela Bauer-Levesque, Episcopal Divinity School
Gregory Bourgond, formerly of Bethel Seminary of Bethel University
William Cahoy, St. John's University School of Theology–Seminary
Cynthia Campbell, McCormick Theological Seminary
Nick Carter, Andover Newton Theological School
Bryan Chapell, Covenant Theological Seminary
James Donahue, Graduate Theological Union
Dorcas Gordon, Knox College
Lee Hinson-Hasty, PC(USA)
Alice Hunt, Chicago Theological Seminary
James Johnson, Lexington Theological Seminary
John Kinney, Samuel DeWitt Proctor School of Theology
Byron Klaus, Assemblies of God Theological Seminary
Christa Klein, In Trust, Inc.
Penny Long Marler, Samford University
Molly Marshall, Central Baptist Theological Seminary
Michael Martin, Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary
Janet Maykus, Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary
David McAllister-Wilson, Wesley Theological Seminary
Myron McCoy, Saint Paul School of Theology
Mary McNamara, United Theological Seminary of the Twin Cities
Richard Mouw, Fuller Theological Seminary
Barbara Mutch, Carey Theological College
Gail O'Day, Candler School of Theology of Emory University
Alvin Padilla, Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary
Nancy Ramsay, Brite Divinity School
Robert Reber, Bexley Hall Seminary
Bruce Roberts, Christian Theological Seminary (retired)
Joanne Rodriguez, Princeton Theological Seminary
Anthony Ruger, Auburn Center for the Study of Theological Education
Donald Senior, Catholic Theological Union
John Simons, Montreal School of Theology
Tite Tienou, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School
Leanne VanDyk, Western Theological Seminary
John VerBerkmoes, Grand Rapids Theological Seminary of Cornerstone University
Lacey Warner, Duke University Divinity School
Howard Wilson, Ambrose Seminary of Ambrose University College
Barbara Brown Zikmund, Women in Leadership Research Project Director

Staff participants are listed on the following page.

Association Officers

President

John Kinney

Dean, Samuel DeWitt Proctor School of Theology
Richmond, Virginia

Secretary

Laura Mendenhall

The Texas Presbyterian Foundation
Irving, Texas

Vice President

Richard Mouw

President, Fuller Theological Seminary
Pasadena, California

Treasurer

Mary McNamara

President, United Theological Seminary of the
Twin Cities
New Brighton, Minnesota

Commission Officers

Chair

Anne Anderson

President, University of St. Michael's College
Faculty of Theology
Toronto, Ontario

Vice Chair and Treasurer

David Draper

President, Winebrenner Theological Seminary
Findlay, Ohio

ATS Professional Staff

Daniel O. Aleshire

Executive Director

Tisa Lewis

Director, Accreditation and Institutional Evaluation

Helen M. Blier

Director, Student Information and Organizational
Evaluation

Carol E. Lytch

Assistant Executive Director

Eliza Smith Brown

Director, Communications and External Relations

Chris A. Meinzer

Director, Finance and Administration

Janice Edwards-Armstrong

Director, Leadership Education

William C. Miller

Director, Accreditation and Institutional Evaluation

Stephen R. Graham

Director, Faculty Development and Initiatives
in Theological Education

Chris Olsztyn

Director, Information Technology

Lester Edwin J. Ruiz

Director, Accreditation and Institutional Evaluation

ATS Presidents

- 1918—
 1920—C. A. Barbour, Colgate Rochester Divinity School
 1921—W. D. Mackenzie, Hartford Seminary
 1922—Daniel D. Fraser, Presbyterian College of Montreal
 1924—Charles M. Stuart, Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary
 1926—George B. Stewart, Auburn Seminary
 1928—Luther A. Weigle, Yale University Divinity School
 1930—Shailer Mathews, University of Chicago Divinity School
 1932—Warren J. Moulton, Bangor Theological Seminary
 1934—Richard Davidson, Emmanuel College of Victoria University
 1936—Arlo A. Brown, Drew University Theological School
 1938—Lewis J. Sherrill, Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary
 1940—Albert W. Beaven, Colgate Rochester Divinity School
 1942—Henry P. Van Dusen, Union Theological Seminary
 1944—Sanford Fleming, Berkeley Baptist Divinity School
 1946—Conrad Bergendoff, Augustana Theological Seminary
 1948—John A. Mackay, Princeton Theological Seminary
 1950—John K. Benton, Vanderbilt University Divinity School
 1952—Edward H. Roberts, Princeton Theological Seminary
 1954—Charles L. Taylor, Episcopal Divinity School
 1956—Walter N. Roberts, United Theological Seminary
 1958—Ernest C. Colwell, Claremont School of Theology
 1960—James A. Jones, Union Theological Seminary in Virginia
 1962—Stanley B. Frost, McGill University Faculty of Religious Studies
 1964—Olin T. Binkley, Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary
 1966—Robert V. Moss, Lancaster Theological Seminary
 1968—Arthur R. McKay, McCormick Theological Seminary
 1970—Allix B. James, Virginia Union University School of Theology
 1972—Joseph D. Quillian, Perkins School of Theology
 1974—Frederick W. Whittaker, Bangor Theological Seminary
 1976—David A. Hubbard, Fuller Theological Seminary
 1978—James I. McCord, Princeton Theological Seminary
 1980—Harvey Guthrie, Episcopal Divinity School
 1982—Vincent Cushing, Washington Theological Union
 1984—C. Douglas Jay, Emmanuel College of Victoria University
 1986—Barbara Brown Zikmund, Pacific School of Religion
 1988—Russell H. Dilday, Jr., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
 1990—James L. Waits, Candler School of Theology
 1992—Robert E. Cooley, Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary
 1994—James H. Costen, Interdenominational Theological Center
 1996—Diane Kennedy, Aquinas Institute of Theology
 1998—Luder G. Whitlock, Jr., Reformed Theological Seminary
 2000—Martha J. Horne, Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary in Virginia
 2002—David L. Tiede, Luther Seminary
 2004—Cynthia M. Campbell, McCormick Theological Seminary
 2006—Donald Senior, Catholic Theological Union
 2008—John Kinney, Samuel DeWitt Proctor School of Theology

Meeting Registrants

Agosto, Efrain	Hartford Seminary
Aitken, Ellen B.	McGill University Faculty of Religious Studies
Akkerman, Jay	Individuals
Aleshire, Daniel O.	The Association of Theological Schools
Alexander, Kimberly Ervin E.	Pentecostal Theological Seminary
Anderson, Anne T.	University of St. Michael's College
Anderson, Christopher Colt	Washington Theological Union
Anderson, Kenton C.	Associated Canadian Theological Schools
Anderson, Phyllis	Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary
Attebery, Philip	Baptist Missionary Association Theological Seminary
Attridge, Harold W.	Yale University Divinity School
Aune, Michael B.	Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary
Aymer, Albert	Hood Theological Seminary
Bader, Jennifer	Boston College School of Theology and Ministry
Bailey, Mark L.	Dallas Theological Seminary
Banks, Nadine	The Association of Theological Schools
Barber, Ray G.	Chapman Seminary
Barfield, Virginia (Ginger)	Lutheran Theological Southern Seminary
Barnes, Jay H.	Bethel Seminary of Bethel University
Barstad, Joel	St. John Vianney Theological Seminary
Bartelt, Andrew H.	Concordia Seminary (MO)
Bauer-Levesque, Angela	Episcopal Divinity School
Beckerdite, Susan D.	The Association of Theological Schools
Benefiel, Ron	Nazarene Theological Seminary
Beresford, Eric	Atlantic School of Theology
Bernard, David K.	Urshan Graduate School of Theology
Black, Mark C.	Hazelip School of Theology
Blaising, Craig A.	Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
Blier, Helen M.	The Association of Theological Schools
Bliese, Richard	Luther Seminary
Blossom, Jay	In Trust, Inc.
Blount, Brian K.	Union Presbyterian Seminary
Bode, Kyle	The Kern Family Foundation
Bonner, Steven	Individuals
Booth, Steven C.	Canadian Southern Baptist Seminary
Bosso, Stephen C.	St. Vincent de Paul Regional Seminary
Bottoms, Robert G.	Seabury-Western Theological Seminary
Bourgond, Gregory W.	Individuals
Bowers, James P.	Pentecostal Theological Seminary
Boyd, Marsha Foster	Ecumenical Theological Seminary
Briley, Terry	Hazelip School of Theology
Brink, Mary Louise	Seminary of the Immaculate Conception
Britton, Joseph H.	Berkeley Divinity School
Brown, Eliza Smith	The Association of Theological Schools
Brown, J. Alistair	Northern Baptist Theological Seminary
Brown, Timothy L.	Western Theological Seminary
Cahoy, William J.	St. John's University School of Theology & Seminary
Callahan, Sharon	Seattle University School of Theology and Ministry
Campbell, Cynthia M.	McCormick Theological Seminary
Cannada Jr., Robert C.	Reformed Theological Seminary
Canoy, Robert W.	M. Christopher White School of Divinity

MEETING REGISTRANTS

Cara, Robert J.	Reformed Theological Seminary
Carl III, William J.	Pittsburgh Theological Seminary
Carter, Nick	Andover Newton Theological School
Chang, Peter M.	Washington Baptist Theological Seminary of Washington Baptist University
Chapell, Bryan	Covenant Theological Seminary
Chapman, Tasha	Covenant Theological Seminary
Childs, James M.	Trinity Lutheran Seminary
Choi, Kyunam	Individuals
Choi, Won S.	Washington Baptist Theological Seminary of Washington Baptist University
Clader, Linda L.	Church Divinity School of the Pacific
Clark, Janet	Tyndale University College & Seminary
Clifford, Catherine E.	Individuals
Cloud, Rodney	Turner School of Theology of Amridge University
Cole, Thomas W.	Interdenominational Theological Center
Conniry, Charles	George Fox Evangelical Seminary
Cooley, Robert E.	Individuals
Cooper-White, Michael L.	Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg
Cortez, Marc A.	Western Seminary
Cullum, Douglas R.	Northeastern Seminary at Roberts Wesleyan College
Culpepper, R. Alan	James and Carolyn McAfee School of Theology
Currie III, Tom W.	Union Presbyterian Seminary
Dalbey, Mark	Covenant Theological Seminary
Dale, Janet L.	Alliance Theological Seminary
Dirks, Dennis H.	Talbot School of Theology
Doubleday, William A.	Bexley Hall Seminary
Drumm, Curtis Scott	New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary
D'Souza, Mario O.	University of St. Michael's College
Duke, Russell	Haggard Graduate School of Theology
Dyer, Amelia J.	Virginia Theological Seminary
Earwood, Greg C.	Baptist Seminary of Kentucky
Echols, James Kenneth	Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago
Edwards, Wendy J. Deichmann	United Theological Seminary
Edwards-Armstrong, Janice	The Association of Theological Schools
Eliason, Leland V.	Individuals
Ellis, Robert R.	Logsdon Seminary of Logsdon School of Theology
Evans, Christopher	Colgate Rochester Crozer Divinity School
Fawcett, Bruce	Acadia Divinity College
Fitchue, Leah Gaskin	Payne Theological Seminary
Fletcher, Wendy	Vancouver School of Theology
Fredenburg, Brandon L.	Individuals
Fuller, Thomas	Beeson Divinity School of Samford University
Gardner, Harry	Acadia Divinity College
Gasque, W. Ward	Pacific Association for Theological Studies
Gaston, H. Neely	Erskine Theological Seminary
Gay, Craig M.	Regent College
Gill, Jeffrey A.	Grace Theological Seminary
Gilson, Ken	Talbot School of Theology
Gordon, J. Dorcas	Knox College
Graham, Stephen R.	The Association of Theological Schools
Gresham, John L.	Kenrick-Glennon Seminary
Gropp, Douglas	Individuals
Hadsell, Heidi	Hartford Seminary
Hagan, G. Michael	Sioux Falls Seminary
Hahn, Roger L.	Nazarene Theological Seminary
Hamilton, Mark W.	Abilene Christian University

Harvey, John D.	Columbia International University - Seminary & School of Missions
Hayes, Alan L.	Toronto School of Theology
Hearon, Holly E.	Christian Theological Seminary
Heidt, Sarah	Ecumenical Theological Seminary
Heille, Gregory	Aquinas Institute of Theology
Henke, Donald	Kenrick-Glennon Seminary
Hinson-Hasty, G. Lee	Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)
Hollinger, Dennis P.	Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary
Holmes, Charley	Baptist Missionary Association Theological Seminary
Hooten, Jon	Claremont School of Theology
Howell, Nancy R.	Saint Paul School of Theology
Hudnut-Beumler, James D.	Vanderbilt University Divinity School
Huffard, Evertt W.	Harding University Graduate School of Religion
Hunt, Alice W.	Chicago Theological Seminary
Irvin, Dale T.	New York Theological Seminary
Iverson, Cheryl L.	Oral Roberts University School of Theology
Jackson, Byron	Pittsburgh Theological Seminary
James III, Frank A.	Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary
Jelinek, John A.	Moody Theological Seminary and Graduate School - Michigan
Jensen, Gordon A.	Lutheran Theological Seminary (SK)
Jimena-Palmer, Jaretha Joy	International Theological Seminary
Johnson, David H.	Providence Theological Seminary
Johnson, H. Wayne	Trinity Evangelical Divinity School
Johnson, James P.	Lexington Theological Seminary
Johnson, Jerry A.	Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
Johnson, Robert E.	Central Baptist Theological Seminary
Jones, Barry A.	Campbell University Divinity School
Jones, L. Serene	Union Theological Seminary
Jones, R. Clifford	Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary
Jost, Lynn	Mennonite Brethren Biblical Seminary
Kardash, Amy	In Trust, Inc.
Kasza, John C.	SS. Cyril & Methodius Seminary
Katip, William J.	Grace Theological Seminary
Kavlie, Lucas B.	Moody Theological Seminary and Graduate School - Michigan
Keathley, Kenneth D.	Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary
Kelley Jr., Charles S.	New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary
Kettner, Edward G.	Concordia Lutheran Seminary (AB)
Kim, Shalom Y.	Shepherd University School of Theology
Kinney, John W.	Samuel DeWitt Proctor School of Theology
Klaus, Byron D.	Assemblies of God Theological Seminary
Klein, Christa R.	In Trust, Inc.
Kleyn, Henk	Individuals
Kosanke, Charles G.	SS. Cyril & Methodius Seminary
Kovack, Ronald	Knox Theological Seminary
Krause, Deborah D.	Eden Theological Seminary
Krey, Philip D.W.	Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia
Lajiness, Todd J.	Sacred Heart Major Seminary
Land, Steven J.	Pentecostal Theological Seminary
Landrebe, Robert S.	Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary
Larson, Duane H.	Wartburg Theological Seminary
Latcovich, Mark A.	Saint Mary Seminary and Graduate School of Theology
Lawrence, William B.	Perkins School of Theology
Laytham, D. Brent	North Park Theological Seminary
Leeds, Mark	Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
Lemke, Steve W.	New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary

MEETING REGISTRANTS

Lescher, Bruce H.	Jesuit School of Theology of Santa Clara University
Leung, Katheryn	Individuals
Lewis, G. Douglass	Individuals
Lewis, Tisa	The Association of Theological Schools
Liebert, Elizabeth	San Francisco Theological Seminary
Lingenfelter, Sherwood G.	Fuller Theological Seminary
Liu, Felix	Logos Evangelical Seminary
Liu, Samuel	China Evangelical Seminary North America
Lockwood, Daniel R.	Multnomah Biblical Seminary
Love, Jan	Candler School of Theology of Emory University
Lu, Jeffrey	Logos Evangelical Seminary
Lytch, Carol E.	The Association of Theological Schools
MacFarland, Randolph M.	Denver Seminary
Maddix, Mark A.	Northwest Nazarene University School of Theology
Mafico, Temba L.	Interdenominational Theological Center
Mangina, Joseph L.	Wycliffe College
Markuly, Mark S.	Seattle University School of Theology and Ministry
Marshall, Molly T.	Central Baptist Theological Seminary
Martin, John A.	Northeastern Seminary at Roberts Wesleyan College
Martin, Michael	Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary
Martin, Paul	American Baptist Seminary of the West
Martinson, Roland D.	Luther Seminary
Mathew, Thomson K.	Oral Roberts University School of Theology
Mazuk, Melody	Palmer Theological Seminary
McAllister-Wilson, David F.	Wesley Theological Seminary
McAtee, Christopher J.	University of St. Mary of the Lake Mundelein Seminary
McCoy, Myron F.	Saint Paul School of Theology
McMahan, Oliver	Pentecostal Theological Seminary
McMillan, Mary M.	The Association of Theological Schools
McNamara, Mary E.	United Theological Seminary of the Twin Cities
Medenblik, Jul	Calvin Theological Seminary
Meinzer, Chris A.	The Association of Theological Schools
Meyer, Dale A.	Concordia Seminary (MO)
Miller, Glenn T.	Bangor Theological Seminary
Miller, Marcus J.	Lutheran Theological Southern Seminary
Miller, William C.	The Association of Theological Schools
Milton, Michael A.	Reformed Theological Seminary
Mindling, J. Daniel	Mount Saint Mary's Seminary
Mitchell, Margaret M.	University of Chicago Divinity School
Moody-Shepherd, Eleanor	New York Theological Seminary
Moore, James R.	Trinity Evangelical Divinity School
Moore, Mary Elizabeth	Boston University School of Theology
Mouw, Richard J.	Fuller Theological Seminary
Mullen, Deborah F.	Columbia Theological Seminary
Mutch, Barbara H.	Carey Theological College
Neelands, David	Trinity College Faculty of Divinity
Ng, Esther Y.	Christian Witness Theological Seminary
Oaks, Fred	The Kern Family Foundation
O'Day, Gail R.	Wake Forest University Divinity School
Oden, Amy G.	Wesley Theological Seminary
Ogilvie, Kevin A.	Lutheran Theological Seminary (SK)
Oliver, Shawn	Ashland Theological Seminary
Olson, Mark	John Leland Center for Theological Studies
Olsztyn, Christopher A.	The Association of Theological Schools
Padilla, Alvin	Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary

Palmer, Michael	Regent University School of Divinity
Pannell, Randall	Regent University School of Divinity
Panzer, Richard	Individuals
Park, Elaine F.	Mount Angel Seminary
Park, John	World Mission University
Pauley, Edward H.	Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
Peluso-Verdend, Gary E.	Phillips Theological Seminary
Pence, Nadine S.	Wabash Center for Teaching and Learning in Theology and Religion
Pennington, J. Paul	Cincinnati Bible Seminary
Petersen, David L.	Candler School of Theology of Emory University
Pfrimmer, David	Waterloo Lutheran Seminary
Pond, Eugene W.	Dallas Theological Seminary
Porter, Stanley E.	McMaster Divinity College
Potterveld, Riess W.	Lancaster Theological Seminary
Pressley, Johnny	Cincinnati Bible Seminary
Radant, Kenneth G.	Associated Canadian Theological Schools
Ragsdale, Katherine H.	Episcopal Divinity School
Rahn, James	The Kern Family Foundation
Rajashekar, J. Paul	Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia
Ramsay, Nancy J.	Brite Divinity School
Ramseth, Mark R.	Trinity Lutheran Seminary
Reber, Robert E.	Bexley Hall Seminary
Rector, Lallene J.	Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary
Redman, Jr., Robert R.	Multnomah Biblical Seminary
Reid, Barbara	Catholic Theological Union
Rhee, Edmund K.	Shepherd University School of Theology
Rhodes Henderson, Katharine	Auburn Theological Seminary
Richardson, W. Mark	Church Divinity School of the Pacific
Ridder, David A.	Bethel Seminary of Bethel University
Riebe-Estrella, Gary	Catholic Theological Union
Rivera, Luis R.	McCormick Theological Seminary
Roberts, R. Philip	Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
Ruger, Anthony T.	Auburn Theological Seminary
Ruiz, Lester Edwin J.	The Association of Theological Schools
Rundell, Jay	Methodist Theological School in Ohio
Rylaarsdam, David M.	Calvin Theological Seminary
Samalot-Rivera, Yamil A.	Dominican Study Center of the Caribbean
Schenck, Ken	Individuals
Schner, Joseph G.	Regis College
Schoelles, Patricia A.	St. Bernard's School of Theology and Ministry
Schweitzer, Steven J.	Bethany Theological Seminary
Sebastian, David L.	Anderson University School of Theology
Sedgwick, Timothy F.	Virginia Theological Seminary
Seagraves, Daniel L.	Urshan Graduate School of Theology
Senior, Donald	Catholic Theological Union
Sharam, Earle	St. Stephen's College
Shelley, Michael T.	Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago
Shenk, Sara Wenger	Associated Mennonite Biblical Seminary
Shoaf, Diane	Florida Center for Theological Studies
Shultz, John C.	Ashland Theological Seminary
Sigman, Michael W.	Evangelical Theological Seminary
Simons, John	Montreal School of Theology
Skreslet, Stanley H.	Union Presbyterian Seminary
Slough, Rebecca	Associated Mennonite Biblical Seminary
Smarkel, James A.	Winebrenner Theological Seminary

MEETING REGISTRANTS

Smith, Gordon T.	Individuals
Smith, Gregory S.	Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
Smith, Wallace Charles	Palmer Theological Seminary
Snyder, Richard	Bangor Theological Seminary
Stafford, William S.	University of the South School of Theology
Stairs, M. Jean	Queen's School of Religion
Stapleton, John J.	St. Mark's College
Steinke, Robin J.	Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg
Stelck, Brian F.	Carey Theological College
Stoffer, Dale R.	Ashland Theological Seminary
Stone, Bryan P.	Boston University School of Theology
Stone, Kenneth A.	Chicago Theological Seminary
Stone, Polly M.	Reformed Theological Seminary - Atlanta location
Strandjord, Jonathan	Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
Swartzendruber, Loren E.	Eastern Mennonite Seminary
Thames, James H.	Dallas Theological Seminary
Tiede, David L.	Wartburg Theological Seminary
Tienou, Tite	Trinity Evangelical Divinity School
Tornfelt, John V.	Evangelical Theological Seminary
Torrance, Iain R.	Princeton Theological Seminary
Toulouse, Mark G.	Emmanuel College of Victoria University
Townes, Emilie M.	Yale University Divinity School
Trickett, David G.	Iliff School of Theology
Tunncliff, Thomas	The Kern Family Foundation
Uglem, Dwayne	Briercrest College and Seminary
Ulery, Kent J.	Bangor Theological Seminary
Van Dyk, Leanne	Western Theological Seminary
Vanderhill, Steven T.	Redeemer Theological Seminary
Venugopal, Junias V.	Moody Theological Seminary and Graduate School
VerBerkmoes, John F.	Grand Rapids Theological Seminary of Cornerstone University
Visscher, Gerhard H.	Theological College of the Canadian Reformed Churches
Walter, Blake	Northern Baptist Theological Seminary
Ward, John	Fuller Theological Seminary
Warner, Lacey	Duke University Divinity School
Weis, Richard D.	United Theological Seminary of the Twin Cities
Wenthe, Dean O.	Concordia Theological Seminary (IN)
Werbylo, Walter M.	St. Augustine's Seminary of Toronto
Willard, Louis Charles	The Association of Theological Schools
Willey, Stephen	The United Church of Canada
Williams, D. Newell	Brite Divinity School
Williams, David	Taylor College and Seminary
Wilson, Howard G.	Ambrose Seminary of Ambrose University College
Wimberly, Edward P.	Interdenominational Theological Center
Wimmer, John R.	Lilly Endowment Inc.
Winings, Kathy	Unification Theological Seminary
Wondra, Ellen K.	Seabury-Western Theological Seminary
Wong, Arch	Ambrose Seminary of Ambrose University College
Woodward, Scott	Oblate School of Theology
Wright, Travis	Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary
Yardley, Anne B.	Drew University Theological School
Young, Mark S.	Denver Seminary
Zeuch, Manfred	Concordia Lutheran Seminary (AB)
Zikmund, Barbara Brown	Individuals
Zylla, Phil C.	McMaster Divinity College

Rules for the Conduct of Business

Rules for the conduct of Association and Commission business are adopted by each Biennial Meeting. They are designed to enable the assembly to conduct its business not only openly and with sensitivity to all sides of issues but also with efficiency in the light of time constraints. The ATS Board of Directors and the Board of the Commission on Accrediting recommend the following set of rules for the conduct of the 2010 Biennial Meeting.

1. Unless otherwise stipulated, the business of the Association and the Commission shall be conducted according to the most recent edition of *Robert's Rules of Order*.
2. Each member institution of the Association and the Commission shall be entitled to one vote on issues before the respective corporation with the vote cast by the person authorized by the member institution.
3. This meeting will involve actions related to four new policy guidelines proposed by the ATS Board of Directors and changes to the Procedures and Standards of Accreditation proposed by the Board of Commissioners of the Commission on Accrediting. These documents will be presented for discussion on one day of the Biennial Meeting and be voted on the following day. Motions to change the proposed policy guidelines, Procedures or Standards of Accrediting may be referred by the presiding officer to the Committee on Reference and Counsel to assess the full implications of a motion in light of existing policies, procedures, and standards. The Committee on Reference and Counsel will present its report at a subsequent business session, but in no case later than the business session at which the policy, procedure, or standard is scheduled for action in the agenda as adopted or amended by the body. The presiding officer may elect to refer other items that come from the floor to the Committee on Reference and Counsel. The parliamentarian(s) may assist the presiding officer in deciding when referrals would be appropriate and helpful to the deliberations of the body. After consideration, the Committee on Reference and Counsel will bring to the full body a recommendation for discussion and vote at a subsequent session.
4. The process for nominations from the floor and voting on the slate of the Association and the Commission shall follow the procedures referenced in each of the Nominating Committee reports in this book.
5. The Committee on Reference and Counsel and one or more parliamentarians shall be appointed by the president of the Association and the chair of the Commission at the beginning of the Biennial Meeting.

Minutes of the 47th Biennial Meeting

The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada
The Commission on Accrediting of the Association of Theological Schools
June 23–25, 2010

Time and Place

The forty-seventh Biennial Meeting of The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada and the Commission on Accrediting of the Association of Theological Schools was called to order by the president of the Association, John Kinney, and the chair of the Board of Commissioners, Anne Anderson, Wednesday, June 23, 2010, at 1:50 p.m., at the Marriott Montreal Chateau Champlain Hotel in Montreal, Quebec.

Meeting Registrants

There were 325 registrants present: 266 from 173 member schools; 17 representing 11 new member schools; 26 representing affiliate organizations, consortia, and other guests; 2 representing a new affiliate organization; and 14 ATS staff. A quorum was present for the conduct of business.

Wednesday, June 23, 2010

OPENING PLENARY SESSION

The meeting opened with a hymn, "Praise the Source of Faith and Learning," and Donald Senior offered the opening prayer.

Ellen Aitken of McGill University Faculty of Religious Studies and John Simons of Montreal School of Theology offered words of welcome to Montreal. Simons offered greetings in both French and English.

Opening address

Daniel Aleshire offered the opening address (appended).

BUSINESS SESSION I

Joint Association and Commission Business

John Kinney and Anne Anderson convened a joint business session of the Association and the Commission. The president explained that all schools would have a vote during the joint session using

voting cards, red cards for schools that are members of the Commission and the Association (accredited and candidate schools) and blue cards for schools that are members of the Association only (associate member schools). He further explained that subsequent business sessions during the Biennial Meeting would convene as either Association business sessions or Commission business sessions.

Adoption of Rules for the Conduct of Business

VOTED to adopt the "Rules for the Conduct of Business" as set forth in the *Programs & Reports* book for the meeting.

Appointment of Parliamentarians

The Association president and Commission chair appointed Daniel Mindling (Mount Saint Mary's Seminary) and Nancy Ramsay (Brite Divinity School) as parliamentarians.

Appointment of Committee on Reference and Counsel

The Association president and Commission chair appointed Dennis Dirks (Talbot School of Theology), Myron McCoy (Saint Paul School of Theology), Elaine Park (Mount Angel Seminary), Gary Riebe-Estrella (Catholic Theological Union) as chair, Gordon Smith (public member, Commission on Accrediting), Robin Steinke (Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg), Lacey Warner (Duke University Divinity School) to the committee on reference and counsel. The president explained that either the Association president or the Commission chair may refer matters to the committee.

Nominating Committee Reports

Myron McCoy (Saint Paul School of Theology) made the report of the Association Nominating Committee, calling attention to the slate of nominees printed in the *Programs & Reports* book. There were no nominations from the floor. The president explained that the vote on the slate would occur at the Thursday morning Association business session. He expressed appreciation to the members of the Association's 2010 Nominating Committee:

Katarina Schuth, chair (Saint Paul Seminary School of Divinity of the University of St. Thomas); Leslie Andrews (Asbury Theological Seminary); Alan Hayes (Toronto School of Theology); Myron McCoy (Saint Paul School of Theology); and John Phelan (North Park Theological Seminary).

John Kinney yielded the chair to Anne Anderson.

Barbara Mutch (Carey Theological College) made the report of the Commission Nominating Committee, calling attention to the slate of nominees printed in the *Programs & Reports* book. There were no nominations from the floor. The chair explained that the vote on the slate would occur at the Thursday morning Commission business session. She expressed appreciation to the members of the Commission's 2010 Nominating Committee: David Esterline, chair (McCormick Theological Seminary), Richard Benson (St. John's Seminary [CA]), Marsha Foster-Boyd (Ecumenical Theological Seminary), Dennis Hollinger (Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary), and Barbara Mutch (Carey Theological College).

Treasurers' Reports

Mary McNamara (United Theological Seminary of the Twin Cities) made the Association treasurer's report. She highlighted the Association's careful fiscal management during a time of deep financial stress and noted budget reductions that include salary freezes and elimination of matches for staff pension contributions. The audits for FY2008 and FY2009 were unqualified. The unrestricted net assets of the Association were \$13.15 million as of June 2008 and \$10.79 million as of June 2009. This change was due to loss in market value of investments, and much has been restored since then. There were \$2.9 million in grant funds held by the Association in June 2008 and, one year later, \$7.9 million. This represented good staff development work. A surplus of \$42,800 is budgeted for 2010–2011.

VOTED to accept Association treasurer's report.

Chris Meinzer, ATS director of finance and administration, made the Commission treasurer's report on behalf of David Draper (Winebrenner Theological Seminary). The audits for FY2008 and FY2009 were also unqualified. He noted that the FY2010 financials show a surplus due to two open staff positions and that a search is underway for a fourth accreditator. The Commission budget was reviewed.

The majority of revenues are from dues; overall, dues represent \$1.2 million, or about 25 percent of the total combined ATS and COA budget.

VOTED to accept Commission treasurer's report.

Association Business Session

President John Kinney convened the business session of the Association.

Board of Directors Report

John Kinney directed the members' attention to the report of the ATS Board of Directors in the *Programs & Reports* book.

President's Report

The president expressed gratitude for the organization's role in giving voice to diversity of faith, commended the board for its active oversight and generative visioning, praised the administrative leadership for its new structure and recent staff hires, and thanked all for the faithful execution of their work.

Presentation and Action on Applicants for Associate Membership

The president called attention to the list of applicants recommended by the ATS board for Associate Membership and noted that election to Association membership requires a two-thirds majority vote. Mark Ramseth (Trinity Lutheran Seminary) presented the first three:

VOTED that Baptist Seminary of Kentucky in Lexington, Kentucky, be granted Associate Membership.

VOTED that Theological College of the Canadian Reformed Churches of Hamilton, Ontario, be granted Associate Membership.

VOTED that China Evangelical Seminary North America in West Covina, California, be granted Associate Membership.

Elaine Park (Mount Angel Seminary) presented three candidates:

VOTED that Lubbock Christian University Graduate Studies Program in Biblical Studies in Lubbock, Texas, be granted Associate Membership.

MINUTES

VOTED that Moody Bible Institute, Moody Theological Seminary and Graduate School in Chicago, Illinois, be granted Associate Membership.

VOTED that Northwest Nazarene University School of Theology and Christian Ministries in Nampa, Idaho, be granted Associate Membership.

Junias Venugopal (Columbia International University—Seminary and School of Missions) presented three candidates:

VOTED that Puritan Reformed Theological Seminary in Grand Rapids, Michigan, be granted Associate Membership.

VOTED that Redeemer Theological Seminary in Dallas, Texas, be granted Associate Membership.

VOTED that Shepherd University School of Theology in Los Angeles, California, be granted Associate Membership.

Pat Schoelles (St. Bernard's School of Theology and Ministry) presented two candidates:

VOTED that St. Mark's College in Vancouver, British Columbia, be granted Associate Membership.

VOTED that Saint Paul University Faculty of Theology in Ottawa, Ontario, be granted Associate Membership.

Presentation and Action on Applicants for Affiliate Status

The president called attention to the list of applicants recommended by the ATS board for Affiliate Status, with an accompanying definition of Affiliate Status, and offered a reminder that all ATS member schools (Accredited, Candidate, and Associate) could vote and that the vote required a two-thirds majority. Richard Mouw (Fuller Theological Seminary) presented two applicants for Affiliate Status:

VOTED that Association for Doctor of Ministry Education (ADME) be granted Affiliate Status.

MOTION to grant Affiliate Status to Unification Theological Seminary in Barrytown and New York, New York, noting the board's unanimous vote to recommend.

MOTION FAILED (61 in favor, 49 opposed).

Discussion ensued.

MOTION by Paul Martin (who had voted against the first motion) to reconsider the Unification Seminary vote.

VOTED by simple majority to reconsider the Unification Seminary vote (71 in favor, 42 opposed). Based on that vote, the action was slated for reconsideration and the matter referred to the Committee on Reference and Counsel.

Following adjournment of the business session, meeting participants enjoyed a reception hosted by the Faculty of Religious Studies at McGill University, Montreal School of Theology, and the Kern Family Foundation.

At the banquet following the reception, David L. Tiede (professor of New Testament and president emeritus, Luther Seminary) received the 2010 Distinguished Service Award.

Thursday, June 24, 2010

The following workshops were offered on Thursday, the first four of them twice:

Outcomes Assessment

John VerBerkmoes, Grand Rapids Theological Seminary of Cornerstone University
Lacey Warner, Duke University Divinity School

The Choices We Made to Stay Alive and Flourish in the Lean Years

David McAllister-Wilson, Wesley Theological Seminary
Myron McCoy, Saint Paul School of Theology

Delivering Quality Academic Programming with Fewer Resources

Gail O'Day, Candler School of Theology of Emory University
Michael Martin, Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary

A Missional Model of Education

Richard Mouw, Fuller Theological Seminary
Donald Senior, Catholic Theological Union
Leanne VanDyk, Western Theological Seminary

Stabilizing a Tuition-Driven Institution

Bryan Chapell, Covenant Theological Seminary
Howard Wilson, Ambrose Seminary of Ambrose University College

Declaring Financial Exigency

James Johnson, Lexington Theological Seminary
Molly Marshall, Central Baptist Theological Seminary

Strategies for Enhancing Institutional Capacity to Support Racial/Ethnic Diversity

Nancy Ramsay, Brite Divinity School at Texas Christian University

Creative Resource-Sharing Among Schools

Angela Bauer-Levesque, Episcopal Divinity School
Nick Carter, Andover Newton Theological School
James Donahue, Graduate Theological Union

What Have We Learned about Distance Learning?

Gregory Bourgon, formerly of Bethel Seminary of Bethel University

Presidential Leadership that Works

Anthony Ruger, Auburn Center for the Study of Theological Education

Mission-Focused and Margin-Aware: Building Boards for Good Governance in Demanding Times

William Cahoy, St. John's University School of Theology-Seminary
Byron Klaus, Assemblies of God Theological Seminary
Christa Klein, In Trust

Educating Racial/Ethnic Students

Dorcas Gordon, Knox College
Alvin Padilla, Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary

Training for Prospective Accreditation Evaluation Team Members

ATS Accrediting Staff
Alice Hunt, Chicago Theological Seminary

The morning session opened at 9:30 a.m. with a hymn—"Here I Am, Lord"—and Tite Tienou (Trinity Evangelical Divinity School) offered the prayer.

BUSINESS SESSION II**Association Business****Nominations**

VOTED to elect the proposed slate with the addition of Sharon Ringe (Wesley Theological Seminary) to the Lilly Theological Research Grants Selection Panel.

Presentation of policy proposals

John Kinney presented the recommended policy actions and noted that a simple majority is required for approval of such recommendations.

He first presented the proposed change in nomenclature to reflect the nonbinding nature of ATS policies, which are intended as advice and counsel for adoption at the prerogative of each school. There were no questions or comments.

VOTED to change the nomenclature on all existing ATS policy statements from *policy statements* to *policy guidelines*. None opposed.

He then presented four proposed new policy guidelines, outlined the process of drafting and vetting them, and read the preamble that will accompany them in the *ATS Bulletin*:

Policy guidelines are offered by the members of ATS as pragmatic operational advice and counsel to member schools. Unlike compliance with the Standards of Accreditation, member schools are not accountable for implementing the guidelines in their policies or procedures. The guidelines are not intended to establish best practices applicable in all jurisdictions or create standards against which member schools' conduct would be measured. Policy guidelines are not intended and should not be interpreted as legal advice. Member schools should consult their own legal counsel knowledgeable in the applicable law of the state(s) or province(s) where the school operates before implementing policies suggested by these guidelines.

VOTED to accept the proposed policy guideline, Striving for Culturally Competent School Communities (one opposed).

VOTED to accept the proposed policy guideline, Faculty Reductions During Financial Crisis, with the changes noted on the Addenda.

VOTED to accept the proposed policy guideline, Faculty Resignations, Leaves, and Retirements, with the changes noted on the Addenda.

VOTED to accept the proposed policy guideline, Student Financial Aid.

Finally, Kinney presented the board's recommendation to retire the policy guideline, Professional

MINUTES

Ethics for Teachers, which had been recommended for review at the 2008 Biennial Meeting.

VOTED to retire Professional Ethics for Teachers (one opposed).

Reconsideration of affiliate status vote regarding Unification Seminary

Pursuant to the membership vote on the previous day to reconsider Unification Seminary for Affiliate Status, the president reintroduced the issue and reminded the body that the board had unanimously recommended approval of the application.

Gary Riebe-Estrella spoke on behalf of the Committee on Reference and Counsel.

Richard Mouw, on behalf of the Board of Directors, moved to grant Affiliate Status to Unification Theological Seminary.

Discussion ensued.

VOTED to grant Unification Theological Seminary Affiliate Status (89 in favor, 31 opposed).

Commission Business

Anne Anderson reconvened the body for Commission business. She reminded those present that only accredited and candidate schools with red cards are eligible to vote on Commission matters.

Board of Commissioners Report

As she summarized the Commission report, she noted that the Board of Commissioners had given joint visits particular attention, had introduced reader panels to deal with reports in a timely and efficient manner, and ends each meeting with a review for consistency. She expressed gratitude to all chairs and visitors over the past biennium.

Election of Commission board and committees

VOTED to elect the full slate as presented.

Bylaws recommendation

Anne Anderson called attention to the addenda provided to meeting registrants regarding a proposed revision to section 5.8 of the Commission bylaws regarding the Appeals Panel. The change was recommended pursuant to a US Department of Education regulatory change. The effect of this change is to guarantee that at least one representa-

tive of the Appeals Panel is not currently affiliated with any member school.

VOTED to approve revision to section 5.8 of the Commission bylaws regarding the Appeals Panel:

Section 5.8 Appeals Panel

The Appeals Panel shall be composed of five persons who are former Commissioners or former Directors of ATS, **at least one of whom shall have been a Public Commissioner or Public Director.** Appeals Panel members shall be elected by the Members and shall serve two-year terms. A person who has served for two consecutive two-year terms is not eligible for reelection until he or she has not served for two years. The Appeals Panel shall process appeals of Member schools regarding accrediting decisions in accordance with the Standards and Procedures.

Proposed changes to procedures

Anne Anderson reviewed the process by which the procedures were revised. They were developed by the Task Force on Revision of the Standards and Procedures and presented to the Board of Commissioners in late 2009, then online to the membership in February 2010, with members asked to comment by March. The board considered all comments and made its final recommendations in late April. The proposed revisions were posted again in May and distributed in the *Program & Reports* book. Members had the opportunity to question or comment on the proposals during the open forum on Wednesday. She pointed out that the proposed revisions seek to (1) reduce the number of institutional efforts that require action by the BOC and (2) ensure compliance with Department of Education (DOE) regulations.

VOTED unanimously to ratify the proposed changes to the Procedures for Accreditation.

Proposed changes to standards 1–9

Revisions to Standards 1–9 followed the same procedure for development and review as described above for the Procedures. In this case, the goals were to obtain DOE compliance, achieve editorial clarity, and address changes since the 1996 revision of the standards.

VOTED to adopt Standard 1.

MOTION by Robert Cara (Reformed Theological Seminary) to amend Standard 2, section 2.6, by deleting the first clause and rephrasing the section as follows: "Each school shall seek to enhance the participation and leadership of women in theological education within the framework of the school's stated purposes and theological commitments." Seconded by Andrew Bartelt (Concordia Seminary [MO]).

VOTED to accept amended draft language for 2.6. Some opposed and abstained.

MOTION by Bill Lawrence (Perkins School of Theology, SMU) to amend the draft of 2.5 to replace *institutional life* with *theological education* in line 88.

VOTED to accept amended draft language to reflect that change.

MOTION by Dorcas Gordon (Knox College) to add to the beginning of 2.6: "In their institutional and educational practices, theological schools shall promote awareness of gender" and to add end of 2.5 to end of 2.6.

No action.

VOTED to approve Standard 2 with the exception of 2.5 and 2.6, to be amended and presented after lunch.

VOTED to approve Standard 3.

Over a lunch sponsored by the E. Rhodes and Leona B. Carpenter Foundation, Barbara Brown Zikmund presented findings from research on women deans and presidents in ATS schools.

BUSINESS SESSION III

Commission Business

Proposed changes to standards 1–9 (continued)

Anne Anderson pointed out that the agenda had been accelerated to reflect expeditious progress on the work scheduled and to accommodate departure schedules for the final day of the meeting. The meeting then returned to the business of voting on proposed revisions to Institutional Standards 1–9.

VOTED to suppress Standard 4 and make it the preamble to the Degree Program Standards, which will be revised during the 2010–2012 biennium.

Based on discussions in the morning session, an amendment including revisions to 2.5 and 2.6 was presented for consideration:

- 2.5 In their institutional and educational practices, theological schools shall promote awareness of the diversity of race, ethnicity, and culture widely present in North America and shall seek to enhance participation and leadership of persons of color in theological education. Schools shall assist all students in gaining the particular knowledge, appreciation, and openness needed to live and practice ministry effectively in culturally and racially diverse settings.
- 2.6 In their institutional and educational practices, theological schools shall promote awareness of gender. Each school shall seek to enhance the participation and leadership of women in theological education within the framework of the school's stated purposes and theological commitments.

Discussion ensued.

MOTION by Mark Ramseth (Trinity Lutheran Seminary) to strike *awareness of gender. Each school shall seek to enhance* in 2.6. (It was seconded and voted upon later in the proceedings.)

MOTION by Mary Elizabeth Moore (Boston University School of Theology) to propose a substitute amendment of draft language for 2.6:

- 2.6 In their institutional and educational practices, theological schools shall promote awareness of gendered cultural dynamics in North America. Each school shall seek to enhance the participation and leadership of women in theological education within the framework of the school's stated purposes and theological commitments. Schools shall assist all students in gaining the particular knowledge, appreciation, and openness needed to live and practice ministry effectively with women and men.

VOTED the question on Moore-amended draft language for 2.6. (substitute amendment).

MOTION FAILED to accept Moore-amended substitute draft language for 2.6 (36 in favor, 80 opposed).

MINUTES

MOTION by Ramseth repeated and seconded.

VOTED the question on Ramseth motion.

VOTED to accept draft amended language to 2.6 to read as follows:

In their institutional and educational practices, schools shall promote the participation and leadership of women in theological education within the framework of each school's stated purposes and theological commitments.

MOTION by Dorcas Gordon to add a sentence to the 2.6 draft language as follows:

Schools shall assist all students in gaining the particular knowledge, appreciation, and openness needed to live and practice ministry effectively in diverse settings. Seconded.

VOTED by simple majority (88 votes) to add sentence to 2.6 draft language.

VOTED to adopt draft language of 2.5 and 2.6 as amended and to adopt those two sections into Standard 2 as amended:

- 2.5 In their institutional and educational practices, theological schools shall promote awareness of the diversity of race, ethnicity, and culture widely present in North America and shall seek to enhance participation and leadership of persons of color in theological education. Schools shall assist all students in gaining the particular knowledge, appreciation, and openness needed to live and practice ministry effectively in culturally and racially diverse settings.
- 2.6 In their institutional and educational practices, theological schools shall promote the participation and leadership of women in theological education within the framework of each school's stated purposes and theological commitments. Schools shall assist all students in gaining the particular knowledge, appreciation, and openness needed to live and practice ministry effectively in diverse settings.

VOTED to adopt Standard 5.

VOTED to adopt Standard 6.

VOTED to adopt Standard 7.

VOTED to adopt Standard 8.

VOTED to adopt Standard 9.

Agenda Revision

Daniel Aleshire recommended revision to the Friday morning agenda to adjust to the expeditious completion of the scheduled items of business ahead of schedule.

VOTED to amend the agenda and to convene the Forum on Key Educational Issues on Friday at 8:00 a.m. and conclude at 9:30 a.m.

Friday, June 25, 2010

The morning opened with a hymn, "Every Time I Feel the Spirit," and Cynthia Campbell offered the morning prayer.

The president recognized Sharon Callahan (Seattle University School of Theology and Ministry), who filed the following protest and invited others to stand in support and to sign a copy of the protest:

We register the following protest regarding the debate on Standard 2.6:

1. We protest the nature and tone of the debate;
2. We protest an outcome which many of us see as a regression in our commitment to supporting gender equity in theological education and leadership—we do note that we are not addressing denominational ordination policies but academic standards.

We stand to serve notice that we expect ongoing, substantive discussion of these issues. Recognizing that some may feel constrained, we invite those of you who feel able to stand with us. Those who wish may sign a copy of this statement at the Secretary's desk.

Educational Issues Forum

John Kinney yielded to Anne Anderson, who directed attention to the implementation plan adopted by the Board of Commissioners for the revised procedures and Standards 1–9 as approved during the preceding day (attached).

Anne Anderson then asked Gary Riebe-Estrella (Catholic Theological Union) to lead the Educational Issues Forum. He recognized and thanked the members of the Task Force on the Revision of the Standards.

Gary Riebe-Estrella called attention to the hand-out, "Background Reflections on Degree Program Standards," that identified key issues in the Degree Program Standards, including duration and residency. He directed participants through a staged process to complete a grid provided to gather both individual and group ideas about revisions to the Degree Program Standards. The input from the process will inform the deliberations of the Task Force on the Revision of the Standards and Procedures.

Riebe-Estrella reminded all registrants to fill out evaluations to receive gifts.

Kinney thanked all present for their participation. Daniel Aleshire thanked Kinney and Anderson for their leadership.

Richard Mouw, newly elected president of the Association, led the benediction.

Kinney adjourned the meeting at 9:40 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia Schoelles
Secretary

Message from the Executive Director

The Future Has Arrived: Changing Theological Education in a Changed World

During the past four decades, the social location of the church has changed, old privileges that the culture had extended to Christian churches have weakened, new religious neighbors have moved in, and the fastest growing religious preference has become “none.” Sturdy old North American denominations have weakened, newer ones have gained strength, and congregations have found ways to relate that are not denominational. The growth center of Christianity has moved from North America to the Global South. Much has changed, and more change is on the way.

During these decades, new immigrants have arrived, and fast-growing racial/ethnic constituents have shifted old population patterns. The past twenty years have brought the personal computer, the Internet, and the virtual stress of virtual availability. The oil is running out, the planet is heating up, the poor are poorer, and the sustainability of Western economic privilege is increasingly questioned. Much has changed, and more change is on the way.

In the past forty years, the gender, age, and racial/ethnic composition of faculty and students of ATS schools has changed markedly. Patterns of seminary attendance have changed, and the schools have invented new academic schedules and patterns of theological education. Students are coming to seminary with different motivations and divergent vocational aspirations. Degrees have multiplied, theological disciplines have specialized, and sources of financial support have shifted. Much has changed, and more change is on the way.

Montreal is a marquee city for many of these changes. In forty years, it has moved from the Canadian province with the highest percentage of church attenders to the province with the lowest. It is on its way to becoming home to one of the three highest percentages of visible minorities of any location in Canada. It has shifted from a city in which Catholic culture was normative to a city in which all religious instruction has been removed from preschools that receive any public funding. Much has changed, and more change is coming.

The 2010 Biennial Meeting will explore some of the boundaries that have been transcended and borders that have been crossed. After almost fifteen years of work on the ATS Women in Leadership program and a decade of work on the Association’s efforts on race and ethnicity, this meeting will provide opportunities to explore these two constituencies and the gifts they bring to theological education in North America. It has been fourteen years since the current accrediting standards were adopted, and this Biennial Meeting will provide the opportunity to consider proposals for changes to accrediting standards and procedures and to think about the future shape of theological degree programs. Finally, it will provide the opportunity to think, once again, about how religion is situated in the culture and how theological education is situated in religion.

This is a working meeting. While some Biennial Meetings offer a range of plenary presentations, the plenary sessions of the forty-seventh meeting are working sessions to consider proposals for policy guidelines, accrediting procedures, and institutional standards, and to set the stage for the efforts during the 2010–2012 biennium to develop proposals for changes to the standards for theological degree programs.

So much change both in the church and in the world where the church does its work requires theological schools to assess implications for theological education in the United States and Canada. I am pleased to welcome you to the deliberations and discussions of this meeting.



Opening Address

The Future has Arrived: Changing Theological Education in a Changed World

The future has arrived. It's an illogical statement, I know. The future is always arriving, so it can never be portrayed in the past tense. Most times, the future arrives as the present passes, like the sun rising in the morning after it sets in the evening. This time, it doesn't seem to be happening that way. It is as if the future has moved faster than the present and the sun has risen in the east before it has set in the west. The future has plopped itself full blown into the present; it has arrived.

Thomas Freedman has told us that the earth has gotten flat; the financial markets have told us that, in a globalized economy, national debt in Greece can depress seminary endowments in North America; the demographers have told us that racial/ethnic composition of the North American population has changed more quickly than anticipated; and flattened mountains in Appalachia and oily waters in the Gulf of Mexico tell us that our fossil-fueled past cannot extend far into the future.

The change has been rapid and ubiquitous, and ATS schools have been affected by both the scope and the pace. Twenty years ago, theological schools were barely on the Internet; now thousands of students are completing courses online. Schools spent significant amounts of money to wire their campuses just as wireless technology made it possible to do the same thing at significantly less expense. More has changed than technology. Religion has changed, higher education has changed, and students have changed. The Association and its member schools have some catching up to do. *The future has arrived.*

What are the responses that will make theological schools as effective in the future as they have been in the past? Because change has been so massive, theological schools need to focus their attention on the areas where their efforts can have greatest impact: North American religion and the practices of theological education. Religion is awash with fundamental change, but it remains to be seen how faithfully theological schools will change.

This Biennial Meeting is designed differently than most, and this is the only plenary address. I apologize that I'm the speaker, but I have to be here and make the same salary whether I speak or not. I may not be good, but I'm the cheapest option available. The other plenary sessions of this meeting are devoted to the business of the Association and Commission and sorting through proposed changes to accrediting standards and procedures, considering revised policy statements, and discussing the ways in which theological degrees should be changed. As we begin, I want to share my perceptions about how religion has changed and speculate about responses that ATS schools should consider making.

The changed world of North American religion

Religion has changed in North America, if you haven't noticed.

Denominations

Denominations have changed and are changing. The reunion of two U.S. Presbyterian church bodies that formed the Presbyterian Church USA is twenty-five years old, and in little more than two decades, membership is down by one-third. The Assemblies of God, on the other hand, has grown each of the past nineteen years, and now equals the PCUSA in size. The Unitarian Universalist Association has charted membership gains during the past two decades, while the U.S. membership of the Church of the Nazarene¹ has been relatively flat. Evangelical Lutheran Church in America membership has declined gradually for many of the years following the merger that formed it,² and membership in the massive Southern Baptist Convention³ plateaued during this past decade and registered slight declines in the most recent years. The United Church of Canada has lost almost half of its membership since its mid-twentieth century peak. Even stable numbers mask considerable internal change. For example, while Roman Catholics have constituted about 25 percent of the American population across these two decades, almost

25 percent of adults who grew up Roman Catholic no longer consider themselves to be Catholic. (No Protestant denomination has as high a retention rate as the Roman Catholics.) The percentage of the population that is Roman Catholic has been stable because of the large number of immigrants.⁴ Some denominations are stronger, most are weaker, and while each has a loyal constituency, it does not appear that denominations will be the structural center of North American Christianity in the future that they have been in the past.

Christian identities

As denominations have weakened, the Christian identities that denominations cultivated have lessened. People seem less aware of what it means to be a Baptist or a Methodist or a Lutheran. Presbyterians and Methodists move easily from a congregation of one denomination to a congregation of the other, as if Arminian and Calvinist positions are best resolved on the basis of which congregation has the better youth ministry program. The Pew U.S. Religious Landscape researchers conclude that “44 percent of adults have either switched religious affiliation, moved from being unaffiliated with any religion to being affiliated with a particular faith, or dropped any connection to a specific religious tradition altogether.”⁵ This denomination switching has resulted in an altered sense of Christian identity and religious practices. At my United Methodist congregation in Pittsburgh, I have seen people cross themselves at the communion rail and occasionally genuflect as they enter the pew. I’m no expert on Methodist piety, but I don’t think these practices are taught on confirmation retreats. Patterns of piety and religious practice have theological homes that shape a way of being Christian, but as practices are separated from those homes and blended with other practices, the theological coherence of any particular Christian identity is strained.

Religious participation

Religious participation in North America has changed. The percentage of residents of Quebec who attend church regularly has moved from higher than the Canadian average in the 1950s to lower than the national average now. The numbers are stunning—from more than 80 percent frequent attendees in the 1950s to far less than 20 percent in the past decade.⁶ People are attending church differently. Reginald Bibby’s data on Canadian church attendance suggest that regular attendees

are attending less regularly, and Mark Chaves data on attendance in the United States indicate that an ever increasing percentage of attendees are going to larger membership congregations.⁷ The fastest growing religious preference for adults in the United States is “no religious preference.” Pew Forum’s recent study of “millennials” indicates that these young adults are not only less likely to be religiously affiliated than any other age cohort in the United States, but they also are less religiously active than their parents or grandparents were at the same age.⁸ Folks in North America are still going to church—the United States and Canada have the highest estimated percentage of church attenders of any Western democracy—but they are going to church differently than they used to go.

Christianity as a world religion

Christianity as a world religion has been changing. More than 20 percent of all Christians now live in Sub-Saharan Africa; Christianity in that region grew an amazing seventy-fold during the twentieth century, to almost 500 million adherents.⁹ Because Christianity embeds itself in the culture in which it is located, Christian practices are reinvented and beliefs take on differing hues as Christianity finds new cultural homes. The center of gravity of worldwide Christianity has moved. This will no doubt be the century of the first non-European pope and the one in which North American Christianity will be more influenced by Christianity in other parts of the world than worldwide Christianity will be influenced by North America. The growing influence of the Global South is already affecting the Anglican Communion and U.S.-based church bodies that have significant membership outside the United States. These influences will only grow as the century matures.

Religious pluralism

North America is increasingly experiencing the influence, interaction, and presence of the religions of the world. At the 1990 Montreal meeting, the ATS Task Force on Globalization presented its first report on the project that the Association launched in the late 1980s. In addition to noting the economic and political issues of a globalized world, the project encouraged theological schools to pay more attention to the world as a whole, to worldwide Christianity, and to the presence of the world’s other religions. The processes of globalization have brought multiple religions into proximity with

each other, and religious proximity can be stormy. Religion has been the basis for prejudice and violence, and in a globalized world, religious tensions threaten not only peace but also the fundamental opportunity for human flourishing. The presence of the world's religions in North America is still limited (about 6 percent of the U.S. population identifies with a religious tradition other than Christianity), but in cultures that value individual expression and do not legally privilege any one religion, the presence of the world's religions takes on an importance disproportionate to its percentage.

Impact on theological education

This catalog of changes is more illustrative than exhaustive, but each has an impact on theological education. The change in denominational strength and capacity has a direct effect on the majority of ATS schools that were founded by denominations to serve particular needs and structures. What is the mission of the denominational seminary related to a denomination that is losing members and institutional capacity? As Christian identity becomes more plastic and amorphous, what is the role of the seminary to clarify what it means to be Christian? Changing patterns of church attendance affect leadership needs in parishes and congregations. They contribute to the increase in bivocational and alternatively credentialed clergy, as some congregations become smaller, and to the increase of lay professional staff members, as other congregations grow larger. What do these changes mean for degree programs and educational practices? The shifting center of gravity in global Christianity invites North American theological schools both to consider their contribution to a wider world and to embrace the intellectual contributions that the world brings to them. Changed religious preferences call theological schools to reassess their work. How do Christians relate to the growing multifaith character of North America, and what is their role when an increasing percentage of the population shares no religious preference?

Changing theological schools

Of course, ATS schools have not been living some Rip Van Winkle existence in the middle of so much change. Since the last Biennial Meeting in Montreal, ATS membership has grown from 205 to 252 schools. Most of these additional members are new schools, and new schools typically reflect responses to growing or changed religious communities.

Enrollment has grown from slightly more than 56,000 students in 1990 to about 75,000 students this past fall. Perhaps more instructive than the increase in the number of students is the increasingly different forms of theological education in which they were enrolled: far more extension programs than was the case in 1990, a growing number of on-line courses (which did not exist at all twenty years ago), and a far wider array of degree programs. New degree programs and delivery patterns are institutional responses to changed religious realities and altered patterns of church-related work. Slightly more than 13 percent of all students in 1990 were persons of color, and this past fall more than 24 percent of total enrollment—by the most conservative computation—were persons of color. The percentage of female students has grown less, from 29 percent to 35 percent—but the combined effect is telling: women and students of color account for all the growth in enrollment since 1990. The faculty has changed as well. The percentage of female faculty members has grown from 15 percent in 1990 to 24 percent, and the percentage of faculty of color has increased from 8 percent to 15 percent. Changes in the composition of the faculties and student bodies reflect the changing composition of the population and the shifting roles of women in religious leadership.

All told, this is a great deal of change. ATS schools have not been asleep at the switch, but the world around them has changed faster and perhaps more pervasively than the schools have. Schools have adapted practices and modified structures, but ultimately, realities beyond the schools will require even more fundamental shifts in institutional form and educational character.

Possible responses to a changed world

In the context of these and other changes in the religious reality, how should theological schools respond? I want to offer several proposals, but ultimately, the task of deciding what should be done will be with individual schools. The response must be at least twofold, in my opinion.

Adapting the gold standard

The first broad response is to do better what theological schools have already been doing well. The pattern of theological education developed during the twentieth century, conducted as graduate, professional education in schools that were invented for this kind of education, has demon-

strated enduring value. It has served Unitarian Universalists and Roman Catholics, Pentecostals and Presbyterians, Baptists and Episcopalians, Nazarenes and Disciples, Lutherans and Orthodox, and it has served them all very well. It brings students together with each other and talented faculty in courses where wisdom has been shared and learning has taken root. It has effectively supported the leadership needs of churches and made it possible for faculty to conduct research that has expanded the understanding of old traditions and generated the perspective of new insights. This pattern of theological education has become a gold standard, and the first response to the changed realities of North American religion is to continue it, with critical attention to how it should adapt to changed religious realities. I think that some of this attention should be given to the curriculum and perceptions about sources of wisdom for theological scholarship.

Multifaith understanding and Christian witness. While much of the curriculum should remain as it is, at least two areas related to the new religious realities in North America need attention. The first is the growing number of persons affiliated with religions other than Christianity, and the second is the fastest growing religious preference in the United States: “no religious preference.”

Ministers and priests will need more sensitivity to the nature of Christian ministry in an increasingly multifaith context. Christian pastors, whose job it is to stand in a pulpit and tell people that Christianity has a vision of the world that is worth their devotion and commitment, need to be able to call Christians to faith in ways that do not alienate them from their neighbors of other faiths or nurture religious prejudices. Pastors need to be able to work with families in which more than one faith is represented, to support the common good with leaders of other faiths, and to deal seriously with the questions their own parishioners have about the religious “other.” These pastoral skills will be increasingly important and require more curricular attention.

Ministerial leaders will need to be equally sensitive to what it means to minister in a culture where the fastest growing religious preference is “none.” In the past, Christian pastors have been able to do their work in a North American culture that was broadly Christian. Every indication points to a future in which that will no longer be

the case. For an ever expanding percentage of the population, the Christian story will be a revelation, not a recitation. Pastors will need to learn to relate the Christian faith to people who have little religious interest and no religious commitment. What curricular support will prepare future leaders to serve as advocates for faith in a religiously neutral culture rather than as chaplains of a faith that was privileged by culture?

These two needs do not travel together easily. Multifaith understanding is not typically coupled with Christian witness. Pastoral work has never been easy, but it is going to become more complex, more demanding, more in need of what theological schools can teach. The gold standard needs to be progressive, not static.

Pastoral wisdom. In addition to this curricular attention, theological scholarship needs to give increased attention to the sources of wisdom that pastors and church professionals can bring to theological education. As seminaries have leaned into their academic identity, they have increasingly presumed that wisdom accrues from advanced degrees, from research and writing, and from participating in the technical work of academic guilds. Certainly it does. But there are other sources of wisdom, equally intellectually lively and viable, that accrue from the discipline of preparing sermons every week, figuring out what it takes to make congregations work well, engaging a faith community in witness in word and deed, and being with people in the middle of unspeakable pain and sadness. This is hard work, and if pastors do it well, they develop a wisdom that can’t be gained from books and academic presentations at AAR or SBL.

The practice of Christian congregations is changing rapidly, and the wisdom about that practice is not in the seminary. Pastors are on the front lines of change; they and their congregations are inventing new paradigms of congregational ministry that reflect new learning; and they are dealing concretely with many of the issues that will form the next theory of practice. Theological schools simply cannot neglect this source of wisdom. They need to engage talented pastors differently than they have in the past. Fifty years ago, the perception of faculties of ATS member schools was that serious, advanced scholarship was underrepresented—too many pastors and not enough academics. Now, ATS schools have significant academic talent and it is pastoral talent that might be underrepresent-

ed. The gold standard for theological education must include both the wisdom that accrues from academic work and the wisdom that emerges only from pastoral work.

A big tent of educational practices

The second broad response is to diversify educational practice to meet an increasing diversity of educational need. Since ATS became an accrediting agency in the 1930s, it has erected a big tent for theological education. Big tents require a large fabric, and for ATS, this has been a common understanding of graduate, professional education for ministry. A big tent also requires tall poles along the center line to give it height. In recent history, these tall poles have been exemplar institutions that embody the gold standard patterns of theological education. It also needs poles around the circumference that maximize the space, and these poles have been schools that have expanded the common educational model to diverse ecclesial communities. This big tent has served denominational Christianity particularly well by providing a standardized model for theological education. The problem for the single standard model is that denominational Christianity is weakening and other patterns of Christian organizing are in the ascendancy. In a recent interview, Michael Lindsay compared bureaucratic denominations to Sears, and some newer forms of Christian expression to eBay.¹⁰ Both retailers were invented to sell products, but one is proving to be more successful than the other. Sears has depended on standardization of products, while eBay depends on diversity of products without standardization. A single pattern for theological education fit bureaucratic denominations very well, but if the future is going to look more like eBay than Sears, then theological education will serve the Christian project best if it provides a diversity of educational strategies.

ATS schools need to consider erecting a new kind of big tent. In this big tent, the large fabric will be an understanding of theological education that serves an even broader range of ministry settings—full and part-time leaders, leaders who are as likely to be noncongregation-based as they are based in congregations, persons preparing for ministry, and persons already in ministry. The tall poles on the center line will be the current model of theological education, and the shorter poles at the circumference will consist of diverse educational models. I realize that metaphors are

risky, and that extended metaphors are dangerous. You may have concluded that I have transformed theological education into a circus, but I will stand my ground. Diversity of educational practices in the future will be as crucial as uniformity of educational practice was in the past. Diversity of practice, however, is not intrinsically valuable. It becomes valuable only as it serves the multiple needs of a changed religious reality, reflects passionate and thoughtful educational practice, and has intellectual substance. Theological education must have more diverse models, but these models will have limited value if they do not reflect the equivalent of a gold standard for each. What forms might this diversity take?

Baccalaureate theological education. One form might be the development of more theological education at the baccalaureate level. One president of an ATS member school who was struggling with the uniform postbaccalaureate pattern of theological education asked me to explain the difference between a baccalaureate-level funeral and a graduate-level funeral. His point, of course, was that many of the central tasks of pastoral ministry can be learned effectively at more than one educational level. Theological education practices could be broadened to include levels of education other than graduate, professional education, and in so doing, might be strengthened, rather than weakened. Religious communities need more educated leaders who are from recent immigrant communities and some racial/ethnic groups that have a low percentage of baccalaureate degree holders. As compensation in many small and mid-sized congregations continues to be more stressed, the church may need more leaders who have been theologically educated at the baccalaureate or even associate degree level. What would constitute a gold standard for theological education at this level? How might ATS schools partner with undergraduate institutions to provide ministerial education at this level?

Alternatively credentialed clergy. Another form will be theological education for alternatively credentialed clergy. While Protestantism has always had a large percentage of smaller membership congregations, the percentage of part-time pastors has emerged as a growth industry in mainline Protestantism across the past two decades. Lutherans, Disciples of Christ, United Church of Christ, Presbyterians, American Baptists, and the United Church have all been busy inventing patterns of

education for alternatively credentialed clergy, and most of these programs have limited requirements and expectations. While the educational preparation needs to be different for regularly and alternatively credentialed clergy, much of the work of ministry does not vary by congregational size. The family whose child is dying of cancer who attend a small membership church needs skillful pastoral support from an alternatively credentialed pastor just as a family with the same trauma in a larger congregation served by a seminary graduate. Part-time pastors cannot leave their primary jobs for three years to study at seminary and then return to a part-time church, but they need more than the current alternative educational models are providing. They need educational programs that prepare them for the complex tasks of ministry, but designed in accessible and thoughtful ways. What would the gold standard of theological education be for part-time pastoral leaders?

On-the-job education. Theological schools need to give increased attention to the character of education that supports persons who are already engaged in ministry. Seminaries have built educational systems primarily on the professional school model in which students go to school, get a degree, and then begin work in ministry. For most professions, this is a mandatory model. Not so with ministry. An increasing number of persons who have already begun ministry need theological education to advance their ministerial work. They are lay ecclesial ministers already at work in large Roman Catholic parishes or program staff members of larger membership Protestant congregations. According to the National Congregations Study, while 90 percent of pastors of congregations with at least 200 regular attendees have a seminary education, only 29 percent of education and youth ministers have attended seminary, and 18 percent of music ministers.¹¹ Theological schools need to develop effective patterns of postemployment education that enhance ministerial work already underway. These patterns of education will recognize that the congregation or ministry context is the primary community of formation and will use that community in developing educational practices. It should assume that these students already have ministerial skills and that they are as capable learners as on-campus degree students. What kind of good education practices would form the gold standard for on-the-job theological education?

Lay education. Still another needed form of theological education is for persons who want to enrich their understanding of faith but do not want to pursue vocational ministry or advanced higher education degrees. The deepest layer of identity for most ATS schools is the education of clergy. Most ATS schools have expanded that identity to educate lay persons who want to work vocationally in ministry. Both of these groups are well served by this professional educational model. Many schools also offer academic degrees. The educational aim of professional degree programs is to equip students to exercise religious leadership. The educational aim of an academic degree program is a more thorough and comprehensive understanding of an area of study, often in preparation for advanced study. The students whose educational needs are *not* well met by either of these kinds of degrees are lay persons who are seriously interested in learning their faith but do not want to work in ministry vocationally and do not want a specialized academic degree. Many schools squeeze these students into one of these two programs, but the educational design does not address their real educational motivation. The church is in as much need of educated lay persons as it is educated ministers, and theological schools are among the best environments to provide this kind of education. What would gold standard theological education look like for lay persons who are often better educated in almost every other area of their lives than in their faith?

Tapping a broad array of resources

If ATS schools are to build a big tent of diverse educational practices, they will need to tap a broader array of educational resources.

Higher education conventions. First, theological schools will need to broaden their use of higher education conventions. North American higher education has a variety of educational practices, from community colleges to research universities, but ATS schools have tended to model their work more after research universities than the others. This model includes conventions of full-time faculty with research expectations, tenure, a nine-month academic year, and periodic time away from instructional responsibilities for reading and research. These are all good educational practices, but as a set, they are very expensive. Some sectors in higher education have never had these practices, and other significant sectors are shifting their practices. Some theological schools may

need to pay more attention to these other higher education conventions for financial and missional reasons. While it would be tragic if no ATS schools functioned like research universities, it might also be tragic if others do not develop very different educational practices.

Other theological education providers. Second, theological schools will need to pay closer attention to the educational integrity of other theological education providers. The uniformity of the postbaccalaureate model has led to the perception that theological education doesn't begin until the student enrolls in a graduate professional degree program. That has also led to a tendency to devalue education in other educational settings. In the future, ATS schools will need to reassess this perspective. While schools have learned to value clinical pastoral education, many have tended to undervalue what can be learned in field education, have assigned too little credit for learning in context, and have not required as much contextual learning as ministerial practice requires. Social work education is similar to professional ministry education in its overall educational goals, but it differs in that carefully supervised field work is the organizing educational principle. While most students do not enter a theological school with any baccalaureate education in relevant fields, some do, but their background does not count for much. The current standards do not permit articulation of any undergraduate work into an ATS approved degree, except by examination. (I know that many schools have creatively skirted this accrediting limitation, but I'll save commentary on that practice for another time.) Would it be advisable to develop articulation procedures whereby appropriate learning at the undergraduate level could be counted in a graduate degree, as is the case with graduate, professional social work or engineering degrees? Many Latino/a students have attended Bible institutes or other church-based programs and learned a great deal about the Hispanic church and ministry in Spanish speaking communities. Is there a better way for ATS schools to honor this experience and the learning that it has generated? The answer to these questions is bound to the ability of ATS accredited schools to understand the broader ecology of theological education providers and determine how they participate in that ecology, instead of over against it.

Technology. Third, theological schools need to embrace the full range of educational opportunities

that technology makes possible. Information technology is changing higher education and scholarly work. While online resources for theological education are less abundant than they are for medical or legal education, these resources are increasing. Google Books, for example, has digitized most of the holdings of the Andover Harvard Library, one of the premier theological libraries in the country. After the legal issues are resolved, texts that used to be available only at great effort can be downloaded to your Kindle. The American Theological Library Association has digitized the entire series of a core set of theology journals. You can read every issue that ATS has ever published of *Theological Education* online, if you want, although I don't know of anyone who has ever wanted to. As the literature that theological study requires becomes more available digitally and pedagogical capacity of online courses increases, technology can help theological schools meet many of the needs that the current residential model of education leaves wanting. All educational strategies function in service to educational goals, and technology might advance the effectiveness of theological study, not retard it.

Conclusion

The future has arrived and brought a multitude of changes in cultural norms, educational models, international tensions, business practices, and religious presence. Theological schools need to change to meet the needs of changed and changing religion, and there are a few things worth remembering along the way.

The first is that Christianity in North America is changed but not diminished. Loving neighbor as self is still noble moral guidance. Doing "good" remains crucial to the common good. The Christian message has not lost its power to heal human brokenness or guide the human family in life-giving ways. The Christian message has not been rendered powerless; its promise has not been eviscerated.

The second is that theological schools are needed as much in this changed world, if not more, as they have ever been. As denominational structures weaken, as the organizational center of North American Christianity shifts, theological schools will be called both to educate students for service in a newly ordered religious landscape and to help the church remember its past and envision its future. Religion has an increasing number of

MESSAGE FROM THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

organizations, but organizations have a tendency to come and go. It needs institutions that can dig in for the long term and provide the setting where, in Hugh Hecló's words, "the shadows from both past and future lengthen into the present."¹² A historical moment when the sun appears to be rising in the east before it has set in the west can be dizzying, but a place where the shadows from the past and future lengthen into the present can be energizing. Religious leaders will need all the education they can get, and religion will need institutional homes where its vision can be sustained and renewed over time.

The third is that there will be adequate resources to accomplish what needs to be done. It has been a brutal two years for most ATS schools economically, and many are not out of the woods yet. I know that some of you were putting a price tag on everything that I have said this afternoon and wondering how any of it could be done. The economic model that many schools have used in the past will not carry them into the future, and we are not sure what the new model will be. What I am sure of is that providence and hard work and frugal budgets and deep commitments and creative strategies will provide the resources to do what most needs to be done.

Most of the executive leadership of North American theological education is in this room. You have the gift of the future and the opportunity of a lifetime. *The future has arrived*, and it is full of promise.

ENDNOTES

1. Annual statistics from the Church of the Nazarene, 2009, <http://www.nazarene.org/files/docs/StatisticsAnnual.pdf>.
2. "Research and Evaluation," Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, <http://www.elca.org/Who-We-Are/Our-Three-Expressions/Churchwide-Organization/Research-and-Evaluation.aspx>.
3. "Southern Baptist Statistical Survey—2009," LifeWay Christian Resources, May 13, 2010, www.lifeway.com/lwc/files/lwcF_corp_news_ACP2009_GeneralData.pdf.
4. "U.S. Religious Landscape Survey," The Pew Forum on Religious & Public Life, February 2008, <http://religions.pewforum.org/reports>. See also "The Impact of Religious Switching and Secularization on the Estimated Size of the U.S. Adult Catholic Population," Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate (CARA) at Georgetown University, 2008, <http://cara.georgetown.edu/CARA%20Services/FRStats/Winter%202008.pdf> for a thoughtful reflection on the Pew Forum data on Roman Catholics.
5. "U.S. Religious Landscape Survey," The Pew Forum on Religious & Public Life, February 2008, <http://religions.pewforum.org/reports>.
6. "Church Attendance," In Depth: Catholicism in Canada, *CBC News Online*, October 2, 2003, www.cbc.ca/news/background/catholicism/churchattendance.html.
7. Jim Coggins, "The State of the Canadian Church—Part 1: A Nation of Believers," December 6, 2007, www.canadianchristianity.com/nationalupdates/071206state.html. See also "The National Congregations Study," Hartford Institute for Religion Research, http://hrr.hartsem.edu/congregation_research_ncs.html.
8. Allison Pond, Gregory Smith, and Scott Clement, "Religion Among the Millennials," Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life, February 17, 2010, <http://pewforum.org/Age/Religion-Among-the-Millennials.aspx>.
9. "Tolerance and Tension: Islam and Christianity in Sub-Saharan Africa," The Pew Forum on Religious & Public Life, April 15, 2010, <http://pewforum.org/executive-summary-islam-and-christianity-in-sub-saharan-africa.aspx>.
10. "Michael-Lindsay: The Mainline is not on the Sidelines," interview in *Faith and Leadership*, March 17, 2010, <http://www.faithandleadership.com/qa/michael-lindsay-the-mainline-not-the-sidelines>.
11. "Mark Chaves: Has Your Whole Staff been to Seminary?" blog from the National Congregations Study, June 18, 2009, <http://www.faithandleadership.com/blog/06-18-2009/mark-chaves-has-your-whole-staff-been-seminary>.
12. Hugh Hecló, *On Thinking Institutionally* (Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers, 2008), 109.

Report of the Board of Commissioners

During the 2008–10 biennium, the Board of Commissioners committed most of the time during its twice-yearly meetings to deliberation and actions regarding the accredited status of member schools. The actions were based on focused and comprehensive accrediting visits to member schools, staff reports, and the large number of petitions, requests, and reports from the schools. This report includes a summary of all actions taken during the first three meetings of the Board of Commissioners and will be supplemented at the Biennial Meeting by a summary of actions taken at the final meeting, which occurs just weeks prior to the Biennial Meeting.

Accreditation is a peer process, and the board expresses its appreciation to the 187 persons who have served as chairs and committee members for the fifty-nine comprehensive and focused visits conducted during this biennium. The board also expresses its appreciation for the work of staff members Tisa Lewis, Jeremiah McCarthy, William Miller, and Lester Ruiz who have worked full time during part or all of this biennium in support of the Commission on Accrediting.

In addition to its ongoing agenda of accrediting decisions, the board gave special attention to several ongoing issues with regard to Commission accreditation: joint visits with regional accrediting agencies and the work of the board's Task Force on the Revision of the Standards and Procedures as well as assessment of interpretive guidelines, the board's administrative procedures, and the way in which the board is implementing accrediting decisions in a time of financial stress.

Joint visits with regional accrediting agencies

About 80 percent of the freestanding schools in the United States that are accredited by the Commission are also accredited by one of six regional accrediting agencies. The Commission on Accrediting has maintained agreements with these agencies for decades. Historically, the Commission's procedures and standards closely paralleled those maintained by regional agencies. In the past decade, however, the procedures and strategies of some regional agencies have become more diver-

gent from one another and from ATS Commission strategies. Joint visits with some regional agencies have become increasingly complex as differences in procedures have increased. During this biennium, following work of the previous biennium, the Board of Commissioners has reviewed its policies regarding joint visits and initiated conversations with several agencies to review and, in some cases, revise protocols for joint visits. The board has negotiated or is in the process of negotiating revised procedures with the Higher Learning Commission, the Southern Association's Commission on Colleges, Middle States Commission on Institutions of Higher Learning, and the Western Association Commission on Senior Colleges. To guide these efforts, the board adopted the following evaluative questions:

1. Does the joint process ensure a thorough, community-wide engagement in the process of accreditation, or is the process largely managed by key administrators of the institution?
2. Does the joint process carefully ensure that the standards of ATS are clearly reflected in the narrative of the joint team report, that they are appropriately referenced, and that specific recommendations to the ATS Board of Commissioners are clearly identified for the benefit of the board?
3. Does the joint process ensure that the ATS Board of Commissioners exercises its "separate and independent" judgment with regard to the Commission standards?
4. Does the construction of the self-study document and other materials for the joint visit clearly attend to the expectations of the self-study as articulated in the *ATS Handbook of Accreditation*?
5. Does the joint process clearly provide a benefit to the member school in terms of coordination of effort, efficiency in satisfying the expectations of both agencies, and enhanced value in terms of the significant investment of human, financial, and physical resources that is required?
6. Can the ATS/COA staff handle the increasingly large workload associated with joint visits with some agencies?

Task Force on the Revision of the Standards

The Board of Commissioners appointed the task force in 2008, and it has worked during the past biennium on the Procedures of Accrediting and General Institutional Standards 1–9. The task force presented a preliminary report to the Board of Commissioners at its June 2009 meeting. The board reviewed this report, and the task force worked during the second half of 2009 on its final recommendations to the Board of Commissioners. The board received the final report of the task force at its February 2010 meeting, determined to accept the recommendation of the task force with only a few changes, and forwarded the proposals for public comment by member schools during March and early April. The board reviewed comments and proposals submitted, and its final recommendations for changes to the procedures and accrediting standards are included in this *Program and Reports* book, beginning on page 21.

A primary guideline for proposed changes to the procedures was to ease the number of accrediting interactions between schools and the Board of Commissioners. Other changes were necessary to comply with new U.S. Department of Education regulations of agencies that it recognizes; these regulations were implemented as a result of the 2009 reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. The task force worked on General Institutional Standards 1–9 on the assumption that these standards have been functioning effectively. Across the past decade, the Commission has asked self-study directors, deans, and visiting committee chairs and members to evaluate these standards, and those evaluations have been consistently positive. The task force proposed changes that would enhance editorial clarity, update the standards as appropriate, and introduce substantive changes only where they were deemed most necessary. The Board of Commissioners concurred and is recommending limited changes to these standards.

The board is appreciative of the time and thoughtful consideration given to the process of revision by the members of the Task Force on the Revision of the Standards: Gary Riebe-Estrella, Chair (Catholic Theological Union), Richard Benson (St. John's Seminary, CA), Richard Bliese (Luther Seminary), Lawrence Brennan (Public Member), Bryan Chapell (Covenant Theologi-

cal Seminary), Dennis Dirks (Talbot School of Theology), James Echols (Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago), Patrick Graham (Candler School of Theology of Emory University), Michael Martin (Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary), Melody Mazuk (Palmer Theological Seminary), David McAllister-Wilson (Wesley Theological Seminary), Jeremiah McCarthy (St. Patrick's Seminary and University), Mary Kay Oosdyke (Public Member), Andrew Peterson (Reformed Theological Seminary), Jean Stairs (Queen's Theological College), Kenneth Swetland (Public Member), Lacey Warner (Duke University Divinity School), and Mary Young (Samuel DeWitt Proctor School of Theology).

Discussion of interpretive guidelines

The Standards of Accrediting are adopted by member schools, and the Board of Commissioners is charged in the Commission bylaws with responsibility for accrediting decisions. In the context of that effort, the Commission adopts interpretive guidelines to maximize the consistency of its accrediting decisions. During this biennium, the board has reviewed the interpretive guidelines by which it makes accrediting decisions related to the duration of professional master's degrees that required the equivalent of two years of full-time study and its understanding of the residency for research doctoral programs. These guidelines ensure that the board interprets the standards adopted by member schools in a consistent manner.

Administrative procedures

During the biennium, the Board of Commissioners has continued to monitor its administrative procedures. The workload of the board has continued to increase in recent years, and the board has worked to identify strategies that will ensure consistent and fair decisions related to member schools and accomplish its growing agenda in a reasonable time and with reasonable effort. This biennium, the board has implemented a reader panel process whereby a subgroup of the board reviews certain actions that do not change the accredited status of schools and makes appropriate decisions in conference call sessions apart from the semiannual meetings in Pittsburgh. The board has also reviewed the background material that staff make available for each of its decisions and the ways in which professional staff support the board's work.

Accrediting decisions in a time of financial stress

With the rapid changes in U.S. and international equity markets and the recession that has negatively affected member schools, the board assessed how it can best make accrediting decisions. In February 2009, the board requested that the executive director issue a letter to member schools regarding the way in which it intended to implement accrediting decisions in the context of the financial stress the schools are experiencing. The board does not have authority to fail to administer the standards, but it can interpret them in the context of the financial stress that all schools are experiencing. In addition to considering the implications for schools, the board has reviewed its revenues from

dues and, with the ATS Board of Directors, is carefully monitoring its revenue to ensure that it has the resources necessary for its responsibilities.

Actions during the 2008–2010 biennium

The following list of actions by the Board of Commissioners reflects decisions taken at the first three of four meetings in the 2008–2010 biennium. The final, published version of this report in ATS Bulletin 49, Part 3, Biennial Meeting will include actions taken at the June 7–8, 2010, Board of Commissioners' meeting. The board will not distribute those actions at the Biennial Meeting because the formal period for appeals will not have expired, and the actions are not final until that time.

Comprehensive evaluation visits

- Alliance Theological Seminary—Nyack, NY
 Anderson University School of Theology—Anderson, IN
 Associated Mennonite Biblical Seminary—Elkhart, IN
 Atlantic School of Theology—Halifax, NS
 Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary—Austin, TX
 Bangor Theological Seminary—Bangor, ME
 Baptist Theological Seminary at Richmond—Richmond, VA
 Barry University Department of Theology and Philosophy—Miami Shores, FL
 Blessed John XXIII National Seminary—Weston, MA
 Boston College School of Theology and Ministry—Chestnut Hill, MA
 Chapman Seminary—Oakland City, IN
 Cincinnati Bible Seminary—Cincinnati, OH
 Concordia Theological Seminary (IN)—Fort Wayne, IN
 Dominican Study Center of the Caribbean—Bayamon, PR
 Eastern Mennonite Seminary—Harrisonburg, VA
 Eden Theological Seminary—St. Louis, MO
 Episcopal Divinity School—Cambridge, MA
 Evangelical Seminary of Puerto Rico—San Juan, PR
 Franciscan School of Theology—Berkeley, CA
 Fuller Theological Seminary—Pasadena, CA
 Garrett—Evangelical Theological Seminary—Evanston, IL
 Harding University Graduate School of Religion—Memphis, TN
 Houston Graduate School of Theology—Houston, TX
 Iliff School of Theology—Denver, CO
 Jesuit School of Theology of Santa Clara University—Berkeley, CA
 Kenrick—Glennon Seminary—St. Louis, MO
 Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary—Louisville, KY
 Lutheran Theological Seminary—Saskatoon, SK
 McMaster Divinity College—Hamilton, ON
 Mennonite Brethren Biblical Seminary—Fresno, CA
 Methodist Theological School in Ohio—Delaware, OH
 Nashotah House—Nashotah, WI
 Oblate School of Theology—San Antonio, TX
 Pacific School of Religion—Berkeley, CA
 Payne Theological Seminary—Wilberforce, OH
 Pentecostal Theological Seminary—Cleveland, TN
 Perkins School of Theology—Dallas, TX
 Princeton Theological Seminary—Princeton, NJ
 Regent College—Vancouver, BC
 Sacred Heart School of Theology—Hales Corners, WI
 Seabury-Western Theological Seminary—Evanston, IL
 Seattle University School of Theology and Ministry—Seattle, WA
 Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary—Berrien Springs, MI
 St. Charles Borromeo Seminary—Wynnewood, PA
 St. John's University School of Theology—Seminary—Collegeville, MN
 St. Tikhon's Orthodox Theological Seminary—South Canaan, PA
 St. Vincent de Paul Regional Seminary—Boynton Beach, FL
 Starr King School for the Ministry—Berkeley, CA
 Trinity Evangelical Divinity School—Deerfield, IL
 Tyndale University College & Seminary—Toronto, ON

COMMISSION ON ACCREDITING

University of St. Thomas School of Theology—
Houston, TX
Wake Forest University Divinity School—Win-
ston-Salem, NC
Washington Theological Union—Washington, DC
Western Seminary—Portland, OR
Westminster Theological Seminary in California—
Escondido, CA

Initial evaluation visits

Mid-America Reformed Seminary—Dyer, IN

Focused evaluation visits

Ashland Theological Seminary—Ashland, OH
Assemblies of God Theological Seminary—Spring-
field, MO
Byzantine Catholic Seminary of SS. Cyril and
Methodius—Pittsburgh, PA
Carolina Evangelical Divinity School—Greens-
boro, NC
Central Baptist Theological Seminary—Shawnee, KS
Claremont School of Theology—Claremont, CA
Erskine Theological Seminary—Due West, SC
Fuller Theological Seminary—Pasadena, CA
John Leland Center for Theological Studies—Ar-
lington, VA
Logsdon Seminary of Logsdon School of Theology—
Abilene, TX
Moody Theological Seminary and Graduate
School—Michigan—Plymouth, MI
Northern Baptist Theological Seminary—Lombard, IL
Notre Dame Seminary—New Orleans, LA
Oral Roberts University School of Theology—Tulsa,
OK
Seattle University School of Theology and Ministry—
Seattle, WA
St. Andrew's College—Saskatoon, SK
St. Charles Borromeo Seminary—Wynnewood, PA
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School—Deerfield, IL
Vancouver School of Theology—Vancouver, BC
Waterloo Lutheran Seminary—Waterloo, ON

Initial visits

Grace Theological Seminary—Winona Lake, IN
Urshan Graduate School of Theology—Florissant,
MO

Candidacy visits

Reformed Episcopal Seminary—Blue Bell, PA

Requests for initial visits

Hazelip School of Theology—Nashville, TN

Candidacy for accredited membership

Hazelip School of Theology—Nashville, TN
Inter-American Adventist Theological Seminary—
Miami, FL
La Sierra University School of Religion—River-
side, CA

Preliminary approval of degree programs

Acadia Divinity College—Wolfville, NS
American Baptist Seminary of the West—Berkeley,
CA
Aquinas Institute of Theology—St. Louis, MO
Asbury Theological Seminary—Wilmore, KY
Ashland Theological Seminary—Ashland, OH
Assemblies of God Theological Seminary—Spring-
field, MO
Bangor Theological Seminary—Bangor, ME
Baptist Theological Seminary at Richmond—Rich-
mond, VA
Beeson Divinity School of Samford University—
Birmingham, AL
Bethany Theological Seminary—Richmond, IN
Boston University School of Theology—Boston,
MA
Brite Divinity School of Texas Christian Univer-
sity—Fort Worth, TX
Calvin Theological Seminary—Grand Rapids, MI
Campbell University Divinity School—Buies
Creek, NC
Capital Bible Seminary—Lanham, MD
Carey Theological College—Vancouver, BC
Catholic Theological Union—Chicago, IL
Central Baptist Theological Seminary—Shawnee, KS
Christian Witness Theological Seminary—San Jose,
CA
Claremont School of Theology—Claremont, CA
Colgate Rochester Crozer Divinity School—Roches-
ter, NY
Columbia International University-Seminary &
School of Missions—Columbia, SC
Columbia Theological Seminary—Decatur, GA
Covenant Theological Seminary—St. Louis, MO
Dominican School of Philosophy and Theology—
Berkeley, CA
Drew University Theological School—Madison, NJ
Duke University Divinity School—Durham, NC
Eastern Mennonite Seminary—Harrisonburg, VA
Emmanuel School of Religion—Johnson City, TN

- Erskine Theological Seminary—Due West, SC
 Florida Center for Theological Studies—Miami, FL
 Fuller Theological Seminary—Pasadena, CA
 Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary—Mill Valley, CA
 Haggard Graduate School of Theology—Azusa, CA
 Heritage Theological Seminary—Cambridge, ON
 Houston Graduate School of Theology—Houston, TX
 Iliff School of Theology—Denver, CO
 James and Carolyn McAfee School of Theology—Atlanta, GA
 John Leland Center for Theological Studies—Falls Church, VA
 Lexington Theological Seminary—Lexington, KY
 Logos Evangelical Seminary—El Monte, CA
 Logsdon Seminary of Logsdon School of Theology—Abilene, TX
 Logsdon Seminary of Logsdon School of Theology—Abilene, TX
 Luther Seminary—St. Paul, MN
 Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago—Chicago, IL
 Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia—Philadelphia, PA
 McCormick Theological Seminary—Chicago, IL
 Meadville Lombard Theological School—Chicago, IL
 Memphis Theological Seminary—Memphis, TN
 Mennonite Brethren Biblical Seminary—Fresno, CA
 Methodist Theological School in Ohio—Delaware, OH
 Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary—Kansas City, MO
 Moody Theological Seminary and Graduate School—Michigan—Plymouth, MI
 Nazarene Theological Seminary—Kansas City, MO
 New Brunswick Theological Seminary—New Brunswick, NJ
 New York Theological Seminary—New York, NY
 Northeastern Seminary at Roberts Wesleyan College—Rochester, NY
 Pacific School of Religion—Berkeley, CA
 Palmer Theological Seminary—Wynnewood, PA
 Pittsburgh Theological Seminary—Pittsburgh, PA
 Queen's College Faculty of Theology—St. John's, NL
 Queen's Theological College—Toronto, ON
 Reformed Theological Seminary—Jackson, MS
 Saint Vincent Seminary—Latrobe, PA
 Samuel DeWitt Proctor School of Theology—Richmond, VA
 Seattle University School of Theology and Ministry—Seattle, WA
 Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary—Berrien Springs, MI
 Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary—Wake Forest, NC
 Southern Baptist Theological Seminary—Louisville, KY
 St. John Vianney Theological Seminary—Denver, CO
 St. John's Seminary (MA)—Brighton, MA
 Trinity Episcopal School for Ministry—Ambridge, PA
 Trinity Lutheran Seminary—Columbus, OH
 Union Theological Seminary and Presbyterian School of Christian Education—Richmond, VA
 United Theological Seminary—Dayton, OH
 University of Dubuque Theological Seminary—Dubuque, IA
 University of Winnipeg Faculty of Theology—Winnipeg, MB
 Vancouver School of Theology—Vancouver, BC
 Virginia Theological Seminary—Alexandria, VA
 Wartburg Theological Seminary—Dubuque, IA
 Washington Theological Union—Washington, DC
 Waterloo Lutheran Seminary—Waterloo, ON
 Westminster Theological Seminary—Philadelphia, PA
 Wycliffe College—Toronto, ON
- Reports received from member institutions**
- Abilene Christian University Graduate School of Theology—Abilene, TX
 Alliance Theological Seminary—Nyack, NY
 Ambrose Seminary of Ambrose University College—Calgary, AB
 Andover Newton Theological School—Newton Centre, MA
 Aquinas Institute of Theology—St. Louis, MO
 Asbury Theological Seminary—Wilmore, KY
 Ashland Theological Seminary—Ashland, OH
 Atlantic School of Theology—Halifax, NS
 Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary—Austin, TX
 Bangor Theological Seminary—Bangor, ME
 Baptist Missionary Association Theological Seminary—Jacksonville, TX
 Baptist Theological Seminary at Richmond—Richmond, VA
 Barry University Department of Theology and Philosophy—Miami Shores, FL
 Bethel Seminary of Bethel University—St. Paul, MN
 Blessed John XXIII National Seminary—Weston, MA
 Boston University School of Theology—Boston, MA

COMMISSION ON ACCREDITING

Calvin Theological Seminary—Grand Rapids, MI
Canadian Southern Baptist Seminary—Cochrane, AB
Carey Theological College—Vancouver, BC
Catholic University of America School of Theology
and Religious Studies—Washington, DC
Central Baptist Theological Seminary—Shawnee,
KS
Chapman Seminary—Oakland City, IN
Chicago Theological Seminary—Chicago, IL
Christian Theological Seminary—Indianapolis, IN
Church Divinity School of the Pacific—Berkeley,
CA
Cincinnati Bible Seminary—Cincinnati, OH
Claremont School of Theology—Claremont, CA
Colgate Rochester Crozer Divinity School—Roch-
ester, NY
Columbia International University—Seminary and
School of Missions—Columbia, SC
Columbia Theological Seminary—Decatur, GA
Concordia Lutheran Seminary (AB)—Edmonton, AB
Concordia Seminary—St. Louis, MO
Covenant Theological Seminary—St. Louis, MO
Dominican Study Center of the Caribbean—Bay-
amon, PR
Drew University Theological School—Madison, NJ
Eastern Mennonite Seminary—Harrisonburg, VA
Ecumenical Theological Seminary—Detroit, MI
Eden Theological Seminary—St. Louis, MO
Emmanuel School of Religion—Johnson City, TN
Episcopal Divinity School—Cambridge, MA
Episcopal Theological Seminary of the Southwest—
Austin, TX
Erskine Theological Seminary—Due West, SC
Florida Center for Theological Studies—Miami, FL
Fuller Theological Seminary—Pasadena, CA
General Theological Seminary—New York, NY
Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary—Mill
Valley, CA
Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary—South
Hamilton, MA
Graduate Theological Union—Berkeley, CA
Grand Rapids Theological Seminary of Corner-
stone University—Grand Rapids, MI
Haggard Graduate School of Theology—Azusa, CA
Hood Theological Seminary—Salisbury, NC
Houston Graduate School of Theology—Houston, TX
Iliff School of Theology—Denver, CO
Immaculate Conception Seminary—South Orange, NJ
Interdenominational Theological Center—Atlanta,
GA
Interdenominational Theological Seminary—El
Monte, CA
International Theological Seminary—El Monte, CA
James and Carolyn McAfee School of Theology—
Atlanta, GA
Kenrick-Glennon Seminary—St. Louis, MO
Knox College—Toronto, ON
Knox Theological Seminary—Fort Lauderdale, FL
Lincoln Christian Seminary—Lincoln, IL
Logos Evangelical Seminary—El Monte, CA
Logsdon Seminary of Logsdon School of Theol-
ogy—Abilene, TX
Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary—
Louisville, KY
Loyola Marymount University Department of
Theological Studies—Los Angeles, CA
Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago—Chicago, IL
M. Christopher White School of Divinity—Boiling
Springs, NC
McCormick Theological Seminary—Chicago, IL
Memphis Theological Seminary—Memphis, TN
Michigan Theological Seminary—Plymouth, MI
Mid-America Reformed Seminary—Dyer, IN
Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary—Kan-
sas City, MO
Montreal School of Theology—Montreal, QC
Moravian Theological Seminary—Bethlehem, PA
Multnomah Biblical Seminary—Portland, OR
Nazarene Theological Seminary—Kansas City,
MO
New Brunswick Theological Seminary—New
Brunswick, NJ
New York Theological Seminary—New York, NY
Newman Theological College—Edmonton, AB
North Park Theological Seminary—Chicago, IL
Northeastern Seminary at Roberts Wesleyan Col-
lege—Rochester, NY
Northern Baptist Theological Seminary—Lom-
bard, IL
Notre Dame Seminary—New Orleans, LA
Oblate School of Theology—San Antonio, TX
Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary—Berkeley, CA
Payne Theological Seminary—Wilberforce, OH
Phillips Theological Seminary—Tulsa, OK
Phoenix Seminary—Phoenix, AZ
Pittsburgh Theological Seminary—Pittsburgh, PA
Princeton Theological Seminary—Princeton, NJ
Providence Theological Seminary—Otterburne, MB
Reformed Presbyterian Theological Seminary—
Pittsburgh, PA
Reformed Theological Seminary—Jackson, MS
Regent University School of Divinity—Virginia
Beach, VA
Saint Mary Seminary and Graduate School of The-
ology—Wickliffe, OH
Saint Meinrad School of Theology—St. Meinrad, IN
Saint Paul School of Theology—Kansas City, MO
Saint Vincent Seminary—Latrobe, PA

Samuel DeWitt Proctor School of Theology—Richmond, VA	Trinity Episcopal School for Ministry—Ambridge, PA
Seminary of the Southwest—Austin, TX	United Theological Seminary—Dayton, OH
Sioux Falls Seminary—Sioux Falls, SD	United Theological Seminary of the Twin Cities—New Brighton, MN
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary—Wake Forest, NC	University of Dubuque Theological Seminary—Dubuque, IA
Southern Baptist Theological Seminary—Louisville, KY	University of St. Michael’s College Faculty of Theology—Toronto, ON
St. Andrew’s College—Saskatoon, SK	University of St. Thomas School of Theology—Houston, TX
St. Charles Borromeo Seminary—Wynnewood, PA	University of Winnipeg Faculty of Theology—Winnipeg, MB
St. John’s University School of Theology—Seminary—Collegeville, MN	Wartburg Theological Seminary—Dubuque, IA
St. John’s Seminary (CA)—Camarillo, CA	Washington Theological Union—Washington, DC
St. John Vianney Theological Seminary—Denver, CO	Wesley Biblical Seminary—Jackson, MS
St. Peter’s Seminary—London, ON	Western Theological Seminary—Holland, MI
Talbot School of Theology—La Mirada, CA	Westminster Theological Seminary—Philadelphia, PA
Trinity College Faculty of Divinity—Toronto, ON	

Notations imposed or [removed] during the biennium

(not including the June 2010 Board of Commissioners meeting)

Asbury Theological Seminary—[N8.5]
 Bangor Theological Seminary—N1.2, [N9.1]
 Baptist Theological Seminary at Richmond—N9.3
 Cincinnati Bible Seminary—N5.3
 Episcopal Divinity School—N9.3
 Heritage Theological Seminary—N9.3
 Houston Graduate School of Theology—N8.3
 International Theological Seminary—[N9.2, N9.5]
 New Brunswick Theological Seminary—[N4.10]
 Northeastern Seminary—[N9.3]
 Princeton Theological Seminary—N1.3
 Reformed Presbyterian Theological Seminary—[N1.2, N1.3, N4.1, N4.10]
 Seminary of the Southwest—N9.2
 Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary—N1.2
 St. Andrew’s College—[N9.3]
 Waterloo Lutheran Seminary—[N1.3, N4.2, N9.3]

Officers and Commissioners during this Biennium

Anne Anderson, Chair	University of St. Michael’s College
David Draper, Vice Chair/Treasurer	Winebrenner Theological Seminary
Mary Ann Donovan	Jesuit School of Theology of Santa Clara University
David Esterline	McCormick Theological Seminary
Hillary Gaston Sr.	Fellowship of Reconciliation
David Hogue	Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary
Alice Hunt	Chicago Theological Seminary
Kevin LaGree	First United Methodist Church
Mark Latcovich	Saint Mary Seminary and Graduate School of Theology
Melody Mazuk	Palmer Theological Seminary
Barbara Mutch	Carey Theological College

COMMISSION ON ACCREDITING

Mark Ramseth	Trinity Lutheran Seminary
Gary Riebe-Estrella	Catholic Theological Union
Gordon Smith	ReSource Leadership International for Theological Education
Robin Steinke	Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg
Tite Tienou	Trinity Evangelical Divinity School

Visitors

The Commission expresses its appreciation to the following persons who served as members and chairs (*) of accreditation visiting committees in the 2008–2010 biennium.

*Ann Clay Adams	Columbia Theological Seminary
Efrain Agosto	Hartford Seminary
Charles Amjad-Ali	Luther Seminary
*Katherine E. Amos	Wake Forest University Divinity School
*Anne T. Anderson	University of St. Michael's College
Phyllis Anderson	Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary
*Leslie A. Andrews	Asbury Theological Seminary
Steven Argyris	Graduate Theological Union
*Harold W. Attridge	Yale University Divinity School
Michael Attridge	University of St. Michael's College
Albert Aymer	Hood Theological Seminary
*Andrew H. Bartelt	Concordia Seminary (MO)
*Paul T. Barton	Seminary of the Southwest
*Michael J. Basler	Kenrick–Glennon Seminary
Ron Benefiel	Nazarene Theological Seminary
*Dean G. Blevins	Nazarene Theological Seminary
Michael Boddy	Union Theological Seminary
*Stephen C. Bosso	St. Vincent de Paul Regional Seminary
*Gregory W. Bourgond	Formerly of Bethel Seminary of Bethel University
*Paul D. Bramer	Tyndale University College & Seminary
Lawrence Brennan	Kenrick–Glennon Seminary
Thomas Brisco	Logsdon Seminary of Logsdon School of Theology
Elaine Brothers	Oblate School of Theology
Anne Brown	Kent State University
Mitzi Budde	Virginia Theological Seminary
David Bundy	Fuller Theological Seminary
*W. David Buschart	Denver Seminary
*D. Martin Butler	Nazarene Theological Seminary
*William J. Cahoy	St. John's University School of Theology–Seminary
Sharon Callahan	Seattle University School of Theology and Ministry
*Linda M. Cannell	North Park Theological Seminary
*Robert J. Cara	Reformed Theological Seminary
*William J. Carl III	Pittsburgh Theological Seminary
Nick Carter	Andover Newton Theological School
*Milton J. Coalter Jr.	Union Theological Seminary and Presbyterian School of Christian Education
*Robert F. Coleman	Immaculate Conception Seminary
Charles Conniry	George Fox Evangelical Seminary
Linda Corman	Trinity College Faculty of Divinity
Deborah Creamer	Illiff School of Theology
Stephen Crocco	Princeton Theological Seminary
*Faustino M. Cruz	Franciscan School of Theology
*R. Alan Culpepper	James and Carolyn McAfee School of Theology
*Cecelia I. Dachtler	Sioux Falls Seminary

Cindy Derrenbacker	Public Visitor
*Dennis H. Dirks	Talbot School of Theology
*Perry G. Downs	Trinity Evangelical Divinity School
*David E. Draper	Winebrenner Theological Seminary
*Sarah B. Drummond	Andover Newton Theological School
*Jimmy W. Dukes	New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary
*James Warren Dunkly	University of the South School of Theology
*Rodrick K. Durst	Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary
*Ray R. Easley	Wesley Biblical Seminary
*Susan J. Ebertz	Wartburg Theological Seminary
*James Kenneth Echols	Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago
*Leland V. Eliason	Public Visitor
Rene Espinosa	Oblate School of Theology
*David V. Esterline	McCormick Theological Seminary
*Douglas L. Fagerstrom	Grand Rapids Theological Seminary of Cornerstone University
*David William Faupel	Wesley Theological Seminary
Wendy Fletcher	Vancouver School of Theology
*Douglas W. Fombelle	Bethel Seminary of Bethel University
*Kurt A. Gabbard	Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary
Harry Gardner	Acadia Divinity College
Raul Gomez	Sacred Heart School of Theology
*J. Dorcas Gordon	Knox College
*Douglas L. Gragg	Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary
*M. Patrick Graham	Candler School of Theology of Emory University
*David M. Greenhaw	Eden Theological Seminary
*Leander S. Harding	Trinity Episcopal School for Ministry
John Harris	Public Visitor
*Eric E. Hartman	University of the South School of Theology
*John D. Harvey	Columbia International University–Seminary & School of Missions
Gregory Heille	Aquinas Institute of Theology
*Jack C. Heimbichner	Denver Seminary
*William R. Herzog II	Andover Newton Theological School
*Michelle M. Holmes	American Baptist Seminary of the West
Seymour House	Mount Angel Seminary
*Mary Linnie Hudson	Memphis Theological Seminary
*Alice W. Hunt	Chicago Theological Seminary
*Dale T. Irvin	New York Theological Seminary
*Cheryl L. Iverson	Oral Roberts University School of Theology
*Mignon R. Jacobs	Fuller Theological Seminary
Michael Jinkins	Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary
*Ruthann Knechel Johansen	Bethany Theological Seminary
*Timothy J. Johnson	Nashotah House
Lynn Jost	Mennonite Brethren Biblical Seminary
Namsoon Kang	Brite Divinity School
*Donald E. Keeney	Seminary of the Southwest
*Duane K. Kelderman	Calvin Theological Seminary
Joseph Kleppner	Public Visitor
*Victor J. Klimoski	St. John’s University School of Theology–Seminary
*Mary Ann Knefel	University of Dubuque Theological Seminary
Thomas Kobelt	Associated Canadian Theological Schools
Tracy Koenig	Athenaeum of Ohio
*Francis B. Koper	SS. Cyril & Methodius Seminary
*Charles G. Kosanke	SS. Cyril & Methodius Seminary
*Deborah D. Krause	Eden Theological Seminary

COMMISSION ON ACCREDITING

*Todd J. Lajiness	Sacred Heart Major Seminary
*Mark A. Latcovich	Saint Mary Seminary and Graduate School of Theology
Elizabeth Leahy	Haggard Graduate School of Theology
*Peter A. Lillback	Westminster Theological Seminary
*John R. Lillis	Bethel Seminary of Bethel University
*Timothy D. Lincoln	Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary
*Daniel R. Lockwood	Multnomah Biblical Seminary
*Roger L. Loyd	Duke University Divinity School
*Sandra J. Lynch	Yale University Divinity School
Randolph M. MacFarland	Denver Seminary
Shawn C. Madden	Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary
Sandra Magie	University of St. Thomas School of Theology
Thomson K. Mathew	Oral Roberts University School of Theology
Melody Mazuk	Palmer Theological Seminary
Christopher J. McAtee	University of St. Mary of the Lake Mundelein Seminary
Jeremiah J. McCarthy	St. Patrick's Seminary and University
Kelly L. McCormick	Illiff School of Theology
Myron F. McCoy	Saint Paul School of Theology
William T. McGrattan	St. Peter's Seminary
William McKinney	Pacific School of Religion
Oliver McMahan	Pentecostal Theological Seminary
Chris A. Meinzer	The Association of Theological Schools
Ronald A. Mercier	Regis College
H. Lee Merritt	Fuller Theological Seminary
William C. Miller	The Association of Theological Schools
J. Daniel Mindling	Mount Saint Mary's Seminary
Elsie M. Miranda	Barry University Department of Theology and Philosophy
Richard J. Mouw	Fuller Theological Seminary
Allen Mueller	Public Visitor
John R. Muether	Reformed Theological Seminary
D. Cameron Murchison	Columbia Theological Seminary
Sara Joyce Myers	Columbia Theological Seminary
David Neelands	Trinity College Faculty of Divinity
Gail R. O'Day	Candler School of Theology of Emory University
Steven O'Hala	St. Vincent de Paul Regional Seminary
Shawn Oliver	Ashland Theological Seminary
Nancy J. Olson	Lincoln Christian College and Seminary
Alvin Padilla	Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary
William B. Palardy	Blessed John XXIII National Seminary
Fr. Richard Paperini	Mount Angel Seminary
Miriam J. Parent	Trinity Evangelical Divinity School
Eugene W. Pond	Dallas Theological Seminary
Joseph G. Prior	St. Charles Borromeo Seminary
J. Paul Rajashekar	Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia
Mark R. Ramseth	Trinity Lutheran Seminary
Charles A Ray	New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary
Lallene J. Rector	Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary
Brenda J. Reish	Bethany Theological Seminary
Jerry Reisig	New York Theological Seminary
Dianne Reistroffer	Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary
Patricia Rennie	Sacred Heart Major Seminary
*James T Roberson Jr.	Shaw University Divinity School
R. Philip Roberts	Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
Beatriz G. Robinson	Public Visitor

Faith E. Rohrbough	Public Visitor
Michael Ross	Pontifical College Josephinum
Randall T. Ruble	Erskine Theological Seminary
Roberta Schaafsma	Perkins School of Theology
Patricia A. Schoelles	St. Bernard's School of Theology and Ministry
R. Paul Schrodtt	Public Visitor
Donald Senior	Catholic Theological Union
Richard Siepka	Public Visitor
Jeffrey S. Siker	Loyola Marymount University Department of Theological Studies
Rebecca Slough	Associated Mennonite Biblical Seminary
Robin J. Steinke	Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg
David R. Stewart	Luther Seminary
Polly M. Stone	Reformed Theological Seminary
Norma Sutton	North Park Theological Seminary
Tom M. Tanner	Lincoln Christian College and Seminary
James H. Thames	Dallas Theological Seminary
John J. Thatamanil	Vanderbilt University Divinity School
Tite Tienou	Trinity Evangelical Divinity School
Mark Tolbert	New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary
Dwayne Uglem	Briercrest College and Seminary
Mariel E. Voth	Bethel Seminary of Bethel University
Randy C. Walls	Assemblies of God Theological Seminary
Thomas P. Walters	Saint Meinrad School of Theology
Lacey Warner	Duke University Divinity School
Raymond J. Webb	University of St. Mary of the Lake Mundelein Seminary
Mark E. Wedig	Barry University Department of Theology and Philosophy
Richard D. Weis	United Theological Seminary of the Twin Cities
Christine Wenderoth	Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago
Edward L. Wheeler	Christian Theological Seminary
Charles Willard	Public Visitor
G. Craig Williford	Trinity Evangelical Divinity School
Laura Wood	Harvard University Divinity School
Anne B. Yardley	Drew University Theological School
Mary H. Young	Samuel DeWitt Proctor School of Theology
Heather Zdancewicz	Virginia Theological Seminary
Matthew Zyniewicz	University of Notre Dame Department of Theology

Revisions to Standards 1–9 and Procedures for Accreditation

The text for both the standards and the procedures indicates deleted text in ~~strikeout~~ and additional text in underline.

1 **Revisions to the Current Commission on Accrediting Procedures**

2 **I. Membership**

3 A. Membership in the Commission on Accrediting of the Association of Theological
4 Schools (the Commission) is limited to schools that meet the Membership Eligibility
5 Criteria of The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada
6 (ATS) and that are either Full Members of ATS or Associate Members of ATS on whom
7 the Board of Commissioners has conferred candidate for accredited status. In addition, a
8 school that has ceased to be a Member of ATS solely as a result of a Termination for
9 Cause may continue as a Member of the Commission.

10 B. Each school shall either be accredited by the Commission on Accrediting or hold
11 candidate for accredited status.

12 **II. Candidate for Accredited Status**

13 A. Candidate for accredited status is conferred on those Members of ATS that, after review
14 on the basis of the Commission's standards and procedures, have been formally
15 authorized by vote of the Board of Commissioners to begin the self-study process.
16 Candidacy for accredited status is granted for a period of two years. By special action of
17 the Board of Commissioners, candidacy may be extended for one year at a time, but in no
18 case may candidacy extend beyond a total of five years. The Board of Commissioners
19 recognizes candidacy for accredited status as its official pre-accredited status.

20 B. Criteria for candidate for accredited status

21 1. The applying institution shall be able to demonstrate that either it is, or by the
22 conclusion of the self-study process will be, operating according to the Commission's
23 General Institutional and individual Degree Program Standards and that it has the
24 institutional capacity to evaluate its institutional and educational effectiveness.

25 2. The applying institution shall demonstrate that it has the resources and capacity to
26 complete a self-study process and report satisfactorily within the normal two-year
27 period.

28 C. Attaining candidate for accredited status by Associate Members of ATS

29 1. The chief administrative officer of an Associate Member school desiring candidacy
30 status should notify the Commission staff in writing that the school intends to petition
31 the Board of Commissioners for candidate for accredited status.

- 32 2. The applicant school shall undertake an internal study of its readiness for candidate
 33 for accredited status. The Board of Commissioners will provide guidance for this
 34 internal study.
- 35 3. Upon the school's completion of its internal study, a Commission staff member will
 36 review the study, conduct a staff visit to the school, and prepare a report regarding the
 37 school's compliance with the General Institutional and Degree Program Standards.
- 38 4. The Board of Commissioners will base its decision regarding candidacy on the
 39 institution's internal study report, on the report of the staff visit, and on its assessment
 40 of the extent to which the institution will be able to meet the Commission's
 41 accrediting standards by the conclusion of the candidacy period. The Board of
 42 Commissioners may:
- 43 a. grant candidacy for a period of two years; or
 44 b. deny the candidacy petition.

45 If it denies the request for candidacy, the Board of Commissioners shall provide
 46 reasons for its action and notify the school of additional responses required to
 47 qualify for candidacy.

48 D. Maintaining candidate for accredited status

- 49 1. The institution shall demonstrate evidence of progress in the self-study process.
 50 2. The institution shall continue to meet criteria for candidacy and conduct its degree
 51 programs in conformity with the Commission's Degree Program Standards.
 52 3. The institution shall complete the Commission's Annual Report Forms.
 53 4. The institution shall pay annual dues as prescribed by ATS and the Commission.

54 E. Withdrawal from candidacy

55 A school may, on its own initiative, withdraw as a Member of the Commission as a
 56 candidate for accredited status at any time during its term of candidacy, by written notice
 57 to the Board of Commissioners.

58 **III. Accredited Membership**

- 59 A. Accredited Members are institutions in the United States and Canada that are Associate
 60 Members of ATS that, after review on the basis of the accrediting standards of the

61 Commission, are granted accreditation by the Board of Commissioners and become Full
62 Members of ATS.

63 B. Criteria for accredited membership

- 64 1. Accredited institutions shall demonstrate that they operate according to the
65 Commission’s General Institutional standards.
- 66 2. All graduate degree programs offered by accredited Members of the Commission
67 shall meet the Degree Program Standards and be approved by the Board of
68 Commissioners.
- 69 3. All extension education offerings that provide graduate credit toward approved
70 degrees shall be approved by the Board of Commissioners.

71 C. Attaining accredited membership

- 72 1. Candidates for accredited status shall engage in the self-study process, following the
73 guidance provided in the Commission’s *Handbook of Accreditation*. On-site staff
74 consultation is available to schools in the self-study process. The General Institutional
75 and appropriate Degree Program Standards must be addressed in the self-study report.
- 76 2. The Board of Commissioners will examine the self-study report and determine
77 whether it provides a sufficient basis for an on-site evaluation committee visit. If the
78 Board of Commissioners approves the self-study report and authorizes an initial
79 accreditation visit, an evaluation committee will be appointed. If the Board of
80 Commissioners finds the self-study report inadequate, an evaluation committee visit
81 will not be authorized, but staff will be instructed to work with the institution to make
82 the changes necessary to permit future consideration.
- 83 3. The evaluation committee will conduct a two-to-three day visit to the campus and
84 prepare a written report evaluating the institution in the light of the Commission’s
85 standards, following the procedures for evaluation committees published in the
86 Commission’s *Handbook of Accreditation*.
- 87 4. Based on the committee report and its recommendations, the Board of Commissioners
88 may act in one of two ways:
- 89 a. Accredite the institution and approve its degree programs for a period of no longer
90 than seven years; or ~~or up to five years; or~~
- 91 b. Deny accreditation to the institution. In this event, specific reasons will be stated
92 in writing to the school.

93 5. It is possible for schools that offer graduate, professional theological degrees and that
 94 are demonstrably engaged in educating professional leadership for communities of
 95 the Christian and Jewish faiths but that are not individually eligible for accredited
 96 membership to qualify for accreditation by virtue of resources available through
 97 membership in a cluster or by contractual arrangement with another accredited
 98 institution. Accreditation requires assessment of the strength of the individual
 99 institution, the availability and actual use of resources claimed, and adequacy of the
 100 cluster of which the school is a part. Listings in publications, both of the Commission
 101 and of the school, shall state explicitly that such an institution is “accredited by The
 102 Commission on Accrediting of the Association of Theological Schools by virtue of
 103 affiliation with ____.”

104 D. Maintaining accredited membership

- 105 1. The institution shall maintain standards defined by the Commission and abide by the
 106 procedures of ATS and the Commission.
- 107 2. The institution shall complete the Commission’s Annual Report Forms.
- 108 3. The institution shall pay annual dues as prescribed by ATS and the Commission.
- 109 4. The institution shall, at intervals specified by the Board of Commissioners, complete
 110 a process of comprehensive institutional self-study and prepare for regular scheduled
 111 visits of evaluation committees.

112 E. Policy regarding teach-out plans

- 113 1. A member school must submit a teach-out plan to the Board of Commissioners for
 114 the board’s approval upon the occurrence of any of the following events:
 - 115 a. if the U.S. Department of Education notifies the Board of Commissioners of an
 116 action against the institution to limit, suspend, or terminate an institution’s
 117 participation in any Title IV program or initiates an emergency action against the
 118 institution;
 - 119 b. if the Board of Commissioners withdraws, terminates, or suspends the
 120 accreditation of the institution; or
 - 121 c. if the institution notifies the Board of Commissioners that it intends to cease
 122 operations or terminate a degree program.

123

124 | **IV. Withdrawal from Membership**

125 | A school may, on its own initiative and by written notice to the Board of Commissioners,
126 | withdraw from membership and accredited status.

127 | **IV. Procedures for Approval of New Degree Programs**

128 | A. New degree programs shall not be announced without prior approval by the Board of
129 | Commissioners.

130 | B. A school considering the introduction of a new degree program shall notify Commission
131 | staff and seek consultative guidance. It shall then submit a petition for consideration by
132 | the Board of Commissioners. The petition shall follow the guidelines established by the
133 | Board of Commissioners, including (1) an evaluation of the appropriateness of the
134 | proposed degree in the light of the institution’s mission and purpose; (2) a detailed
135 | description of the design of the proposed degree (program features, compliance with the
136 | standards, resources available, relation to other degrees, etc.); (3) the institution’s
137 | assessment of the new degree’s impact on the programs already offered; and (4) an
138 | analysis of the financial support for the new degree and its impact on the institutional
139 | budget.

140 | C. If the proposed degree program is at the master’s level, ~~preliminary~~ approval by the
141 | Board of Commissioners may be granted on the basis of the written petition. If the
142 | proposed degree is at the doctoral level, ~~preliminary~~ approval will be considered only
143 | after a focused evaluation visit has been conducted. The board may excuse a school from
144 | this requirement if the institution already offers an approved doctoral program in the
145 | same degree category.

146 | ~~D. Initial approval of a degree program is designated as “preliminary approval.” This~~
147 | ~~designation is recognized by the Commission as a formally approved status.~~

148 | ~~E. After a degree program has been offered for a sufficient period of time to permit~~
149 | ~~extended evaluation, usually requiring the completion of all degree requirements by at~~
150 | ~~least one group of students, the institution shall seek “ongoing approval” for the program~~
151 | ~~by petitioning the Board of Commissioners and supplying appropriate documentation of~~
152 | ~~its comprehensive evaluation of the program.~~

153 | **VI. Procedures for Approval of Programs Involving Multiple Locations (Extension**
154 | **Sites) and Distance Education**

155 | A. Institutions shall seek appropriate Board of Commissioners’ action for all programs
156 | involving multiple locations (extension sites) and distance education. The procedures for

157 review and approval of such programs vary with the type of program. The Board of
 158 Commissioners has developed guidelines that outline in detail the review and approval
 159 process for different types of extension sites and for distance education programs.

160 B. Branch campuses. A branch campus is geographically apart and independent of the main
 161 campus of the institution as evidenced by permanence in nature; offering courses in
 162 educational programs leading to degrees; having its own faculty and administrative or
 163 supervisory organization; and having its own budgetary and hiring authority. The
 164 establishment of a branch campus requires consultation, a written petition to the Board of
 165 Commissioners identifying the educational programs to be offered, the financial,
 166 operational, management, and physical resources necessary to meet Commission
 167 standards. A site visit is required prior to final action on the institution's petition by the
 168 Board of Commissioners.
 169

170 BC. Complete degree sites. The offering of a full degree program at a site away from the
 171 institution's primary location requires consultation, a written petition to the Board of
 172 Commissioners, and a site visit prior to final action on the institution's petition by the
 173 Board of Commissioners.
 174

175 CD. Ongoing course offering sites. The establishment of a program at a site away from the
 176 institution's primary location where a school intends to offer a variety of courses over
 177 time requires the submission of a written petition to the Board of Commissioners and
 178 action on the petition prior to the first offering of courses. Sites where courses are offered
 179 on an ongoing basis may be visited and evaluated as part of the Board of Commissioners'
 180 review cycle. If as much as half of the course work required for any approved degree may
 181 be completed at the site away from the school's primary location, a site visit shall be
 182 conducted. Pursuant to board policy, a school may be excused from an initial site visit.

183 DE. Occasional course offering sites. The establishment of a program in which a school
 184 intends to offer courses at a site away from the institution's primary location less
 185 frequently than on an annual basis does not require notification of or approval by the
 186 Board of Commissioners. The Board of Commissioners requests that institutions report
 187 such occasional offerings on the Commission's Annual Report Form.

188 EF. International sites

189 1. *Outside Canada and the United States.* Institutions seeking to implement programs
 190 outside Canada and the United States that involve either the ongoing offering of
 191 courses or a full degree program must have the prior approval of the Board of
 192 Commissioners. In its proposal, the school shall clearly give attention to the
 193 guidelines adopted by the Board of Commissioners. After its review of the written
 194 proposal, the Board of Commissioners will ordinarily require a site review before it

195 considers granting approval for these types of programs. The offering of occasional
196 courses does not require notification of or approval by the Board of Commissioners.
197 The Board of Commissioners ~~expects requests~~ that institutions report such occasional
198 offerings on the Commission's Annual Report Form.

199 2. *Across the Canadian/U.S. Border.* Institutions seeking to offer a program across the
200 Canadian/United States border that involves either the ongoing offering of courses or
201 a full degree program must have the prior approval of the Board of Commissioners.
202 In its proposal, the school shall clearly demonstrate that it has given appropriate
203 attention to the guidelines adopted by the Board of Commissioners and that it has
204 consulted with Commission member schools near the location where the program is
205 to be offered. The offering of occasional courses does not require notification of or
206 approval by the Board of Commissioners. The Board of Commissioners requests that
207 institutions report such occasional offerings on the Commission's Annual Report
208 Form.

209 FG.Distance education

210 ~~1. Distance education courses may be taught for one year with notification to the Board~~
211 ~~of Commissioners on the Commission's annual report form. When a course is offered~~
212 ~~a second time, Board of Commissioners approval will be required, based on the~~
213 ~~design, requirements, and evaluation of the proposed course.~~

214 ~~2. When an institution has received approval for two distance education courses, it may~~
215 ~~offer additional courses by notifying the Board of Commissioners on the~~
216 ~~Commission's annual report form.~~

217 ~~13. When as many as six of the courses offered in any approved degree may be taken~~
218 ~~through distance education, it will be considered a comprehensive distance education~~
219 ~~program, and the institution must petition the Board of Commissioners for~~
220 ~~preliminary approval, according to guidelines adopted by the Board of~~
221 ~~Commissioners. The petition should provide a proposed time frame including the~~
222 ~~point at which the first students taking courses in the distance education program will~~
223 ~~have graduated.~~

224 ~~24. When the first students have graduated, †The school shall undertake a comprehensive~~
225 ~~evaluation review of the program either as part of its institutional self-study or at~~
226 ~~another time by request of the Board of Commissioners. and shall petition the Board~~
227 ~~of Commissioners for ongoing approval of the program.~~

228 ~~35. When the A significant change in the design or amount of distance education courses~~
229 ~~offered in an approved distance program is significantly altered, the school is~~

230 | responsible for reporting the change to the ~~requires further approval by the~~ Board of
231 | Commissioners.

232 | 4. In its consideration of approval of distance learning programs, ~~addition to the petition~~
233 | ~~(and supporting documentation),~~ the Board of Commissioners may require a site visit.

234 | 5. Schools conducting distance education must have a process by which the institution
235 | establishes that the student who registers in a distance education course or program is
236 | the same student who participates in and completes the program and receives the
237 | academic credit courses by use of secure login and pass code, proctored
238 | examinations, or other means that are effective in verifying student identity and
239 | protecting student privacy.

240 | **VII. Enforcement of Standards for Accredited Members**

241 | A. Through comprehensive evaluation visits

242 | 1. Comprehensive ~~Periodic~~ reevaluations occur in the six months before the expiration
243 | of a grant of accreditation. The grant of initial accreditation is limited to no more than
244 | seven ~~five~~ years and reaffirmation to no more than ten years. The Board of
245 | Commissioners may grant accreditation for shorter periods of time, with reasons
246 | given for the action in each case. Because accreditation is an ongoing relationship
247 | between the Board of Commissioners and the school, the Board of Commissioners
248 | may authorize a visit prior to the scheduled visit for reaffirmation.

249 | 2. Institutions shall engage in an comprehensive institutional self-study in preparation
250 | for each comprehensive ~~periodic~~ visit. ~~Self-study entails both an internal institutional~~
251 | ~~process and a written report of the findings.~~ The self-study shall follow the guidance
252 | provided in the *Handbook of Accreditation*. In some cases, as described in the
253 | *Handbook*, the Board of Commissioners may approve a special design for a self-study
254 | that allows an institution to focus on identified areas of need.

255 | 3. The self-study report shall be submitted, at least sixty days before the scheduled visit,
256 | to the Commission staff who, in consultation with the chairperson of the evaluation
257 | committee, ~~will have responsibility to~~ determine whether the document is an adequate
258 | basis for conducting the visit or whether the visit should be postponed. If the visit is
259 | postponed by Commission staff for more than one semester, the institution shall have
260 | the right of appeal at the next scheduled meeting of the Board of Commissioners.

261 | 4. In preparation for an evaluation visit, a school shall advertise to its constituencies that
262 | it is receiving an evaluation committee and invite comment in writing concerning the
263 | institution’s qualifications for accreditation. These comments will be available to the

COMMISSION ON ACCREDITING

264 evaluation committee. The evaluation committee may also include an open hearing
265 scheduled during the course of the visit.

266 4-5. The Board of Commissioners will publish the names of schools receiving a
267 comprehensive evaluation visit in a given year and request comment from other
268 Commission member institutions.

269 B. Through focused evaluation visits

270 1. Focused evaluation visits may be authorized by the Board of Commissioners as a
271 response to any of the following:

- 272 a. a school’s invitation to the Board of Commissioners;
- 273 | b. a school’s decision to offer a new degree program, as noted in section IV of these
274 | procedures;
- 275 | c. a school’s decision to offer ~~more than~~ 50 percent or more of the courses for an
276 | approved degree at a new location;
- 277 | d. a change in ownership or substantive change in the pattern of control of the
278 | institution;
- 279 | e. the receipt of other information that leads the Board of Commissioners to
280 | conclude that a focused evaluation visit is advisable; ~~or~~
- 281 | f. ~~an ny other~~ indication that the quality of a school’s programs may have been
282 | adversely affected by changes in circumstances; or
- 283 | g. in the context of investigating or the receipt of a formal complaint against the
284 | institution when deemed appropriate.

285 2. In preparation for focused evaluation visits, the Board of Commissioners may require
286 reports from the school as are appropriate to the situation, authorize staff or other
287 evaluators as appropriate, and provide instruction for the school and the evaluators
288 regarding the committee’s report to the Board of Commissioners. The expectations
289 for a focused evaluation will be described to the school in the context of a written
290 prospectus prepared for the visit.

291 C. ~~Through the identification of areas of needed improvement~~ Through monitoring of
292 substantive changes
293 ~~Institutional self-study reports and the reports of evaluation committees shall identify~~
294 ~~areas of needed improvement. In its actions based on these reports, the Board of~~
295 ~~Commissioners may identify areas in the school’s institutional or educational efforts that~~

296 should be the focus of improvement. When such areas have been identified, subsequent
 297 accreditation reviews will assess the improvement the institution has made. The Board of
 298 Commissioners' actions identifying areas of needed improvement shall be clearly related
 299 to the standards of accreditation

300 1. Substantive changes include the following: change in ownership, name, or governing
 301 control of an institution; change in location(s) at which an institution conducts its
 302 educational programs; introduction of a program of six or more distance learning
 303 courses; or the offering of a new degree or major changes in the total hours required
 304 for an approved degree. Substantive changes do not include exceptions that an
 305 institution may choose to make for an individual student.

306 2. It is the responsibility of an accredited school to petition the Board of Commissioners
 307 for approval of these changes prior to implementing them.

308 D. Through the use of reports

309 1. When the Board of Commissioners may require determines that it a report if it
 310 judges requires additional information or that an accredited institution should supply
 311 additional information or needs to improve in has an area or areas of needed
 312 improvement with respect to one or more general institutional or degree program
 313 standards, it may require that the institution provide the necessary information or
 314 effect the necessary improvement and report the results of its actions to the Board of
 315 Commissioners. In its action to require such a report or reports, the board of
 316 Commissioners will identify the standards where it needs information or judges that
 317 the institution requires improvement, and it will set the submission date or dates
 318 according to its judgment of the time reasonably necessary to provide the information
 319 or to make the improvement.

320 2. Required reports are not a public characterization of membership status. This
 321 requirement is not published in the *Membership List* as part of the institution's
 322 formally accredited status.

323 2.3 The circumstances meriting reports are not instances of noncompliance, and
 324 insufficient improvement does not signal noncompliance.

325 E. Through the use of published notations

326 1. On the basis of reports received either from an evaluation committee or from a
 327 member institution, the Board of Commissioners shall impose a notation or notations
 328 when it judges that an institution insufficiently meets one or more sections of an
 329 accrediting standard. in the general institutional or degree program standards.

COMMISSION ON ACCREDITING

- 330 2. A notation is a public characterization of membership status. The *Membership List*
331 includes any notations imposed by the Board of Commissioners as part of the
332 institution's formal accredited status.
- 333 ~~4.~~3. Within two years following the imposition of a notation, the institution shall provide
334 evidence to the Board of Commissioners as to why the notation should be lifted. If the
335 institution does not provide the requisite evidence, the Board of Commissioners shall
336 take an adverse action. In certain cases and for demonstrated good cause, the Board of
337 Commissioners may extend by one year the period of imposition of a notation. In no
338 case shall extensions for good cause exceed two years.
- 339 F. Through the use of probation
- 340 1. Probation is designed to respond to the circumstance in which an institution does not
341 meet one or more of the General Institutional or Degree Program Standards.
- 342 2. No institution will be placed on probation without an on-site visit. The evaluation
343 committee will prepare a written report and submit it to the institution for its
344 response. The evaluation committee's report and the institution's response will be
345 considered by the Board of Commissioners and will serve as the basis for the decision
346 of the Board of Commissioners.
- 347 3. In any action imposing probation, the Board of Commissioners will identify the
348 standards that it judges that the institution is no longer meeting and describe its
349 expectations regarding changes necessary to correct the situation.
- 350 4. The time assigned to an institution for the remedial action required for the removal of
351 probation will be not less than twelve nor more than twenty-four months. If an
352 institution demonstrates that the conditions to remove probation have been met prior
353 to the deadline, the institution may petition the Board of Commissioners for an early
354 decision on the request to remove probation.
- 355 5. Prior to the end of the period of probation, a visit by an evaluation committee will be
356 conducted to bring a report to the Board of Commissioners with a recommendation as
357 to whether the Board of Commissioners should remove probation or take an adverse
358 action. In certain cases and for demonstrated good cause, the Board of
359 Commissioners may extend by one year the period an institution has to demonstrate
360 that the conditions to remove probation have been met. In no case shall extensions
361 for good cause exceed two years.
- 362 6. When probation is imposed upon an institution, the action of the Board of
363 Commissioners will be communicated in the *Membership List* ~~ATS Bulletin~~ and in
364 the Board of Commissioners' reports ~~according to the time frame~~ provided by the

365 board’s policies. The institution will continue to appear in the list of accredited
 366 institutions, but following its name will appear the note, “Probation (date) to (date).”

367 G. Through withdrawal of accreditation

- 368 1. Notations and probation are not sequential actions.
- 369 2. If, at the end of the term of a notation and any extension for good cause, an institution
 370 does not demonstrate that it has remedied the problem identified by the notation, the
 371 board shall withdraw accreditation.
- 372 3. If, after a period of probation (including any extension for good cause), an on-site
 373 visit, examination of the evaluation committee’s report, and receipt of an institution’s
 374 response, the Board of Commissioners determines that an institution has failed to
 375 demonstrate that it can or will function according to the standards of accreditation, the
 376 Board of Commissioners shall withdraw institutional accreditation.
- 377 4. Once accreditation is withdrawn, an institution may not apply for reaccreditation for a
 378 period of three years. Application will follow the procedures outlined in section III
 379 above.

380 H. Adverse accrediting actions

381 Adverse accrediting actions by the Board of Commissioners are defined as denial of
 382 accreditation or withdrawal of accreditation.

383 **VIII. The Board of Commissioners**

384 A. Composition and duties

- 385 1. The composition and duties of the Board of Commissioners ~~are~~ defined by the
 386 Bylaws of the Commission on Accrediting of the Association of Theological Schools.
- 387 ~~2. In the context of its duties to make decisions regarding accreditation, the Board of~~
 388 ~~Commissioners is responsible for adopting and overseeing policies and procedures~~
 389 ~~that ensure thorough and fair evaluation of schools and for consistently applying the~~
 390 ~~Commission’s procedures and accrediting standards.~~
- 391 23. The primary duties of the Board of Commissioners ~~include~~ ~~has three primary duties:~~
 392 (1) the oversight of the corporate work of the Commission, as authorized by the
 393 bylaws; (2) the compilation and maintenance of the list of schools accredited in
 394 accordance with the standards determined by the Commission, including the authority
 395 to add schools to or delete them from schools to the list; (3) ~~the~~ undertaking, on an
 396 ongoing basis, of a review of accredited schools for continued inclusion on the list of

397 accredited schools, including all aspects of Commission accreditation pursuant to the
398 procedures and standards of the Commission; and ~~(3), through its staff, the review~~
399 ~~and recommendation of schools applying for membership in ATS.~~

400 ~~4. The Board of Commissioners is also responsible for (4) the regular and continuous~~
401 ~~review of the accrediting standards and for bringing recommendations for changes to~~
402 ~~the Commission member schools.~~

403 3. In the context of its duties to make decisions regarding accreditation, the Board of
404 Commissioners is responsible for adopting and overseeing policies and procedures
405 that ensure thorough and fair evaluation of schools and for consistently applying the
406 Commission’s procedures and accrediting standards.

407 B. Procedures

408 1. Members of the Board of Commissioners must absent themselves from discussion
409 and voting on matters having to do with schools in which they are currently or have
410 been previously employed and schools that they have attended as students.

411 2. In making decisions following evaluation committee visits, the Board of
412 Commissioners will consider the self-study of the school under consideration, the
413 written report of the evaluation committee, the committee’s recommendations
414 contained in that report, and the responses of the institution to both the report and the
415 recommendations. The actions that the Board of Commissioners takes will be based
416 on these materials and will reflect both the Board of Commissioners’ experience of
417 applying the Commission’s standards and the decisions it has made regarding other
418 institutions.

419 3. Subcommittees of the Board of Commissioners will give preliminary consideration to
420 evaluation committee reports and recommendations. Members of the Board of
421 Commissioners may not serve on a subcommittee considering a report from an
422 evaluation committee ~~of which they were a member~~ on which they served, nor may
423 they vote on decisions about schools they visited.

424 4. Any school about which the Board of Commissioners is considering an accreditation
425 action has the right to request an appearance by its designated representative(s) before
426 the Board of Commissioners or a subcommittee of the Board of Commissioners.

427 5. Letters reporting the actions of the Board of Commissioners will be sent to schools no
428 later than thirty days from the date of the action.

- 429 6. When an institution plans to close, or if the Board of Commissioners determines that
 430 an institution is in danger of closing, the institution shall be required to provide a plan
 431 detailing agreements with other institutions and the means of support necessary to
 432 allow students to complete the degree programs to which they were admitted in a
 433 manner and at a cost consistent with their enrollment in the institution that is closing.
- 434 7. Accreditation is a continuing relationship between an institution and the Commission,
 435 which is subject to review and consideration.

436 **VIIIX. Evaluation Committees**

- 437 A. Committees evaluating institutions for initial accreditation, for reaffirmation of
 438 accreditation, and for focused visits will be selected according to procedures adopted by
 439 the Board of Commissioners and published in the *Handbook of Accreditation*.
- 440 B. The Board of Commissioners and its staff will receive nominations for potential visitors
 441 from the executive officers of any institution that is a Member of the Commission.
- 442 C. The Board of Commissioners will provide the resources, training, and staff support to
 443 ensure informed and responsible work by members of evaluation committees.
- 444 D. Evaluation committee members will be selected by Commission staff, under the
 445 supervision of the Board of Commissioners and in consultation with the institution to be
 446 visited, and with due consideration of the purpose, programs, and context of the
 447 institution. At least one member of the committee will not be a member of the Board of
 448 Commissioners or ATS Board of Directors. Schools may object to the appointment of
 449 persons to a committee if the appointee has attended the school as a student or been
 450 employed by the institution. The number of persons appointed to evaluation committees
 451 will vary according to the nature of the visit and will be determined in consultation with
 452 the institution.
- 453 E. In cooperative visits with another accrediting agency, the composition of the committee
 454 will be negotiated with that agency to ensure that all committee members are mutually
 455 acceptable.
- 456 F. Comprehensive evaluation visits normally require the equivalent of three days on-site at
 457 the institution, but that time may be adjusted in view of the size of the school and its
 458 overall situation. Committees conducting focused visits normally spend the equivalent of
 459 one or two days on-site at the institution.
- 460 G. Members of evaluation committees serve without remuneration except for reimbursement
 461 of related out-of-pocket expenses, travel, meals, and other costs incurred.

462 H. Committees are responsible for conducting their work and preparing their reports
463 according to the guidelines provided by the Board of Commissioners in its *Handbook of*
464 *Accreditation*.

465 **IX. Policy on Disclosure and Confidentiality**

466 A. Accredited status ~~*Membership List*~~:

467 1. The Commission will publish a ~~list of its Members in the~~ *Membership List* on the
468 ATS Web site. *The Membership List* reports the formal accredited status of schools,
469 including accreditation status, approved degree programs, approved degrees at
470 locations other than the institution’s primary location, approved programs of distance
471 learning, the date of the most recent comprehensive visit, the date of the next
472 scheduled visit, and reports required of schools during the current grant of
473 accreditation. If the institution is on probation or has notations, this status shall also
474 be disclosed. An institution’s entry will not be published until the period for receiving
475 appeals of actions by the Board of Commissioners, as specified in these Procedures
476 (Article XI below) and in the Bylaws of the Commission on Accrediting of the
477 Association of Theological Schools (Section 2.14), has expired. No adverse
478 accrediting action will be published while an appeal is in process. Adverse
479 accrediting actions are defined in VII.H. above.

480 2. ~~B.~~ Accredited Members

481 1. ~~Institutions shall disclose the following information in complete accredited status in~~
482 ~~their printed and/or electronic bulletin, calendar, or catalog: the status of their~~
483 ~~accreditation with the following language “the school is accredited by the~~
484 ~~Commission on Accrediting of the Association of Theological Schools,” and provide~~
485 ~~the and give the Commission’s mailing address and phone number. References shall~~
486 ~~comply with the designations in the Membership List.~~ Schools shall also disclose the
487 status of each degree program with the following language: “The following degree
488 programs are approved by the Commission on Accrediting (name of degree
489 programs).” When schools have been approved to offer full degree programs at more
490 than one site, the school shall disclose this information as well.

491 3. ~~as to accredited status, approved degree programs, and approved locations for~~
492 ~~offering degrees if other than the institution’s primary location. If the institution is on~~
493 ~~probation, this status shall also be disclosed.~~ Candidate Members shall publish their
494 formal status with the Commission as “Candidates for Accredited Status.”

495 2. ~~The *Membership List* reports the formal accredited status of schools and will not be~~
496 ~~published until the period for receiving appeals of actions by the Board of~~

497 | Commissioners, as specified in these Procedures (Article X below) and in the Bylaws
498 | of the Commission on Accrediting of the Association of Theological Schools (Section
499 | 2.14), has expired. No adverse accrediting action will be published while an appeal is
500 | in process. Adverse accrediting actions are defined in VI.H. above.

501 | ~~C. Candidate Members: The institution shall publish its formal status with the Commission.~~

502 | B. Self-study reports

- 503 | 1. An institution may release for internal or public distribution the contents of its self-
504 | study.
- 505 | 2. The Board of Commissioners may permit representatives from member institutions
506 | access to another institution’s self-study report to aid in the self-study process. This
507 | access will be permitted only if an institution has given prior approval for use of its
508 | self-study in this way. The Board of Commissioners may also approve the use of self-
509 | study reports by educators who are conducting research, the purpose of which is the
510 | improvement of the accrediting process. The Council for Higher Education
511 | Accreditation and the U.S. Department of Education may be allowed access to self-
512 | study reports in conjunction with the process of recognition that the Board of
513 | Commissioners undergoes with these entities.

514 | C. E.—Evaluation committee reports

- 515 | 1. As part of the accreditation process, reports prepared by evaluation committees of the
516 | Board of Commissioners shall be made available to governing boards and faculties by
517 | the chief executive officers of the schools.
- 518 | 2. An institution may make public the report of an evaluation committee, although this
519 | is not mandatory and is not advisable prior to formal action by the Board of
520 | Commissioners. If the institution makes a report public, it must make clear that the
521 | document is a report of the evaluation committee to the Board of Commissioners and
522 | is not an action of the Board of Commissioners.
- 523 | 3. The recommendations of the evaluation committee to the Board of Commissioners
524 | shall not be published by the institution as actions. Only the actions of the Board of
525 | Commissioners comprise the formal accreditation.
- 526 | 4. If, in the judgment of the Board of Commissioners, a school publishes selected
527 | portions of a report on an accreditation visit in such a way as to distort the overall
528 | import of that report, the Board of Commissioners has the authority to release the full
529 | text of the report in question.

530 5. The Board of Commissioners will not release evaluation committee reports to the
531 public. With the approval of the institution, the Board of Commissioners may approve
532 access to a report to those conducting research that contributes to the improvement of
533 the accrediting process. Evaluation committee reports may be examined by the
534 Council for Higher Education Accreditation and the U.S. Department of Education
535 only in the context of reviews of the Board of Commissioners by those agencies, for
536 the purpose of recognition. Evaluation committee reports will also be shared with
537 regional accrediting agencies in the case of dually accredited schools.

538 | D.F. Other accrediting documents

539 1. Minutes of the Board of Commissioners are available to the members of the Board of
540 Commissioners. A summary report of all actions of the Board of Commissioners is
541 published biennially in the *ATS Bulletin*.

542 2. An institution that has officially appealed an adverse action of the Board of
543 Commissioners may request those sections of official minutes that pertain to the
544 adverse action.

545 3. Correspondence between the Board of Commissioners and a Member or an applying
546 institution shall be treated confidentially by both parties.

547 | 4. Institutional ~~progress and follow-up~~ reports will not be released to the public by the
548 Board of Commissioners. These reports, however, may be released by the institution
549 after action has been taken by the Board of Commissioners.

550 5. The Board of Commissioners will share its correspondence to member schools with
551 the appropriate regional accrediting agencies, with the Council for Higher Education
552 Accreditation and the U.S. Department of Education in conjunction with the
553 recognition process, and, as required, with appropriate state or provincial authorities.

554 | E.G. Public statements by institutions

555 If an institution uses the public forum to take issue with an action by the Board of
556 Commissioners relating to that institution, the chair of the Board of Commissioners may
557 make available to the public any information pertinent to the decision. “Taking issue in a
558 public forum” does not include an announcement by an institution that it intends to
559 appeal an action of the Board of Commissioners.

560 | F.H. Disclosure by the Board of Commissioners of information about Member or applying
561 institutions

- 562 1. Upon inquiry, the Board of Commissioners will release the following information
563 about Member or applying institutions:
- 564 a. Membership and accredited status.
- 565 b. The dates when the Board of Commissioners conferred candidate for accredited
566 status and, as relevant, granted initial accreditation.
- 567 c. The dates of the last comprehensive evaluation and of the next scheduled
568 comprehensive evaluation.
- 569 d. The date of the next scheduled focused visit and formal reasons for the visit.
- 570 e. The date a formal application for membership began and the estimated date a
571 decision on the application will be made.
- 572 f. The date of denial of candidacy or removal from candidacy.
- 573 g. The submission date and action taken on the most recent written report required
574 by the Board of Commissioners.
- 575 h. The Board of Commissioners' action subsequent to the last evaluation visit
576 regarding accreditation.
- 577 i. Whether an institution has appealed an adverse accrediting action of the Board of
578 Commissioners and the status and outcome of such appeal.
- 579 j. Actions of the appropriate appeal bodies with reasons for the actions.
- 580 2. The *Membership List* will identify institutions removed from candidacy or accredited
581 membership, placed on probation, or withdrawing from candidacy or accredited
582 membership.
- 583 3. The summary report of the Board of Commissioners, published biennially, identifies
584 institutions removed from candidacy or accredited membership, placed on probation,
585 or withdrawing from candidacy or accredited membership during the period of the
586 report.
- 587 4. In all cases of adverse accrediting actions, a public statement about the action will be
588 prepared in consultation with the institution for response to inquiries. The Board of
589 Commissioners reserves the right to make final determination of the nature and
590 content of the public statement. The Board of Commissioners will identify the
591 reasons for the adverse accrediting action in the public statement.

592 **XI. Appeals of Actions by the Board of Commissioners**

593 (cf. Bylaws of the Commission on Accrediting of the Association of Theological Schools,
594 Section 2.14, Appeal of Accreditation Decisions)

595 A. Unless otherwise specified, the time for requesting an appeal shall be within thirty days
596 from receipt of the letter reporting the action of the Board of Commissioners. The request
597 for an appeal shall be in writing. Appeals are limited to decisions identified in sections B.
598 and C. below.

599 B. Regarding actions of the Board of Commissioners related to the failure to approve new
600 degrees, extension sites, or distance education programs, the imposition of a notation, or
601 the imposition of probation:

602 1. If the institution believes that the action of the Board of Commissioners is unjust or
603 based on erroneous information, the institution shall, either on its own initiative or at
604 the invitation of the Board of Commissioners, first ~~arrange to~~ meet with ~~at least~~ three
605 Commissioners appointed by the chair of the Board of Commissioners to seek a
606 mutually satisfactory resolution. The response of the Board of Commissioners to a
607 written appeal, including relevant specifics, shall be communicated in writing.

608 2. If, after such consultation, the institution believes the action of the Board of
609 Commissioners still to be unjust or based on erroneous information, it shall have the
610 right to appeal in writing within sixty days of the receipt of the written findings, to the
611 Appeals Panel as elected biennially by member schools. Within 120 days after
612 receiving the notice of appeal, accompanied by a consent and waiver to be bound by
613 the provisions therein and hereof, the Appeals Panel shall arrange for a hearing to
614 review the findings of the Board of Commissioners and the position of such Member.
615 The recommendation of the Appeals Panel, including relevant specifics, shall be
616 made to the Board of Commissioners, which shall act on the recommendation. The
617 decision of the Board of Commissioners shall be communicated in writing and shall
618 be final and binding in accordance with the consent and waiver referenced herein
619 (and as submitted concurrent with the appeal procedures).

620 C. Regarding adverse actions of the Board of Commissioners that are defined by the
621 Procedures as failure to grant initial accreditation or withdrawal of accreditation:

622 1. If the institution believes that the action of the Board of Commissioners is unjust or
623 based on erroneous information, the institution shall, either on its own initiative or at
624 the invitation of the Board of Commissioners, first meet with three Commissioners
625 appointed by the chair of the Board of Commissioners to seek a mutually

626 satisfactory resolution. The response of the Board of Commissioners to a written
627 appeal, including relevant specifics, shall be communicated in writing.

628 2. If, after such consultation, the institution believes the action of the Board of
629 Commissioners still to be unjust or based on erroneous information, it shall have the
630 right to appeal in writing within sixty days of the receipt of the written findings, to
631 the Appeals Panel as elected biennially by member schools. Within 120 days after
632 receiving the notice of appeal, accompanied by a consent and waiver to be bound by
633 the provisions therein and hereof, the Appeals Panel shall arrange for a hearing to
634 review the findings of the Board of Commissioners and the position of such
635 Member. The Appeals Panel shall make a decision to affirm, amend, or reverse the
636 adverse action, or remand to the Board of Commissioners with instruction regarding
637 its conclusions. The decision of the Appeals Panel is final and binding on both the
638 Board of Commissioners and member school. The Board of Commissioners in all
639 cases will be responsible for implementing the decision.

640 D. The Board of Commissioners and the moving party/parties shall have the right to
641 representation in person and by counsel, if desired, at any level of appeal, and the school
642 may provide new or additional information at any level of appeal that further demonstrates
643 that the school is appropriately implementing the standards of accrediting.

644 **XII. Complaints**

645 The Commission has an obligation to the various publics it serves to give responsible
646 consideration to complaints that may be made against any accredited school. The Board of
647 Commissioners maintains policies and procedures for reviewing and responding to complaints.
648 The complaint must be filed in writing, together with substantial documentation, as appropriate
649 for the circumstance. The Board of Commissioners will determine if the complaint has standing
650 with reference to any membership criterion or accreditation standard of the Commission. If the
651 complaint has standing, the Board of Commissioners will conduct an investigation. The Board of
652 Commissioners will communicate its conclusions and actions to the institution and the party
653 raising the complaint. The Board of Commissioners assumes no responsibility for or obligation
654 to adjudicate individual grievances.

655 **XIII. Dual Accreditation**

656 A. Any institution seeking or holding accreditation by more than one accrediting body
657 recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation or the U.S. Department of
658 Education must describe itself in identical terms to each recognized accrediting body with
659 regard to purpose, governance, programs, degrees, diplomas, certificates, personnel,

COMMISSION ON ACCREDITING

660 finances, and constituents; and it must keep each accrediting body apprised of any change
661 in its status with one or another accrediting body.

662 B. The Board of Commissioners will withhold actions granting reaffirmation of
663 accreditation, granting candidacy for accredited status, or extending the term of
664 candidacy to any institution that is currently subject to (1) an adverse accrediting action
665 by another accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Department of Education or (2) an
666 action by an appropriate governmental authority that may lead to suspension, revocation,
667 or termination of the school's legal authority to provide degree-granting higher education.
668 If, after review, the Board of Commissioners determines that the institution is in
669 compliance with Commission standards, it will proceed with the actions appropriate to
670 Commission procedures, criteria, and standards.

671 C. The Board of Commissioners will withhold actions granting reaffirmation of accreditation,
672 granting candidacy for accredited status, or extending candidacy status to a college-related
673 or university-related theological school, if the institution to which it is related is currently
674 subject to an adverse action by another accrediting agency recognized by the U.S.
675 Department of Education or an interim action by a governmental agency leading to
676 suspension, revocation, or termination of the institution's authority to offer degree-granting
677 higher education. If, after review, the Board of Commissioners determines to grant
678 candidacy, initial accreditation, or reaffirmation of accreditation to schools related to
679 colleges or universities, subject to the conditions noted above, the Board of Commissioners
680 will provide an explanation for its action to the U.S. Secretary of Education and to the
681 recognized accrediting agency.

682 D. Schools accredited by the Commission on Accrediting and other recognized accrediting
683 agencies in the United States and Canada may request a joint comprehensive evaluation
684 visit conducted by both agencies. The Commission on Accrediting will conduct joint
685 visits if the other agency agrees, and if the joint evaluation procedures do not
686 compromise the independence and consistency of the Board of Commissioners'
687 accreditation decisions.

Revisions to General Institutional Standards 1 through 9

1 Purpose, Planning, and Evaluation

Theological schools are communities of faith and learning guided by a theological vision. Schools related to the Commission on Accrediting of the Association of Theological Schools conduct post-baccalaureate programs for ministerial leadership and in theological disciplines. Their educational programs should continue the heritage of theological scholarship, attend to the religious constituencies served, and respond to the global context of religious service and theological education.

1.1 Purpose

1.1.1 Each member school shall have a formally adopted statement of institutional purpose. The statement of institutional purpose should articulate the mission to which the school believes it is called and define its particular identity and values. When confessional commitments are central to the identity of a school, they shall be clearly articulated in the statement of purpose. The initiation, development, authorization, and regular review of this statement is the responsibility of the appropriate governing body, and the development should involve all appropriate constituencies (e.g., trustees, faculty, administration, staff, students, and ecclesiastical bodies).

1.1.2 Theological schools that are related to colleges or universities should support the purpose of the overall institution and develop their purpose statements in relationship to the institutions of which they are a part.

1.1.3 Purpose statements should be enabling and defining documents, and should be realistic and accurate. The adequacy of the purpose statement and the institution's ability to fulfill its mission are critical elements to the institution's integrity.

1.2 Planning and evaluation

1.2.1 The purpose statement shall guide the institution in its comprehensive institutional planning and evaluation procedures and in making decisions regarding programs, allocation of resources including the use and support of educational technology, constituencies served, relationships with ecclesiastical bodies, global concerns, institutional flexibility, and other comparable matters.

31 | 1.2.2 Evaluation is a critical element in support of integrity ~~to in educational efforts,~~
32 | ~~institutional renewal, and individual institutional planning and mission fulfillment.~~
33 | ~~professional development.~~ Evaluation is a process that includes (1) the identification of
34 | desired goals or outcomes for an educational program, or institutional service, or
35 | personnel performance; (2) a system of gathering quantitative or qualitative information
36 | related to the desired goals; (3) the assessment of the performance of the program,
37 | service, or person based on this information; and (4) the establishment of revised goals or
38 | activities based on the assessment. Institutions shall develop and implement ongoing
39 | evaluation procedures for institutional vitality and educational effectiveness. ~~employees,~~
40 | ~~students, educational programs, and institutional activities.~~

41 | 1.2.2.1 Institutions shall develop and implement ongoing evaluation
42 | procedures for institutional vitality. The scope of institutional vitality evaluation
43 | includes (1) ability to fulfill the school’s mission; (2) ability to provide the
44 | resources necessary to sustain and improve the school; and (3) ability of
45 | governance and administrative structures, personnel, and procedures to exercise
46 | leadership adequately on behalf of the school’s purpose and to operate the school
47 | with integrity.

48 | 1.2.2.2 Institutions shall develop and implement ongoing evaluation
49 | procedures for educational effectiveness as required by individual degree program
50 | standards. ~~The scope of educational effectiveness evaluation includes (1) the~~
51 | ~~extent to which degree programs are meeting the needs of students and the~~
52 | ~~institution’s overall goals for the programs; and (2) the effectiveness of~~
53 | ~~instruction and other educational activities to foster student learning.~~

54 | 1.2.3 A comprehensive evaluation process is the primary resource an institution uses to
55 | determine the extent to which it is accomplishing its purpose. The various institutional
56 | and educational evaluation procedures shall be analyzed, coordinated, and employed in
57 | comprehensive institutional planning. Information gained in evaluation processes should
58 | be utilized widely within the institution for ongoing administrative and educational
59 | planning.

60 | **2 Institutional Integrity**

61 | Institutional integrity is demonstrated by the consistency of a theological school’s actions with
62 | commitments it has expressed in its formally adopted statement of purpose, with agreements it
63 | assumes with accrediting and governmental agencies, with covenants it establishes with

64 ecclesiastical bodies, and with ethical guidelines for dealing with students, employees, and
65 constituencies.

66 2.1 Schools accredited by the Board of Commissioners shall carry out their educational
67 programs and institutional activities according to the standards and procedures established by the
68 Commission and its Board of Commissioners, communicate honestly and forthrightly with the
69 board, comply with requests for information, and cooperate with the board in preparation for and
70 conduct of visits.

71 2.2 With regard to state, provincial, and federal authorities, schools shall conduct their
72 operations in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations.

73 2.3 The school shall ensure that all published materials, electronic and print, including
74 catalogs, academic calendars, and promotional literature, accurately represent the institution to
75 its various constituencies and publics, including students and prospective students. All charges
76 and fees, including refund policies, should be fully disclosed. Schools should exercise care in
77 advertising to portray the institution fairly and honestly to the public. Wherever appropriate,
78 published institutional documents shall employ gender inclusive language with reference to
79 persons.

80 2.4 The institution shall seek to treat students, faculty, administrators, employees, and the
81 publics to which it relates in ethical ways. Such treatment includes, among other concerns, an
82 equitable policy of student tuition refunds; nondiscriminatory practices in employment, insofar
83 as such practices do not conflict with doctrine or ecclesiastical polity; clearly defined processes
84 for addressing faculty, employee, and student grievances; and integrity in financial management.

85 2.5 In their institutional and educational practices, theological schools shall promote
86 awareness of the diversity of race, ethnicity, and culture widely present in North America and
87 shall seek to enhance participation and leadership of persons of color in theological education.
88 Schools shall assist all students in gaining the particular knowledge, appreciation, and openness
89 needed to live and practice ministry effectively in culturally and racially diverse settings.
90 ~~Integrity in theological education includes institutional and educational practices that promote~~
91 ~~awareness of the diversity of race, ethnicity, and culture widely present in North America.~~
92 ~~Schools shall seek to enhance participation of persons of racial/ethnic minorities in institutional~~
93 ~~life. According to its stated purpose, the school shall seek to address the concerns of women and~~
94 ~~to increase their participation in theological education. In all cases, schools shall seek to assist~~
95 ~~students in gaining the particular knowledge, appreciation, and openness needed to live and~~
96 ~~practice ministry effectively in changing cultural and racially diverse settings.~~

97 2.6 In their institutional and educational practices, theological schools shall promote the
98 participation and leadership of women in theological education within the framework of each
99 school's stated purposes and theological commitments. Schools shall assist all students in
100 gaining the particular knowledge, appreciation, and openness needed to live and practice
101 ministry effectively in diverse settings.

102 2.76 Institutions participating in U.S. federally guaranteed federal student financial assistance
103 programs shall comply with prevailing governmental guidelines regulating these programs.
104 Default rates on student loans above the federal threshold, or failure to comply with federal
105 guidelines, is cause for review of an institution's overall conformity to the standards of
106 accreditation of the Commission. Schools shall demonstrate that they have resolved effectively
107 all areas of deficiency identified in audits, program reviews, and any other information provided
108 by the US Department of Education to the Commission.

109 | 2.87 For schools related to colleges or universities, integrity requires that these schools
110 contribute to the overall goals of the larger institution and support its policies and procedures.

111 | 2.9. Member schools shall make public a statement of their policy on transfer credits earned at
112 other institutions of higher education, including the criteria used for their decisions.

113 | 2.10 Institutions shall establish and enforce policies for the appropriate and ethical use of
114 instructional technology, digital media, and the Internet that are consistent with the institution's
115 educational purposes and environment.

116 | **3 The Theological Curriculum: Learning, Teaching, and Research; ~~Theological~~**
117 **Scholarship**

118 | A theological school is a community of faith and learning that cultivates habits of theological
119 reflection, nurtures wise and skilled ministerial practice, and contributes to the formation of
120 spiritual awareness and moral sensitivity. Within this context, the task of ~~theological scholarship~~
121 the theological curriculum is central. It includes the interrelated activities of ~~teaching~~, learning,
122 teaching, and research. The theological curriculum is the means by which learning, teaching, and
123 research are formally ordered to educational goals.

124 **3.1 Goals of the theological curriculum**¹

125 3.1.1 In a theological school, the overarching goal is the development of theological
 126 understanding, that is, aptitude for theological reflection and wisdom pertaining to a
 127 responsible life in faith. Comprehended in this overarching goal are others such as
 128 deepening spiritual awareness, growing in moral sensibility and character, gaining an
 129 intellectual grasp of the tradition of a faith community, and acquiring the abilities
 130 requisite to the exercise of ministry in that community. These goals, and the processes
 131 and practices leading to their attainment, are normally intimately interwoven and should
 132 not be separated from one another.

133 3.1.2 The emphasis placed on particular goals and their configuration will vary, both
 134 from school to school (depending on the understanding of institutional purpose), and
 135 within each school (depending on the variety of educational programs offered). The
 136 ordering of teaching, learning, and research toward particular sets of goals is embodied in
 137 the degree programs of the school and in the specific curricula followed in those
 138 programs. The theological curriculum, comprehensively understood, embraces all those
 139 activities and experiences provided by the school to enable students to achieve the
 140 intended goals. More narrowly understood, the curriculum is the array of specific
 141 activities (e.g., courses, practica, supervised ministry, spiritual formation experiences,
 142 theses) explicitly required in a degree program. In both the more comprehensive and the
 143 more narrow sense, the ~~entire~~ curriculum should be seen as a set of practices with a
 144 formative aim—the development of intellectual, spiritual, moral, and vocational or
 145 professional capacities—and careful attention must be given to the coherence and mutual
 146 enhancement of its various elements.

147 **3.2 — Activities of Theological Scholarship: Learning, teaching, and research**

148 3.2.0 Learning and teaching occur in the classroom and through experiences outside the
 149 classroom; the responsibilities of teaching and learning rest with both students and
 150 faculty; the collaborative nature of theological scholarship requires that people teach and
 151 learn from one another in communal settings; and research is integral to the quality of
 152 both learning and teaching.

153

¹ This text has been moved from current Standard 4.

154 | **3.2+.1 Learning**

155 | 3.2+.1.1 Learning in a theological school should reflect the goals of the total
156 | curriculum and be appropriate to post-baccalaureate education.

157 | 3.2+.1.2 Learning should cultivate scholarly discourse and result in the ability
158 | to think critically and constructively, conduct research, use library resources, and
159 | engage in the practice of ministry.

160 | 3.2+.1.3 Learning should foster, in addition to the acquisition of knowledge, the
161 | capacity to understand and assess one’s tradition and identity, and to integrate
162 | materials from various theological disciplines and modes of instructional
163 | engagement in ways that enhance ministry and cultivate emotional and spiritual
164 | maturity.

165 | 3.2.1.4 An institution shall demonstrate its ongoing efforts to ensure the
166 | quality of learning within the context of its purpose and as understood by the
167 | relevant scholarly and ecclesial communities.²

168 | **3.2+.2 Teaching**

169 | 3.2+.2.1 Teaching should involve faculty, librarians, and students working
170 | together in an environment of mutual learning, respect, and engagement.

171 | 3.2+.2.2 Instructional methods should use the diversity of life experiences
172 | represented by the students, by faith communities, and by the larger cultural
173 | context. Instructional methods and the use of technology should be sensitive to
174 | the diversity of student populations, different learning styles of students, the
175 | importance of communities of learning, and the instructional goals. The
176 | integration of technology as a teaching tool and resource for learning shall include
177 | careful planning by faculty and administration to ensure adequate infrastructure,
178 | resources, training, and support.

² The existing standards include a statement about “ensuring quality” for teaching and learning at the end of this section (existing 3.1.4). These changes locate this expectation at the end of each statement about teaching and learning and delete the overall statement at the end.

179 | 3.2.2.3 Courses are a central place of interaction between teachers and
 180 | learners. The way the instructor arranges the work and structures the class should
 181 | encourage theological conversation. Courses and programs of study should reflect
 182 | an awareness of the diversity of worldwide and local settings. In the development
 183 | of new courses and the review of syllabi, faculty should interact with one another,
 184 | with librarians, with their students, with the church, and with the developing
 185 | fields of knowledge. Faculty should be appropriately involved in the
 186 | consideration of ways in which technology might enhance or strengthen student
 187 | learning. Course development and review best occur in the context of the goals of
 188 | the entire curriculum.

189 | 3.2.2.4 An institution shall demonstrate its ongoing efforts to ensure the
 190 | quality of teaching within the context of its purpose and as understood by the
 191 | relevant scholarly and ecclesial communities.

192 | **3.2.3 Research**

193 | 3.2.3.1 Research is an essential component of theological scholarship and
 194 | should be evident in the work of both teachers and students. Theological research
 195 | is both an individual and a communal enterprise, and is properly undertaken in
 196 | constructive relationship with the academy, with the church, and with the wider
 197 | public.

198 | 3.2.3.2 As a function of learning, research involves the skills needed both to
 199 | discover information and to integrate new information with established
 200 | understandings. As a function of teaching, research assimilates sources of
 201 | information, constructs patterns of understanding, and uncovers new information
 202 | in order to strengthen classroom experiences.

203 | ~~3.1.4 An institution shall demonstrate its ongoing efforts to ensure the quality of teaching,~~
 204 | ~~learning, and research within the context of its purpose, and as understood by the relevant~~
 205 | ~~scholarly and ecclesial communities.~~

206 | **3.32 Characteristics of theological scholarship**

207 | 3.32.0 Patterns of collaboration, freedom of inquiry, relationships with diverse publics,
208 | and a global awareness are important characteristics of theological scholarship.

209 | **3.32.1 Scholarly collaboration**

210 | 3.32.1.1 The activities of theological scholarship—teaching, learning, and
211 | research—are collaborative efforts among faculty, librarians, and students, and
212 | foster a lifelong commitment to learning and reflection.

213 | 3.32.1.2 Scholarship occurs in a variety of contexts in the theological school.
214 | These include courses, independent study, the library, student and faculty
215 | interaction, congregational and field settings, and courses in universities and other
216 | graduate level institutions. In each of these settings, mutual respect among
217 | scholarly inquirers characterizes theological scholarship.

218 | 3.32.1.3 Collaboration and communication extend beyond the theological
219 | school’s immediate environment to relate it to the wider community of the
220 | church, the academy, and the society. Theological scholarship is enhanced by
221 | active engagement with the diversity and global extent of those wider publics, and
222 | it requires a consciousness of racial, ethnic, gender, and global diversities. In
223 | accordance with the school’s purpose and constituencies, insofar as possible, the
224 | members of the school’s own community of learning should also represent
225 | diversity in race, age, ethnic origin, and gender.

226 | **3.32.2 Freedom of inquiry**

227 | 3.32.2.0 Both in an institution’s internal life and in its relationship with its publics,
228 | freedom of inquiry is indispensable for good theological education. This freedom, while
229 | variously understood, has both religious roots and an established value in North
230 | American higher education. Theological schools have a responsibility to maintain their
231 | institutional purpose, which for many schools includes confessional commitments and
232 | specific responsibilities for faculty as stipulated by these commitments. Schools shall
233 | uphold the freedom of inquiry necessary for genuine and faithful scholarship, articulate

234 their understanding of that freedom, formally adopt policies to implement that
 235 understanding and ensure procedural fairness, and carefully adhere to those policies.

236 **3.32.3 Involvement with diverse publics**

237 3.32.3.1 Theological scholarship requires engagement with a diverse and
 238 manifold set of publics. Although the particular purpose of a school will influence
 239 the balance and forms of this engagement, schools shall assume responsibility for
 240 relating to the church, the academic community, and the broader public.

241 3.32.3.2 Theological scholarship informs and enriches the reflective life of the
 242 church. The school should demonstrate awareness of the diverse manifestations of
 243 religious community encompassed by the term *church*: congregations,
 244 denominations, parachurch organizations, broad confessional traditions, and the
 245 church catholic. Library collections, courses, and degree programs should
 246 represent the historical breadth, cultural difference, confessional diversity, and
 247 global scope of Christian life and thought.

248 3.32.3.3 The theological faculty contributes to the advancement of learning
 249 within theological education and, more broadly, in the academic community, by
 250 contributions to the scholarly study of religion and its role in higher education.

251 3.32.3.4 Theological scholarship contributes to the articulation of religion's
 252 role and influence in the public sphere. The faculty and administration should take
 253 responsibility for the appropriate exercise of this public interpretive role to enrich
 254 the life of a culturally and religiously diverse society.

255 **3.32.4 Globalization-Global Awareness and Engagement**

256 3.32.4.1 Theological teaching, learning, and research require patterns of
 257 institutional and educational practice that contribute to an awareness and
 258 appreciation of global interconnectedness and interdependence, particularly as
 259 they relate to the mission of the church. These patterns are intended to enhance
 260 the ways institutions participate in the ecumenical, dialogical, evangelistic, and

The Association adopted a policy guideline on "Academic Freedom and Tenure," which appears in the Policy Statements section of *Bulletin*, Part 1.

261 justice efforts of the church. ~~The term globalization has been used to identify~~
262 ~~these patterns and practices collectively.~~

263 | 3.32.4.2 ~~Globalization~~ Global awareness and engagement is cultivated by
264 curricular attention to cross-cultural issues as well as the study of other major
265 religions by opportunities for cross-cultural experiences; by the composition of
266 the faculty, governing board, and student body; by professional development of
267 faculty members; and by the design of community activities and worship.

268 | 3.32.4.3 Schools shall ~~develop~~ demonstrate practices of teaching, learning, and
269 research (comprehensively understood as theological scholarship) that encourage
270 global awareness and responsiveness.

271 **3.3.5 Ethics of scholarship**

272 The institution shall define and demonstrate ongoing efforts to ensure the ethical
273 character of learning, teaching, and scholarship on the part of all members of the
274 academic community, including appropriate guidelines for research with human
275 participants.

276 **4 The Theological Curriculum**

277 *The theological curriculum is the means by which teaching and learning are formally ordered to*
278 *educational goals.*

280 **4.1 Goals of the Theological Curriculum**³

281
282 *4.1.1 In a theological school, the overarching goal is the development of theological*
283 *understanding, that is, aptitude for theological reflection and wisdom pertaining to*
284 *responsible life in faith. Comprehended in this overarching goal are others such as*
285 *deepening spiritual awareness, growing in moral sensibility and character, gaining an*
286 *intellectual grasp of the tradition of a faith community, and acquiring the abilities*
287 *requisite to the exercise of ministry in that community. These goals, and the processes*
288 *and practices leading to their attainment, are normally intimately interwoven and should*
289 *not be separated from one another.*
290

³ Existing sections 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 are proposed to become part of Standard 3.

291 *4.1.2 The emphasis placed on particular goals and their configuration will vary, both*
 292 *from school to school (depending on the understanding of institutional purpose), and*
 293 *within each school (depending on the variety of educational programs offered). The*
 294 *ordering of teaching and learning toward particular sets of goals is embodied in the*
 295 *degree programs of the school and in the specific curricula followed in those programs.*
 296 *The theological curriculum, comprehensively understood, embraces all those activities*
 297 *and experiences provided by the school to enable students to achieve the intended goals.*
 298 *More narrowly understood, the curriculum is the array of specific activities (e.g.,*
 299 *courses, practica, supervised ministry, spiritual formation experiences, theses) explicitly*
 300 *required in a degree program. In both the more comprehensive and the more narrow*
 301 *sense, the entire curriculum should be seen as a set of practices with a formative aim—*
 302 *the development of intellectual, spiritual, moral, and vocational or professional*
 303 *capacities—and careful attention must be given to the coherence and mutual*
 304 *enhancement of its various elements.*

305 **4.2 Degree programs**⁴

306 *4.2.0 Degree programs approved by the Board of Commissioners are post-*
 307 *baccalaureate and fall into several groups. It should be noted that these categories are*
 308 *not mutually exclusive and that there is some natural overlapping among them. Programs*
 309 *at the level of the first graduate theological degree are of two main kinds: (1) some are*
 310 *oriented primarily toward ministerial leadership and (2) some toward general*
 311 *theological studies. Programs at the advanced level, normally presupposing a first*
 312 *theological degree, are of two main kinds: (1) those that focus upon advanced ministerial*
 313 *leadership and (2) those directed primarily toward theological research and teaching.*

314 *4.2.0.1 When Commission institutions offer more than one degree program,*
 315 *they shall articulate the distinctions among the degrees with regard to their*
 316 *educational and vocational intent. Institutions shall articulate the goals and*
 317 *objectives of each degree program they offer and assure that the design of its*
 318 *curriculum is in accordance with institutional purpose and the accreditation*
 319 *standards of the Commission.*

⁴ The material from existing 4.2 through 4.4.2 would be moved out of the institutional standards to become an introductory and definitional section to the degree program standards. This change would have no accrediting effect.

320 4.2.0.2 *The number of students enrolled in any degree program shall be*
 321 *sufficient to provide a community of learning in that degree program.*

322 4.2.0.3 *Schools shall follow the recommended nomenclature for all board-*
 323 *approved degree programs. In cases where governmental licensing, charter*
 324 *requirements, or institutional federation agreements preclude use of*
 325 *recommended nomenclature, the board will consider alternate degree*
 326 *nomenclature. In cases where the standards provide alternate nomenclature for*
 327 *the same kind of degree program (e.g., MRE or MA in Religious Education, ThM*
 328 *or STM, PhD or ThD), the nomenclature employed reflects the history or policies*
 329 *of the schools offering the degree programs.*

330 4.2.0.4 *Degree programs shall be approved by the board according to the*
 331 *Commission’s formally adopted procedures (cf. Procedures).*

332 **4.2.1 Basic programs oriented toward ministerial leadership**

333 4.2.1.1 *Curricula for programs oriented toward ministerial leadership have*
 334 *certain closely integrated, common features. First, they provide a structured*
 335 *opportunity to develop a thorough, discriminating understanding and personal*
 336 *appropriation of the heritage of the community of faith (e.g., its Scripture,*
 337 *tradition, doctrines, and practices) in its historical and contemporary*
 338 *expressions. Second, they assist students in understanding the cultural realities*
 339 *and social settings within which religious communities live and carry out their*
 340 *missions, as well as the institutional life of those communities themselves. The*
 341 *insights of cognate disciplines such as the social sciences, the natural sciences,*
 342 *philosophy, and the arts enable a knowledge and appreciation of the broader*
 343 *context of the religious tradition, including cross-cultural and global aspects.*
 344 *Third, they provide opportunities for formational experiences through which*
 345 *students may grow in those personal qualities essential for the practice of*
 346 *ministry, namely, emotional maturity, personal faith, moral integrity, and social*
 347 *concern. Fourth, they assist students to gain the capacities for entry into and*
 348 *growth in the practice of the particular form of ministry to which the program is*
 349 *oriented. Instruction in these various areas of theological study should be so*
 350 *conducted as to demonstrate their interdependence, their theological character,*
 351 *and their common orientation toward the goals of the degree program. The*
 352 *educational program in all its dimensions should be designed and carried out in*
 353 *such a way as to enable students to function constructively as ministerial leaders*

354 *in the particular communities in which they intend to work, and to foster an*
 355 *awareness of the need for continuing education.*

356 4.2.1.2 *The following degree nomenclature is included among these kinds of*
 357 *curricular programs: Master of Divinity; Master of Arts in Religious*
 358 *Education/Master of Religious Education; Master of Arts in _____ (e.g.,*
 359 *Counseling); Master of Sacred Music/Master of Church Music.*

360 **4.2.2 Basic programs oriented toward general theological studies**

361 4.2.2.1 *First graduate theological degrees in basic programs oriented toward*
 362 *general theological studies have in common the purpose of providing*
 363 *understanding in theological disciplines. These programs may be designed for*
 364 *general knowledge of theology or for background in specific disciplines, or for*
 365 *interdisciplinary studies. They are intended as the basis for further graduate study*
 366 *or for other educational purposes. Nomenclature may differ according to the*
 367 *history of its use in the particular school. The curricula for these degrees should*
 368 *be developed in relation to the institution's distinctive goals for the programs. A*
 369 *scholarly investigation of Scripture, tradition, and theology is essential for all of*
 370 *the programs, while some may also emphasize research methods, teaching skills,*
 371 *or competence in specific theological disciplines. Depending on the intention of*
 372 *the degree, appropriate formational experiences are to be provided that will*
 373 *develop the qualities essential for the application of the degree. Adequate faculty*
 374 *and instructional resources must be available, with special attention given to*
 375 *particular areas of focus within the programs.*

376 4.2.2.2 *Degrees of this kind are offered with the following nomenclature:*
 377 *Master of Arts, Master of Arts (Religion), Master of Theological Studies.*

378 **4.2.3 Advanced programs oriented toward ministerial leadership**

379 4.2.3.1 *Advanced programs in ministerial leadership presuppose a basic*
 380 *theological degree. All are designed to deepen the basic knowledge and skill in*
 381 *ministry so that students may engage in ministry with increasing professional,*
 382 *intellectual, and spiritual integrity. Emphasis is upon the practice of ministry*
 383 *informed by analytic and ministerial research skills. Certain curricular features*
 384 *are common to the advanced programs in this category. Each degree program*
 385 *emphasizes the mastery of advanced knowledge informing the understanding of*
 386 *the nature and purposes of ministry, the competencies gained through advanced*

387 *study, and the integration of the many dimensions of ministry. Each degree*
 388 *program includes the completion of a final culminating written project/report or*
 389 *dissertation. Schools offering any of these advanced degrees are expected to make*
 390 *explicit the criteria by which the doctoral level of studies is identified,*
 391 *implemented, and assessed.*

392 *4.2.3.2 Degrees offered in this broad category have the following*
 393 *nomenclature: Doctor of Ministry, Doctor of Educational Ministry, Doctor of*
 394 *Education, Doctor of Missiology, Doctor of Musical Arts.*

395 **4.2.4 *Advanced programs primarily oriented toward theological research and***
 396 ***teaching***

397 *4.2.4.1 These programs oriented toward theological research and teaching*
 398 *presuppose a basic post-baccalaureate theological degree and permit students to*
 399 *concentrate in one or more of the theological disciplines. They equip students for*
 400 *teaching and research in theological schools, colleges, and universities, or for the*
 401 *scholarly enhancement of ministerial practice, or for other scholarly activities.*
 402 *They provide for both specialization and breadth in education and training; they*
 403 *provide instruction in research methods and procedures relevant to the area of*
 404 *specialization; and normally they provide training in teaching methods and skills,*
 405 *or in other scholarly tasks. Curricula for these programs provide, first of all, a*
 406 *structured opportunity to develop an advanced critical understanding and*
 407 *appreciation of a specific area of theological studies or in interdisciplinary*
 408 *relationships and cognate studies. Second, they assist students in understanding*
 409 *cultural realities and social settings within which religious communities and*
 410 *institutions of theological or religious education exist and carry out their*
 411 *missions, as well as the institutional life of these communities and institutions*
 412 *themselves. Third, they assist students to grow in those personal and spiritual*
 413 *qualities essential for the practice of scholarly ministry in theological*
 414 *environments. Fourth, they allow students to gain the capacities for teaching,*
 415 *writing, and conducting advanced research.*

416 *4.2.4.2 The nomenclature for advanced masters' degrees includes the Master*
 417 *of Theology and Master of Sacred Theology. The nomenclature for doctoral*
 418 *degrees oriented to research and teaching includes the Doctor of Philosophy and*
 419 *Doctor of Theology.*

420

421 **4.3 Degree Program Standards**

422 4.3.0 To provide for a common public recognition of theological degrees, to assure
 423 quality, and to enhance evaluative efforts, the Commission establishes standards for each
 424 degree program. Each degree program should reflect the characteristics of the
 425 theological curriculum (see 4.1–4.2). The degree standards articulate the following
 426 requirements: purpose of the degree; primary goals of the program; program content,
 427 location, and duration; admission and resource requirements; and educational
 428 evaluation. The degree programs offered by board-accredited institutions shall conform
 429 to these standards.

430 **4.4 Other instructional programs**

431 4.4.0 In addition to their degree programs, theological schools contribute to their various
 432 publics through other programs of learning and teaching. Although these programs do
 433 not culminate in degrees, they should be compatible with the institution's primary
 434 purpose of graduate theological education.

435 **4.4.1 Characteristics**

436 4.4.1.1 Programs that do not lead to degrees should remain appropriate to
 437 institutional purpose and will differ according to their ~~student audience~~ learning
 438 goals: for example, continuing education for ~~clergy-religious leaders~~, programs
 439 for ~~racial/ethnic~~ persons of color or linguistic minority groups, or programs for
 440 enrichment.

441 4.4.1.2 Such programs should be conducted with the proper administrative
 442 and faculty oversight, including design, approval, staffing, financing, and
 443 evaluation.

444 4.4.1.3 Faculty who teach in such programs should be appropriately
 445 qualified. Normally, qualification will be demonstrated by the possession of an
 446 appropriate graduate theological degree and by significant experience in the field
 447 in which one is teaching. Students in these programs should have appropriate
 448 access to the instructor and to learning resources commensurate with the level
 449 and purpose of the program.

450

451 **4.4.2 Types of programs**

452 *4.4.2.1 Schools may offer programs of study consisting either of courses for*
 453 *which graduate academic credit is granted or educational events without such*
 454 *credit.*

455 *4.4.2.2 Programs of study that grant graduate credit are appropriate for*
 456 *enrichment, personal growth, the development of lay leaders, or special,*
 457 *nondegree emphasis for vocational ministerial leaders. Such programs require*
 458 *students to have a baccalaureate degree, or its educational equivalent, for*
 459 *admission and to complete a program comprising courses appropriate for*
 460 *graduate credit. Completion of the program of study results in some formal*
 461 *recognition but not a degree. Credits earned toward these programs may*
 462 *subsequently be transferred into a graduate degree program.*

463 *4.4.2.3 Programs of study that do not carry academic credit may include*
 464 *courses, workshops, lectures, and other types of educational experiences on*
 465 *topics related to the theological curriculum or to the mission and ministry of the*
 466 *church. These programs and events may be designed for continuing education of*
 467 *ministers, for basic theological education, for personal enrichment, or for other*
 468 *purposes consistent with the character of the school. Because no academic credit*
 469 *is offered, those enrolled need not hold the baccalaureate degree. Requirements*
 470 *for admission to particular programs or events are at the discretion of the*
 471 *institution.*

472 **5 Library and information resources**⁵

473 The library is a central resource for theological scholarship ~~and the theological curriculum~~
 474 education. It is integral to the purpose of the school through its contribution to teaching, learning,
 475 and research, and it functions ~~collaboratively as a partner~~ in curriculum development and
 476 implementation. The library’s educational effectiveness depends ~~both~~ on the quality of its
 477 information resources, staff, and administrative vision. ~~collections and information resources and~~
 478 ~~on the vision and organization of its administration.~~ To accomplish its mission task, the library
 479 requires appropriate financial, technological, and physical resources, as well as a sufficient

⁵ The general institutional standards would be renumbered with the library becoming Standard 4 and other standards following in order, but these changes are not shown in this text.

480 number of personnel, collections, effective information technology, and sufficient human and
 481 physical resources. Its mission and complement of resources should align with the school's
 482 mission and be congruent with the character and composition of the student body.

483 **5.1 Library collections**

484 5.1.1 Theological study requires extensive encounter with historical and contemporary
 485 texts. While theological education is informed by many resources, the textual tradition is
 486 central to theological inquiry. Texts provide a point of entry to theological subject matter
 487 as well as a place of encounter with it. Theological libraries serve the church by
 488 preserving its textual tradition ~~both in print and in electronic forms, for the current and~~
 489 future needs, educational needs of faculty, and students, and researchers, and for the
 490 future.

491 5.1.2 To ensure effective growth of the collection, schools shall have an appropriate
 492 collection development policy. Collections in a theological school shall hold materials of
 493 importance for theological study and the practice of ministry, ~~that~~ and they shall represent
 494 the historical breadth and confessional diversity of Christian thought and life. The
 495 collection shall include relevant materials from cognate disciplines and basic texts from
 496 other religious traditions; and demonstrate sensitivity to issues of diversity, inclusiveness,
 497 and globalization to ensure ~~that theological learners and researchers have access to the~~
 498 variety of voices that speak to theological subjects.

499 5.1.3 Because libraries seek to preserve the textual tradition of the church, they may
 500 choose to build unique special collections, such as institutional, regional, or
 501 denominational archives.

502 5.1.4 In addition to print materials, collections shall include other media and electronic
 503 resources as appropriate to the curriculum and ~~ensure~~ provide access to relevant remote
 504 databases.

505 5.1.5 The library should promote coordinated collection development with other
 506 schools to provide stronger overall library collections.

507 **5.2 Contribution to ~~teaching, learning,~~ teaching, and research ⁶**

508 5.2.1 The library accomplishes its teaching responsibilities by meeting the
509 bibliographic needs of the library's patrons; offering appropriate reference services;
510 providing assistance and training in using information resources and communication
511 technology technologies; and teaching information literacy, including research practices
512 of effectively and ethically accessing, evaluating, and using information, theological
513 bibliography and research methods that foster knowledge of the literature and enable
514 students to locate resources, incorporating library research throughout the curriculum,
515 and helping to serve the information needs of graduates, clergy, and the church. The
516 library should collaborate with faculty to develop reflective research practices throughout
517 the curriculum and help to serve the information needs of faculty, students, and
518 researchers-

519 5.2.2 The library promotes theological learning by providing instructional programs
520 and resources that encourage students and graduates patrons to develop reflective and
521 critical research and communication practices that prepare them independent research
522 skills and by preparing them to engage in a lifelong learning process-

523 5.2.3 Theological research is supported through collection development and
524 information technology and by helping faculty and students develop research skills.

525 5.2.4 The library should provide physical and online an environments conducive to
526 learning and scholarly interaction.

527 **5.3 Partnership in curriculum development**

528 5.3.1 The library collaborates in the school's curriculum by providing collections and
529 services that reflect the institution's educational goals.

530 5.3.2 Teaching faculty should consult with library staff to ensure that the library
531 supports the current curriculum and the research needs of faculty and students. Library
532 staff should participate in long-range curriculum planning and anticipate future
533 intellectual and technological developments that might affect the library.

⁶ These changes address the rapidly expanding impact of information technology on libraries.

534 **5.4 Administration and leadership**

535 5.4.1 In freestanding theological schools, the chief library administrator has overall
 536 responsibility for library administration, collection development, and effective
 537 educational collaboration. The chief administrator of the library should participate in the
 538 formation of institutional policy regarding long-range educational and financial planning
 539 and should ordinarily be a voting member of the faculty. Normally, this person should
 540 possess graduate degrees in library science and in theological studies or another pertinent
 541 discipline.

542 5.4.2 When a theological library is part of a larger institutional library, a theological
 543 librarian should provide leadership in theological collection development, ensure
 544 effective educational collaboration with the faculty and students in the institution's
 545 theological school, and ordinarily be a voting member of the theological faculty.

546 5.4.3 The library administrator should exercise responsibility for regular and ongoing
 547 evaluation of the collection, the patterns of use, services provided by the library, and
 548 library personnel.

549 5.4.4 Schools shall provide structured opportunities to theological librarians for
 550 professional development and, as appropriate, contribute to the development of
 551 theological librarianship. ~~appropriate to their role.~~

552 **5.5 Resources**

553 5.5.1 Each school shall have the resources necessary for the operation of an adequate
 554 library program. These include ~~human~~, financial, technological, and physical resources
 555 and sufficient personnel.

556 5.5.2 The professional and support staff shall be of such number and quality as are
 557 needed to provide the necessary services, commensurate with the size and character of
 558 the institution. Professional staff shall possess the skills necessary for information
 559 technology, collection development and maintenance, and public service. Insofar as
 560 possible, staff shall be appointed with a view toward diversity in race, ethnicity, and
 561 gender. Where appropriate, other qualified members of the professional staff may also
 562 have faculty status. Institutions shall affirm the freedom of inquiry necessary for the role
 563 of professional librarians in theological scholarship.

564 5.5.3 An adequate portion of the annual institutional educational and general budget
 565 shall be devoted to the support of the library. Adequacy will be evaluated in comparison

566 with other similar institutions as well as by the library’s achievement of its own
 567 objectives as defined by its collection development policy.

568 5.5.4 Adequate facilities include sufficient space for readers and staff, adequate
 569 shelving for the book collection, appropriate space for nonprint media, adequate and
 570 flexible space for information technology, and climate control for all materials, especially
 571 rare books. Collections should be easily accessible and protected from deterioration,
 572 theft, and other threats.

573 5.5.5 Adequacy of library collections may be attained through institutional self-
 574 sufficiency or cooperative arrangements. In the latter instance, fully adequate collections
 575 or electronic resources are not required of individual member schools, but each school
 576 shall demonstrate contracted and reliable availability and actual use.

577 5.5.6 In its collaborative relationships with other institutions, a school remains
 578 accountable for the quality of library resources available to its students and faculty.

579 | **6 Faculty**

580 The members of the faculty of a theological school constitute a collaborative community of faith
 581 and learning, and they are crucial to the scholarly activities of teaching, learning, and research in
 582 the institution. A theological school’s faculty normally comprises the full-time teachers,
 583 continuing part-time ~~adjunct~~ teachers, and teachers who are engaged occasionally or for one
 584 time. In order for faculty members to accomplish their purposes, theological schools should
 585 assure them appropriate structure, support, and opportunities, including training for educational
 586 technology.

587 | **6.1 Faculty qualifications, responsibilities, development, and employment**

588 | 6.1.1 Schools should demonstrate that their faculty members have the necessary
 589 competencies for their responsibilities. Faculty members shall possess the appropriate
 590 credentials for graduate theological education, normally demonstrated by the attainment
 591 of a research doctorate or, in certain cases, another earned doctoral degree. In addition to
 592 academic preparation, ministerial and ecclesial experience is an important qualification in
 593 the composition of the faculty. Also, qualified teachers without a research doctorate may
 594 have special expertise in skill areas such as administration, music, or media as well as
 595 cross-cultural contextualization for teaching, learning, and research.

596 6.1.2 In the context of institutional purpose and the confessional commitments affirmed
597 by a faculty member when appointed, faculty members shall be free to seek knowledge
598 and communicate their findings.

599 6.1.3 Composition of the faculty should be guided by the purpose of the institution, and
600 attention to this composition should be an integral component of long-range planning in
601 the institution. Faculty should be of sufficient diversity and number to meet the
602 multifaceted demands of teaching, learning, and research. Hiring practices should be
603 attentive to the value of diversity in race, ethnicity, and gender. The faculty should also
604 include members who have doctorates from different schools and who exemplify various
605 methods and points of view. At the same time, faculty selection will be guided by the
606 needs and requirements of particular constituencies of the school.

607 6.1.4 The faculty who teach in a program on a continuing basis shall exercise
608 responsibility for the planning, design, and oversight of its curriculum in the context of
609 institutional purpose and resources and as directed by school administration requirements
610 for recruitment, matriculation, graduation, and service to constituent faith communities.

611 6.1.5 Each school shall articulate and demonstrate that it follows its policies concerning
612 faculty members in such areas as faculty rights and responsibilities; freedom of inquiry;
613 procedures for recruitment, appointment, retention, promotion, and dismissal; criteria for
614 faculty evaluation; faculty compensation; research leaves; and other conditions of
615 employment. Policies concerning these matters shall be published in an up-to-date faculty
616 handbook.

617 6.1.6 Theological scholarship is enriched by continuity within a faculty and safeguards
618 for the freedom of inquiry for individual members. Therefore, each school shall
619 demonstrate effective procedures for the retention of a qualified community of scholars,
620 through tenure or some other appropriate procedure.

621 6.1.7 The institution should support its faculty through such means as adequate salaries,
622 suitable working conditions, and support services.

623 6.1.8 The work load of faculty members in teaching and administration shall permit
624 adequate attention to students, to scholarly pursuits, and to other ecclesial and
625 institutional concerns.

626 **6.2 Faculty role in teaching**

627 6.2.1 Teachers shall have freedom in the classroom to discuss the subjects in which
628 they have competence by formal education and practical experience.

629 6.2.2 Faculty should endeavor to include, within the teaching of their respective
630 disciplines, theological reflection that enables students to integrate their learning from the
631 various disciplines, field education, and personal formation.

632 6.2.3 Full- and part-time faculty should be afforded opportunities to enhance teaching
633 skills, including the use of educational technology as well as training in instructional
634 design and in modes of advisement appropriate to distance programs, as a regular
635 component of faculty development.

636 6.2.4 Appropriate resources shall be available to facilitate the teaching task, including
637 but not limited to, classroom space, office space, educational technology, and access to
638 scholarly materials, including library and other information resources.

639 6.2.5 Schools shall develop and implement mechanisms for evaluating faculty
640 performance, including teaching competence and the use of educational technology.
641 These mechanisms should involve faculty members and students, as well as
642 administrators.

643 **6.3 Faculty role in student learning**

644 6.3.1 Faculty shall be involved in evaluating the quality of student learning by
645 identifying appropriate outcomes and assessing the extent to which the learning goals of
646 individual courses and degree programs have been achieved.

647 6.3.2 To ensure the quality of learning, faculty should be appropriately involved in
648 development of the library collection, educational technology, and other resources
649 necessary for student learning.

650 6.3.3 Faculty should participate in practices and procedures that contribute to students'
651 learning, including opportunities for regular advising and interaction with students and
652 attentiveness to the learning needs of diverse student populations.

653 6.3.4 Faculty should foster integration of the diverse learning objectives of the
654 curriculum so that students may successfully accomplish the purposes of the stated
655 degree programs.

656 **6.4 Faculty role in theological research**

657 6.4.1 Faculty are expected to engage in research, and each school shall articulate clearly
658 its expectations and requirements for faculty research and shall have explicit criteria and
659 procedures for the evaluation of research that are congruent with the purpose of the
660 school and with commonly accepted standards in higher education.

661 6.4.2 Schools shall provide structured opportunities for faculty research and intellectual
662 growth, such as regular research leaves and faculty colloquia.

663 6.4.3 In the context of its institutional purpose, each school shall ensure that faculty
664 have freedom to pursue critical questions, to contribute to scholarly discussion, and to
665 publish the findings of their research.

666 6.4.4 Faculty members should make available the results of their research through such
667 means as scholarly publications, constructive participation in learned societies, and
668 informed contributions to the intellectual life of church and society, as well as through
669 their teaching.

670 **7 Student Recruitment, Admission, Services, and Placement**

671 The students of a theological school are central to the educational activities of the institution.
672 They are also a primary constituency served by the school's curriculum and programs and, with
673 the faculty, constitute a community of faith and learning. Schools are responsible for the quality
674 of their policies and practices related to recruitment, admission, student support, student
675 borrowing, and placement.

676 **7.1 Recruitment**

677 7.1.1 Schools shall be able to demonstrate that their policies and practices of student
678 recruitment are consistent with the purpose of the institution.

679 7.1.2 In recruitment efforts, services, and publications, institutions shall accurately
680 represent themselves as well as the vocational opportunities related to their degree
681 programs.

682 **7.2 Admission**

683 7.2.1 In the development of admission policies and procedures, a theological school
684 shall establish criteria appropriate for each degree program it offers. Admission criteria

685 should give attention to applicants' academic, personal, and spiritual qualifications, as
686 well as their potential for making a contribution to church and society.

687 7.2.2 Schools shall be able to demonstrate that they operate on a post-baccalaureate
688 level, that the students they admit are capable of graduate level studies, and that their
689 standards and requirements for admission to all degree programs are clearly defined,
690 fairly implemented, and appropriately related to the purpose of the institution.

691 7.2.3 Schools shall regularly review the quality of applicants admitted to each degree
692 program and develop institutional strategies to maintain and enhance the overall quality
693 of the student population.

694 7.2.4 Schools shall give evidence of efforts in admissions to encourage diversity in such
695 areas as race, ethnicity, region, denomination, ~~or gender~~, or disability.

696 7.2.5 Schools shall encourage a broad baccalaureate preparation, for instance, studies in
697 world history, philosophy, languages and literature, the natural sciences, the social
698 sciences, music and other fine arts, and religion.

699 **7.3 Student services**

700 7.3.1 Policies regarding students' rights and responsibilities, as well as the institution's
701 code of discipline, shall be clearly identified and published.

702 7.3.2 Schools shall regularly and systematically evaluate the appropriateness, adequacy,
703 and use of student services for the purpose of strengthening the overall program.

704 7.3.3 Students should receive reliable and accessible services wherever they are
705 enrolled and however the educational programs are offered.

706 7.3.4 Schools shall maintain adequate student records regarding admission materials,
707 course work attempted and completed, and in other areas as determined by the school's
708 policy. Appropriate backup files should be maintained and updated on a regular basis.
709 The institution shall ensure the security of files from physical destruction or loss and
710 from unauthorized access.

711 7.3.5 Institutions shall demonstrate that program requirements, tuition, and fees are
712 appropriate for the degree programs they offer.

713 7.3.6 Institutions shall publish all requirements for degree programs, including courses,
714 noncredit requirements, and grading and other academic policies.

715 7.3.7 Student financial aid, when provided, should be distributed according to the
716 guidelines detailed in “Student Financial Aid” (see Policy Statements, *Bulletin*, Part 1).

717 ~~7.3.8 Senior administrators and financial aid officers shall review student educational~~
718 ~~debt and develop institutional strategies regarding student’s borrowing for theological~~
719 ~~education. Based on estimates of compensation graduates will receive, the school should~~
720 ~~provide financial counseling to students so as to minimize borrowing, explore alternative~~
721 ~~funding, and provide the fullest possible disclosure of the impact of loan repayment after~~
722 ~~graduation.~~

723 7.3.98 The institution shall have a process for responding to complaints raised by
724 students in areas related to the accrediting standards of the Commission, and schools shall
725 maintain a record of such formal student complaints for review by the board.

726 **7.4 Student borrowing**

727 7.4.1 Senior administrators and financial aid officers shall review student educational
728 debt and develop institutional strategies regarding students’ borrowing for theological
729 education.

730 7.4.2 Based on estimates of compensation graduates will receive, the school should
731 provide financial counseling to students so as to minimize borrowing, explore alternative
732 funding, and provide the fullest possible disclosure of the impact of loan repayment after
733 graduation.

734 **7.45 Placement**

735 7.45.1 In keeping with institutional purpose and ecclesial context, and upon students’
736 successful completion of their degree programs, schools shall provide appropriate
737 assistance to persons seeking employment relevant to their degrees.

738 7.45.2 Theological schools should monitor the placement of graduates in appropriate
739 positions and review admissions policies in light of trends in placement.

740 7.45.3 The institution should, in the context of its purpose and constituency, act as an
741 advocate for students who are members of groups that have been disadvantaged in
742 employment because of their race, ethnicity, ~~and/or gender,~~ and/or disability.

743 **8 Authority and Governance**

744 Governance is based on a bond of trust among boards, administration, faculty, students, and
745 ecclesial bodies. Each institution should articulate its own theologically informed understanding
746 of how this bond of trust becomes operational as a form of shared governance. Institutional
747 stewardship is the responsibility of all, not just the governing board. Good institutional life
748 requires that all institutional stewards know and carry out their responsibilities effectively as well
749 as encouraging others to do the same. Governance occurs in a legal context, and its boundaries
750 are set by formal relationships with ecclesiastical authority, with public authority as expressed in
751 law and charter, and with private citizens and other legally constituted bodies in the form of
752 contracts. The governance of a theological school, however, involves more than the legal
753 relationships and bylaws that define patterns of responsibility and accountability. It is the
754 structure by which participants in the governance process exercise faithful leadership on behalf
755 of the purpose of the theological school.

756 **8.1 Authority**

757 8.1.1 Authority is the exercise of rights, responsibilities, and powers accorded to a
758 theological school by its charter, articles of incorporation and bylaws, and ecclesiastical
759 and civil authorizations applicable to it, or by the overall educational institution of which
760 it is a part. A theological school derives from these mandates the legal and moral
761 authority to establish educational programs; to confer certificates, diplomas, or degrees;
762 to provide for personnel and facilities; and to assure institutional quality and integrity.

763 8.1.2 The structure and scope of the theological school's authority are based on the
764 patterns of its relationship to other institutions of higher education or ecclesiastical
765 bodies. Some theological schools have full authority for all institutional and educational
766 operations. Other schools, related to colleges, universities, or clusters of theological
767 schools, may have limited authority for institutional operations, although they may have
768 full authority over the educational programs. Still other schools are related to
769 ecclesiastical bodies in particular ways, and authority is shared by the institution and the
770 ecclesiastical body. All three kinds of schools have different patterns for the exercise of
771 authority, and in some schools these patterns may be blended.

772 8.1.2.1 Schools with full authority shall have a governing board with
773 responsibilities for maintaining the purpose, viability, vitality, and integrity of the
774 institution; the achievement of institutional policies; the selection of chief
775 administrative leadership; and the provision of physical and; fiscal resources; and

776 | personnel ~~human resources~~. The board is the legally constituted body that is
777 responsible for managing the assets of the institution in trust.

778 8.1.2.2 Schools where authority is limited by or derived from their
779 relationship to a college or university shall identify clearly where the authority for
780 maintaining the integrity and vitality of the theological school resides and how
781 that authority is to be exercised in actual practice. Schools within universities or
782 colleges should have an appropriate advisory board whose roles and
783 responsibilities are clearly defined in the institution's official documents.

784 8.1.2.3 Schools with authority limited by their ecclesiastical relationships shall
785 develop, in dialogue with their sponsoring church bodies, a formal statement
786 concerning the operative structure of governance for the institution. This
787 statement must make clear where the authority for maintaining the integrity and
788 vitality of the school resides and how that authority is to be exercised in actual
789 practice. In schools of this type, the authority of the governing board shall be
790 clearly specified in appropriate ecclesiastical and institutional documents.

791 8.1.3 Governing boards delegate authority to the faculty and administration to fulfill
792 their appropriate roles and responsibilities. Such authority shall be established and set
793 forth in the institution's official documents and carried out in governing practices.

794 8.1.4 In multilocation institutions, the assignment of authority and responsibilities
795 should be clearly defined in the institution's official documents and equitably
796 administered.

797 **8.2 Governance**

798 8.2.1 While final authority for an institution is vested in the governing board and
799 defined by the institution's official documents, each school shall articulate a structure and
800 process of governance that appropriately reflects the collegial nature of theological
801 education. The governance process should identify the school's constituencies and
802 publics, recognize the multiple lines of accountability, and balance competing
803 accountabilities in a manner shaped by the institution's charter, purpose, and particular
804 theological and denominational commitments.

805 8.2.2 Shared governance follows from the collegial nature of theological education.
806 Unique and overlapping roles and responsibilities of the governing board, faculty,
807 administrators, students, and other identified delegated authorities should be defined in a

808 way that allows all partners to exercise their mandated or delegated leadership.
809 Governance requires a carefully delineated process for the initiation, review, approval,
810 implementation, and evaluation of governing policies, ensuring that all necessary policies
811 and procedures are in place. Special attention should be given to policies regarding
812 freedom of inquiry, board-administrator prerogatives, procedural fairness, sexual
813 harassment, and discrimination.

814 8.2.3 The collaborative nature of governance provides for institutional learning and
815 self-correction, constantly developing the theological school's knowledge of specific
816 tasks, and remaining alert to developments in other organizations and institutions.

817 **8.3 The roles of the governing board, administration, faculty, and students in**
818 **governance processes**

819 8.3.0 The various roles that the board, the administrative leadership, and the faculty
820 play in the development of policy and the exercise of authority should be clearly
821 articulated. Because of their different histories and patterns of governance and
822 administration, the role of the governing board varies from institution to institution; and
823 the role also varies dependent upon the authority vested in the governing board and upon
824 the institution's relationship to other educational and denominational structures.

825 **8.3.1 Governing board**

826 8.3.1.1 The governing board is responsible for the establishment and
827 maintenance of the institution's integrity and its freedom from inappropriate
828 external and internal pressures and from destructive interference or restraints. It
829 shall attend to the well-being of the institution by exercising proper fiduciary
830 responsibility, adequate financial oversight, proper delegation of authority to the
831 institution's administrative officers and faculty, engaging outside legal counsel,
832 ensuring professional and independent audits, using professional investment
833 advisors as appropriate, and maintaining procedural fairness and freedom of
834 inquiry.

835 8.3.1.2 The governing board shall be accountable for the institution's
836 adherence to requirements duly established by public authorities and to
837 accreditation standards established by the Commission and by any other
838 accrediting or certifying agencies to which the institution is formally related.

839 8.3.1.3 Members of the governing board shall possess the qualifications
840 appropriate to the task they will undertake. In accordance with the school's
841 purpose and constituencies, the governing board's membership should reflect
842 diversity of race, ethnicity, and gender. As fiduciaries, they should commit
843 themselves loyally to the institution, its purpose, and its overall well-being. They
844 should lead by affirming the good that is done and by asking thoughtful questions
845 and challenging problematic situations. New members of the board should be
846 oriented to their responsibilities and the structures and procedures the board uses
847 to accomplish its tasks.

848 8.3.1.4 Subject to the terms of its charter and bylaws, the board chooses the
849 chief administrative leadership, appoints faculty, confers degrees, enters into
850 contracts, approves budgets, and manages the assets of the institution. If, in
851 accordance with an institution's specific character and traditions, certain of these
852 powers are reserved to one or more other governing entities, the specific character
853 of these restrictions shall be made clear.

854 8.3.1.5 The governing board shall require ongoing institutional planning and
855 evaluation of outcomes to assure faithful implementation of the school's purpose,
856 priorities, and denominational and theological commitments.

857 8.3.1.6 The governing board shall create and employ adequate structures for
858 implementing and administering policy, and shall delegate to the school's chief
859 administrative leadership authority commensurate with such responsibilities. In
860 turn, it requires from these officers adequate performance and accountability.

861 8.3.1.7 In its actions and processes, the board serves in relationship to a
862 variety of constituencies, both internal (e.g., administration, faculty, students,
863 staff) and external (e.g., graduates, denominations, congregations, etc.) and should
864 seek creative initiatives from all of these constituencies. Individual board
865 members, who are drawn from various constituencies, shall exercise their
866 responsibility on the behalf of the institution as a whole.

867 8.3.1.8 The board shall exercise its authority only as a group. An individual
868 member, unless authorized by the board, shall not commit the institution's
869 resources, nor bind it to any course of action, nor intrude upon the administration
870 of the institution.

871 8.3.1.9 The board shall have a conflict of interest policy. Ordinarily, members
872 should not be engaged in business relationships with the institution, nor should
873 they derive any material benefit from serving on the board. In the event that
874 conflicts of interest arise, a board member must recuse himself or herself from
875 any vote or participation in the board’s decision on that issue.

876 8.3.1.10 Governing boards should be structured to conduct their work
877 effectively. Board membership should be large enough to reflect the institution’s
878 significant constituencies but not so large as to be unwieldy in its decision
879 making. The frequency of board meetings should be determined by the number
880 and complexity of the issues the board is called upon to address. An executive
881 committee of the board may be given the authority to address issues between
882 meetings of the full board.

883 8.3.1.11 The board has the responsibility to hold itself accountable for the
884 overall performance of its duties, and shall evaluate the effectiveness of its own
885 procedures. It should also seek to educate itself about the issues it faces and about
886 procedures used by effective governing bodies in carrying out their work. The
887 board shall evaluate its members on a regular basis.

888 8.3.1.12 The board shall be responsible for evaluating overall institutional
889 governance by assessing and monitoring the effectiveness of institutional
890 governance procedures and structures.

891 **8.3.2 Administration**

892 8.3.2.1 Under the governing board’s clearly stated policies and requisite
893 authority, the chief administrative leadership is responsible for achieving the
894 school’s purpose by developing and implementing institutional policies and
895 administrative structures in collaboration with the governing board, faculty,
896 students, administrative staff, and other key constituencies.

897 8.3.2.2 Administrative leaders should implement the institution’s theological
898 convictions and shared values in the way they manage the school’s financial, and
899 physical; resources and personnel ~~human resources~~, consult and communicate
900 with constituencies, and ensure fairness in all evaluation and planning activities.

901 8.3.2.3 Administrative leaders and staff shall include, insofar as possible,
902 individuals reflecting the institution’s constituencies, taking into account the

903 desirability of diversity in race, ethnicity, and gender. They should be sufficient in
 904 number and ability to fulfill their responsibilities. They should have adequate
 905 resources and authority appropriate to their responsibilities.

906 8.3.2.4 The responsibilities and structures of accountability shall be clearly
 907 defined in appropriate documents.

908 **8.3.3 Faculty**

909 8.3.3.1 Within the overall structure of governance of the school, authority
 910 over certain functions shall be delegated to the faculty and structures devised by
 911 which this authority is exercised. Normally, the faculty should provide leadership
 912 in the development of academic policy, oversight of academic and curricular
 913 programs and decisions, establishment of admissions criteria, and
 914 recommendation of candidates for graduation. The faculty should participate in
 915 the processes concerning the appointment, retention, and promotion in rank of
 916 faculty members.

917 8.3.3.2 Beyond the matters specifically delegated to the faculty, the faculty
 918 should contribute to the overall decision making as determined by the institution's
 919 structure of governance. Such involvement is particularly important in the
 920 development of the institution's purpose statement and in institutional evaluation
 921 and planning.

922 **8.3.4 Students**

923 8.3.4.0 Where students take part in the formal structures of governance, their roles
 924 and responsibilities should be clearly delineated.

925 **9 Institutional Resources**

926 In order to achieve their purposes, institutions need not only adequate sufficient personnel
 927 human, but also adequate financial, physical, and institutional data resources. Because of their
 928 theological character, Commission schools give particular attention to personnel human
 929 resources and to the quality of the institutional environment in which they function. Good
 930 stewardship requires attention by each institution to the context, local and global, in which it
 931 deploys its resources and a commitment to develop appropriate patterns of cooperation with
 932 other institutions, which may at times lead to the formation of clusters.

933 | **9.1 Personnel ~~Human Resources~~**

934 | 9.1.1 The theological school should value and seek to enhance the quality of the human
 935 | lives it touches. The human fabric of the institution is enriched by including a wide range
 936 | of persons. The institution should devote adequate time and energy to the processes by
 937 | which persons are recruited, enabled to participate in the institution, nurtured in their
 938 | development, and prepared for their various tasks within the institution. ~~Human resources~~
 939 | ~~include students, faculty, administrators, support personnel, trustees, friends, church and~~
 940 | ~~public constituencies, volunteers, and external support and consultatives appropriate to~~
 941 | ~~the mission of the school.~~

942 | 9.1.2 Theological schools should support the quality of community through such means
 943 | as policies regarding procedural fairness, discrimination, and sexual harassment.

944 | 9.1.3 The theological school shall (a) engage the numbers and the qualities of personnel
 945 | ~~human resources~~ needed to implement the programs of the school in keeping with its
 946 | purpose; (b) develop appropriate personnel policies and procedures to be approved by the
 947 | board and implemented by the administration; (c) ensure that these policies are clear and
 948 | adequately published; include reference to job performance evaluation, termination,
 949 | sexual harassment or misconduct; and conform to applicable requirements mandated by
 950 | federal, state, or provincial jurisdictions; (d) provide for equitable patterns of
 951 | compensation; (e) provide clear written job descriptions for all employees ~~members of~~
 952 | ~~the staff~~; and (f) provide appropriate grievance procedures.

953 | **9.2 Financial resources**

954 | 9.2.0 Because quality education and sound financial policies are intimately related,
 955 | theological schools should be governed by the principles of good stewardship in the
 956 | planning, development, and use of their financial resources. The financial resources
 957 | should support the purpose of the school effectively and efficiently as well as enable it to
 958 | achieve its goals. The financial resources of the school should be adequate to support the
 959 | programs, personnel (faculty, staff, students), and physical plant/space both in the present
 960 | and for the long term. The financial resources should allow the school to anticipate and
 961 | respond to external changes in the economic, social, legal, and religious environment.

962 | **9.2.1 The financial condition of the school**

963 | 9.2.1.1 Theological schools should maintain the purchasing power of their
 964 | financial assets and the integrity and useful life of their physical facilities. While

965 year-to-year fluctuations are often unavoidable, schools should maintain
 966 economic equilibrium over three or more years, retain the ability to respond to
 967 financial emergencies and unforeseen circumstances, and show reasonable
 968 expectations of future financial viability and overall institutional improvement.

969 9.2.1.2 A theological school shall have stable and predictable sources of
 970 revenue such that the current and anticipated total revenues are sufficient to
 971 maintain the educational quality of the institution. Projected increases in revenue,
 972 including gift income, should be realistic. The use of endowment return to fund
 973 expenditures budgets should be prudent and in accordance with applicable law.*

974 9.2.1.3 A theological school should normally balance budgeted revenues and
 975 expenditures while employing a prudent endowment spending rate.^{† ‡} Deficits
 976 weaken the institution and therefore should prompt the administration and trustees
 977 to take corrective action. A theological school shall be able to demonstrate that it
 978 has operated without cumulative losses across the last three years. If deficits have
 979 been recorded or are projected, the school shall have a plan to eliminate present
 980 and future deficits that is realistic, understood, and approved by the governing
 981 board. When reducing expenditures, the theological school should be mindful of
 982 its purpose and attend to the quality and scope of the degree programs.

983 9.2.1.4 Endowments (including funds functioning as endowment) are
 984 frequently a major source of revenue for schools. A theological school (or the
 985 larger organization of which it is a part) should adopt a prudent endowment
 986 spending formula that contributes to the purpose of the institution while

* A common and customary understanding of a “prudent” use of endowment return is to budget as revenue 5 percent of a three-year average of the market value of endowment and board-designated quasi-endowment. Member schools should seek legal counsel regarding law applicable to the use of endowments.

† The term *endowment spending rate* refers to a common budgeting rule adopted by governing boards. Such a rule limits or controls the consumption of school’s endowment and return, which for purposes of these standards includes all of a school’s endowment and board-designated quasi-endowment.

‡ The term “endowment spending rate” refers to a common budgeting rule adopted by governing boards. Such a rule limits or controls the consumption of return from the school’s endowment (which for purposes of these standards includes all of a school’s long-term invested assets, whether endowment, quasi-endowment, or other funds). A common endowment spending goal among colleges and universities with long-term assets, primarily invested in equities, is to budget as revenue 5 percent of a three-year average of the market value of all long-term invested assets.

987 enhancing the stability of revenue for the school. A school shall demonstrate
988 evidence of adequate plans to protect the long-term purchasing power of the
989 endowment from erosion by inflation. The school (or university, diocese, order, or
990 other larger organization of which it is a part) shall have formally adopted
991 statements of investment policies and guidelines that set forth for trustees and
992 investment managers the conditions governing the granting or withholding of
993 investment discretion, investment goals of the institution, guidelines for long-term
994 asset allocation, a description of authorized and prohibited transactions, and
995 performance measurement criteria. Trustees should review these policies
996 regularly.

997 9.2.1.5 The financial condition of theological schools that are units of colleges
998 or universities is influenced by the financial condition of the related institutions.
999 These theological schools should enhance the well-being of the larger institution,
1000 while the larger institution should demonstrate appreciation for the special
1001 characteristics of theological schools. The larger institution should provide
1002 adequate financial resources to support the mission and programs of the
1003 theological school.

1004 **9.2.2 Accounting, audit, budget, and control**

1005 9.2.2.1 A theological school shall adopt internal accounting and reporting
1006 systems that are generally used in North American higher education. U.S. schools
1007 should follow the principles and procedures for institutional accounting published
1008 by the National Association of College and University Business Officers.
1009 Canadian schools should follow guidelines published by the Canadian
1010 Association of University Business Officers.

1011 9.2.2.2 The institution shall be audited by an external, independent auditor in
1012 accordance with the generally accepted auditing standards for colleges and
1013 universities (not-for-profit organizations) as published by (for U.S. schools) the
1014 American Institute of Certified Public Accountants or (for Canadian schools) the
1015 Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants. If an institution is not freestanding,
1016 the larger organization of which it is a part (such as a university or diocese) shall
1017 provide an audit of the consolidated entity. The governing board of a theological
1018 school shall have direct access to the independent auditor and receive the audit.

1019 9.2.2.3 The institution shall obtain from an auditor a management letter and
 1020 shall demonstrate that it has appropriately addressed any recommendations
 1021 contained in the management letter.

1022 9.2.2.4 A theological school shall ensure that revenues, expenditures, and
 1023 capital projects are budgeted and submitted for review and approval to the
 1024 governing board. Budgets should clearly reflect the directions established by the
 1025 long-range plans of the school. Budgets should be developed in consultation with
 1026 the administrators, staff, and faculty who bear responsibility for managing the
 1027 institution's programs and who approve the disbursements. A theological school
 1028 should maintain three-to-five-year financial projections of anticipated revenues,
 1029 expenditures, and capital projects

1030 9.2.2.5 A system of budgetary control and reporting shall be maintained,
 1031 providing regular and timely reports of revenues and expenditures to those
 1032 persons with oversight responsibilities.

1033 9.2.2.6 While a theological school may depend upon an external agency or
 1034 group (such as a denomination, diocese, order, foundation, association of
 1035 congregations, or other private agency) for financial support, the school's
 1036 governing board should retain appropriate autonomy in budget allocations and the
 1037 development of financial policies.

1038 **9.2.3 Business management**

1039 9.2.3.0 The institution's management responsibilities and organization of business affairs
 1040 should be clearly defined, with specific assignment of responsibilities appropriately set
 1041 forth. The financial management and organization as well as the system of reporting shall
 1042 ensure the integrity of financial records, create appropriate control mechanisms, and
 1043 provide the governing board, chief administrative leaders, and appropriate others with the
 1044 information and reports needed for sound decision making. Schools should ensure that
 1045 personnel responsible for fiscal and budgetary processes are qualified by education and
 1046 experience for their responsibilities.

1047 **9.2.4 Institutional development and advancement**

1048 9.2.4.1 An institutional advancement program is essential to developing
 1049 financial resources. The advancement program should be planned, organized, and
 1050 implemented in ways congruent with the principles of the school. It should

1051 include annual giving, capital giving, and planned giving, and should be
1052 conducted in patterns consistent with relationships and agreements with the
1053 school's supporting constituencies. Essential to the success of the institutional
1054 advancement program are the role played by the chief administrative leader in
1055 fundraising, the leadership and participation of the governing board, graduates'
1056 participation, and involvement of faculty, staff, and volunteers. Advancement
1057 efforts shall be evaluated on a regular basis.

1058 9.2.4.2 The intention of donors with regard to the use of their gifts shall be
1059 respected. The school should also recognize donors and volunteers appropriately.

1060 9.2.4.3 When auxiliary organizations, such as foundations, have been
1061 established using the name and/or reputation of the institution, the school
1062 ~~should~~shall be able to demonstrate that ~~those organizations support institutional~~
1063 ~~aspirations and are regularly audited by independent accountants.~~ the auxiliary
1064 organizations are regularly audited by an independent accountant, and that the
1065 governing relationship between the school and auxiliary organization is clearly
1066 articulated.

1067 **9.3 Physical resources**

1068 9.3.1 The physical resources include space and equipment as well as buildings and
1069 grounds. A theological school shall demonstrate that the physical resources it uses are
1070 adequate and appropriate for its purpose and programs, and that adequate funds for
1071 ~~maintenance and capital renewal are budgeted.~~ maintaining, sustaining, and renewing
1072 capital assets are included in budget planning.

1073 9.3.2 Institutions shall make appropriate efforts to ensure that physical resources are
1074 safe, accessible, and free of known hazards. Insofar as possible, facilities should be used
1075 in ways that respect the natural environment.

1076 9.3.3 Faculty and staff members should have space that is adequate for the pursuit of
1077 their individual work as well as for meeting with students. Physical resources should
1078 enhance community interaction among faculty, staff, and students, and should be
1079 sufficiently flexible to meet the potentially changing demands faced by the school.

1080 9.3.4 The school should determine the rationale for its policies and practices with
1081 regard to student housing, and this rationale should be expressed in a clearly worded

1082 statement. Arrangements for student housing should reflect good stewardship of the
1083 financial and educational resources of the institution.

1084 9.3.5 Facilities shall be maintained as appropriate so as to avoid problems of deferred
1085 maintenance. The institution should maintain a plan that provides a timetable for work
1086 and identifies needed financial resources.

1087 9.3.6 When physical resources other than those owned by the institution are used by the
1088 school, written agreements should clearly state the conditions governing their use and
1089 ensure usage over a sufficient period of time.

1090 **9.4 Institutional Data information technology resources**

1091 9.4.1 To the extent that a theological school uses technology to deliver its educational
1092 programs, the school shall maintain adequate personnel human, and financial, and
1093 technological resources to sustain its technology infrastructure.

1094 9.4.2~~0~~ For planning and evaluation, the school shall create and use various kinds of
1095 institutional data and information technology to determine the extent to which the
1096 institution is attaining its academic and institutional purposes and objectives. ~~The school~~
1097 ~~should provide for the financial costs of developing and maintaining this information.~~ To
1098 the extent possible, it should use the most effective current technologies for creating,
1099 storing, and transmitting this information within the institution, and it should share
1100 appropriate information thus generated among institutions and organizations. The kinds
1101 of information and the means by which that information is gathered, stored, retrieved, and
1102 analyzed should be appropriate to the size and complexity of the institution.

1103 **9.5 Institutional environment**

1104 9.5.1 The internal institutional environment makes it possible for the institution to
1105 maximize the various strengths of its ~~human,~~ personnel and financial, physical, and
1106 information resources in pursuing its stated goals. An institution's environment affects its
1107 resiliency and its ability to perform under duress. Accreditation evaluation will take into
1108 account the ways in which an institution uses its various resources in support of its
1109 institutional purpose.

1110 9.5.2 The quality of institutional environment is cultivated and enhanced by promoting
1111 effective patterns of leadership and management, by providing effective exchange of
1112 information, and by ensuring that mechanisms are in place to address conflict.

1113 **9.6 Cooperative use of resources**

1114 9.6.1 The theological school should secure access to the resources it needs to fulfill its
1115 purpose, administer and allocate these resources wisely and effectively, and be attentive
1116 to opportunities for cooperation and sharing of resources with other institutions. Such
1117 sharing involves both drawing upon the resources of other institutions and contributing
1118 resources to other institutions.

1119 9.6.2 Access to the required resources may be achieved either through ownership or
1120 through carefully formulated relationships with other schools or institutions. These
1121 relationships may include, for instance, cross-appointments of faculty, cross-registration
1122 of students, joint and dual degree programs, rental of facilities, and shared access to
1123 information required by administrators, faculty, and students in the pursuit of their tasks.
1124 Whatever their reason or scope, collaborative arrangements should be carefully designed
1125 with sufficient legal safeguards, adequate public disclosure, and provisions for review,
1126 and with a clear rationale for involvement in such arrangements.

1127 **9.7 Clusters**

1128 9.7.1 Clusters are formed when a number of schools find that they can best operate by
1129 sharing resources in a more integral and systematic way and by establishing structures to
1130 manage their cooperative relationships.

1131 9.7.2 The term *cluster* is meant to be descriptive rather than prescriptive. A variety of
1132 terms can denote these types of arrangements and a variety of approaches can make them
1133 work effectively. Schools should be creative and flexible as they seek to be good
1134 stewards of their resources. However devised, cluster arrangements should have clear
1135 structural components and effective patterns of operation.

1136 **9.7.3 Structural components**

1137 9.7.3.1 The core membership of a cluster comprises schools holding
1138 accredited membership within the Commission, but clusters may include
1139 candidate members of the Commission and associate members of ATS, as well as
1140 other schools and agencies with compatible purposes.

1141 9.7.3.2 Each cluster shall develop a clear definition of purpose and objectives
1142 that should be fully understood by the participating schools and their supporting
1143 constituencies and based on a realistic assessment that encompasses constituent

1144 needs, access of member institutions to one another, available resources, and
 1145 degree programs offered by the cluster directly or enabled by it.

1146 9.7.3.3 The structure of each cluster shall be appropriate to its purpose and
 1147 objectives, providing proper balance between the legitimate autonomy of its
 1148 member institutions and their mutual accountability in terms of their common
 1149 purposes. An effective cluster arrangement frees students, faculty, and institutions
 1150 to operate more effectively and creatively. The cluster shall have a clearly defined
 1151 governance structure that has authority commensurate with responsibility. The
 1152 governance should enable the cluster to set policies, secure financial support,
 1153 select administrative officers, and provide other personnel functions.

1154 9.7.3.4 The cluster shall be able to demonstrate financial support from various
 1155 sources sufficient for the continuity of its functions and for the security of the
 1156 faculty and staff it appoints, and should engage in appropriate financial planning.

1157 9.7.3.5 These structures and resources shall be regularly evaluated and
 1158 appropriately adjusted.

1159 **9.7.4 Effectiveness**

1160 9.7.4.1 Evidence of effective operation may include reciprocal flow of
 1161 students, faculty, and information among the member institutions of a cluster,
 1162 coordinated schedules and calendars, cross-registration, and common policies in
 1163 areas such as tuition and student services. Requirements, especially in academic
 1164 and graduate programs, are determined in such a way as to invite the sharing of
 1165 resources. Duplication is avoided wherever possible.

1166 9.7.4.2 If a school meets the accreditation standards of the Commission only
 1167 by virtue of affiliation with a cluster, this fact shall be formally specified in its
 1168 grant of accreditation by the board.

1169 **9.8 Instructional technology resources**

1170 Institutions using instructional technology to enhance face-to-face courses and/or provide online-
 1171 only courses shall be intentional in addressing matters of coherence between educational values
 1172 and choice of media, recognizing that the learning goals of graduate education should guide the
 1173 choice of digital resources, that teaching and learning maintains its focus on the formation and
 1174 knowledge of religious leaders, and that the school is utilizing its resources in ways that most

1175 effectively accomplish its purpose. They should also establish policies regarding the appropriate
1176 training for and use of these resources.

1177 9.8.1 Students should be adequately informed regarding the necessary skills and
1178 mastery of technology to participate fully in the programs to which they are admitted.
1179 Institutions are encouraged to provide opportunities for students to gain these skills as
1180 part of their program of study.

1181 9.8.2 Sufficient technical support services should ensure that faculty are freed to focus
1182 upon their central tasks of teaching and facilitating learning. Support services should
1183 create systems for faculty development and assistance to ensure consistent, effective, and
1184 timely support.

1185 9.8.2.1 Timely technological support services should include (1) staff with a
1186 sufficiently high level of technical skills to ensure student facility in handling
1187 software and the technological aspects of course offerings and (2) the systemic
1188 evaluation and upgrading of technological resources and services consistent with
1189 the learning goals of theological scholarship.

1190 9.8.2.2 A technological and support services program should include
1191 technological training and should ensure adequate support services personnel for
1192 faculty and students.

1193 9.8.3 Institutions shall develop and implement ongoing evaluation procedures for the
1194 use of instructional technology that involve appropriate groups of people in the
1195 evaluation process.

Report of the Commission Treasurer

This treasurer's report presents the audited financial statements for fiscal 2008 and fiscal 2009 and the current financial results of fiscal 2010. It also presents the budget for fiscal 2011.

Fiscal year ended June 30, 2008

The audited financial statements for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2008, were reviewed by the Commission's Audit Committee and the Board of Commissioners. The Commission's Audit Committee is comprised of the COA treasurer, ATS treasurer, and three chief financial officers from member schools. The audited financial statements, which included an unqualified opinion by the firm of Maher Duessel, are available at www.ats.edu/Private/Documents/COA-FS2009.pdf. Hard copies of the audit will also be available for review at the Biennial Meeting.

The statements show an Unrestricted Net Asset balance of \$545,464. This balance is the result of a \$250,000 initial contribution from ATS and operating surplus from several fiscal years. In addition, Temporarily Restricted Net Assets of \$169,861 were held from an original \$797,000 grant project to provide for a technical conversion of the institutional database.

Expenditures for the fiscal year 2008 totaled \$1,440,078, with ongoing operations totaling \$955,950 and grant expenditures totaling \$484,128. Revenues and releases from grant restriction amounted to \$1,205,367. As a result, the Association recorded a net operating surplus of \$77,476. This surplus was projected by the Commission and was used to build reserves in anticipation of the fourth accrediting staff position.

Fiscal year ended June 30, 2009

The audited financial statements for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2009, were reviewed by the Commission's Audit Committee and the Board of Commissioners. The Commission's Audit Committee is comprised of the COA treasurer, ATS treasurer, and three chief financial officers from member schools. The audited financial statements, which included an unqualified opinion by the firm of Maher Duessel, are available at www.ats.edu/Private/Documents/COA-FS2009.pdf. Hard copies of the audit will also be available for review at the Biennial Meeting.

[Private/Documents/COA-FS2009.pdf](http://www.ats.edu/Private/Documents/COA-FS2009.pdf). Hard copies of the audit will also be available for review at the Biennial Meeting.

The statements show an Unrestricted Net Asset balance of \$515,968. In addition, Temporarily Restricted Net Assets of \$48,838 were held from a grant project to provide for a technical conversion of the institutional database.

Operating expenditures for the fiscal year 2009 totaled \$1,234,863. Operating revenues amounted to \$1,205,367. As a result, the Association recorded a net operating deficit of \$29,496. This deficit was anticipated by the Commission and was covered by net assets.

Current fiscal year 2010

The budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2010, was approved by the Board of Commissioners. No adjustments to the budget have been made during the year.

Financial data for the Commission for the ten months ended April 30, 2010, and a projection for the remainder of fiscal year 2010 is shown in relation to the budget on page 85. The Commission has a projected operating surplus of slightly more than \$163,000, which is the result of one-and-a-half positions being vacant. The budget for fiscal 2010 had anticipated a breakeven budget.

Budget for fiscal year 2011

The budget for the Commission for fiscal 2011 will be reviewed and approved at the June 2010 meeting of the Board of Commissioners. The balanced budget includes projected revenues and expenditures for the fiscal year at slightly more than \$1 million. The budget reflects a change in the tiers within the dues structure by inflation that was approved at the 2006 Biennial Meeting. This change in the tiers resulted in an average increase of less than \$125 to individual schools and resulted in total additional dues of about \$20,000, with 75 percent, or \$15,000, designated for the Commission.

David Draper
Commission Treasurer

The Commission on Accrediting

STATEMENT OF ACTIVITIES—BUDGET vs. PROJECTED ACTUAL—OPERATIONS

	Jul-Apr	May-Jun	FY2010	Total	Good(Bad)
	<u><i>Actual</i></u>	<u><i>Projected</i></u>	<u><i>Projected</i></u>	<u><i>Budget</i></u>	<u><i>Variance</i></u>
Revenues:					
Dues	889,782	-	889,782	885,000	4,782
Accrediting fees	42,645	42,000	84,645	67,000	17,645 a
Reimbursed travel	49,876	35,000	84,876	82,000	2,876 a
Conference fees	-	-	-	20,000	(20,000) b
Investment income, net	7,573	3,000	10,573	20,000	(9,427) c
<i>Total revenues</i>	<u>989,876</u>	<u>80,000</u>	<u>1,069,876</u>	<u>1,074,000</u>	<u>(4,124)</u>
Expenditures:					
Personnel	452,175	101,000	553,175	711,000	157,825 d
Publications	732	1,000	1,732	10,000	8,268
Travel	12,444	2,000	14,444	15,000	556
Reimbursed travel	85,538	5,000	90,538	82,000	(8,538) a
Workshops	12,348	-	12,348	35,000	22,652 b
Committee	17,181	17,000	34,181	35,000	819
Consultants	15,000	1,000	16,000	3,000	(13,000) e
Administration	22,373	10,000	32,373	35,000	2,627
Administration - legal	13,808	2,000	15,808	12,000	(3,808)
Indirect	113,330	22,670	136,000	136,000	- f
<i>Total operations</i>	<u>744,929</u>	<u>213,670</u>	<u>906,599</u>	<u>1,074,000</u>	<u>167,401</u>
Surplus(deficit) before use of net assets	244,947		163,277 c	-	<u>163,277 g</u>
<i>Net assets, beg.</i>	<u>515,968</u>		<u>515,968</u>		
<i>Net assets, end</i>	<u>760,915</u>		<u>679,245</u>		

- a** - Additional fees for one school extension site visits along with additional direct travel for international visits.
- b** - Budgeted fees and cost for Assessment workshop, but all expenses will be covered by expiring ATS grant.
- c** - Earnings on investments have been limited because of their short-term nature and bond market.
- d** - One professional staff position open. One support staff position not filled but covered by other staff members.
- e** - Use of adjunct staff to cover some accrediting visits with professional staff position open.
- f** - Total indirect charge is \$188,000 but it was "capped" at \$136,000 as per agreement to ensure that COA would not have operational deficit in FY10. Full charge will not be requested at end of FY10.
- g** - Projected surplus mostly due to **d**.

**The Association of Theological Schools
The Commission on Accrediting**

BUDGET 2010–2011

	Total <u>ATS</u>	Total <u>COA</u>	Combined <u>Operations</u>
Income:			
Member dues	300,000	900,000	1,200,000
Sales and subscriptions	32,000	-	32,000
Tuition and fees	327,000	20,000	347,000
Foundation support	2,707,300	-	2,707,300
Investment income	100,000	10,000	110,000
Accrediting fees	-	97,000	97,000
Reimbursed travel	-	110,000	110,000
Program Support Fund transfers	326,000	-	326,000
<i>Total income</i>	<u>3,792,300</u>	<u>1,137,000</u>	<u>4,929,300</u>
Direct expenses:			
Staff	1,765,000	708,000	2,473,000
Workshops	677,000	35,000	712,000
Awards	790,000	-	790,000
Consultants	206,000	3,000	209,000
Committee	28,500	35,000	63,500
Administration	168,000	47,000	215,000
Travel	33,000	15,000	48,000
Publications	15,000	5,000	20,000
Reimbursed travel	-	110,000	110,000
<i>Total direct expenses</i>	<u>3,682,500</u>	<u>958,000</u>	<u>4,640,500</u>
Indirect expenses:			
<i>Total indirect expenses</i>	<u>246,000</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>246,000</u>
<i>Total expenses</i>	<u>3,928,500</u>	<u>958,000</u>	<u>4,886,500</u>
<i>Excess(deficit) of revenues before support service charges</i>	(136,200)	179,000	42,800
Charges to COA from ATS			
<i>through Support Service Agreement</i>	179,000	(179,000)	-
<i>Excess for contingency</i>	<u>42,800</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>42,800</u>

Report of the Commission on Accrediting Nominating Committee

The Commission Nominating Committee for the 2010–2012 biennium conducted its work by conference call and email communication, following the guidelines that have been used by the Association since 2001 and are included in this report. Using the guidelines’ “Criteria for the Constituency of Committees,” the committee sought to present a slate of nominees that, as a group, meets the following criteria:

Committees, as groups, should reflect and be inclusive of the Commission constituency. Insofar as possible, the committees should reflect (1) the three broad theological communities (mainline Protestant, Roman Catholic/Orthodox, and evangelical Protestant) with which the member schools are identified; (2) the binational character of the Commission (United States and Canada); (3) the presence of men and women; (4) the presence of racial/ethnic persons, and (5) persons who are fundamentally respectful of the range of theological traditions and commitments represented in the member schools. In addition, the Nominating Committee should consider the value to the ongoing work of committees by both continuing members and new members.

The committee began its work by reviewing the names of individuals that had been forwarded to the committee in response to an email sent to all presidents and academic deans in October 2009. The email request included a form to be used in making recommendations. Responses were received from representatives of approximately twenty member schools. ATS staff also made recommendations (clearly indicated as coming from the staff) of persons who have served as leaders and facilitators of ATS educational events, served on accreditation committees, and/or contributed in significant ways to recent ATS activities.

The Nominating Committee recommends that the election process at the Biennial Meeting adhere to the 2001 procedure, as follows:

Nomination and election process at the Biennial Meeting

The Nominating Committee brings to the Commission membership at the Biennial Meeting a full slate of nominees for the Board of Commissioners, the Appeals Panel, and the Audit Committee, with the slate including the names of continuing committee members. The slate and the procedures for nominations from the floor are distributed in advance of the Biennial Meeting through publication in the *Program & Reports* book, or by some other means. The slate is presented in the first business session and voted upon in the second business session. In the event of nominations from the floor by a voting member in the first business session, and given the bylaw limitations on the number of persons who can be elected to each committee, the following procedure will be followed:

Business Session I

The chair of the Nominating Committee makes the report on behalf of the committee in Business Session I and places the full slate in nomination before the membership. Nominations may be made from the floor by any voting member during this business session, provided that persons being nominated have agreed in advance to serve, if elected. Nominations from the floor also require the endorsement of five voting members, which is equal to the number of institutions represented on the Nominating Committee.

Business Session II

The election takes place in Business Session II. If there were no nominations from the floor in Business Session I, the slate is voted upon as presented. In the event of nominations from the floor in Business Session I, printed ballots will be distributed to voting members for the committee(s) that received nominations from the floor. The ballots will list the names of all nominees for the committee(s), both those brought by the Nominating Committee and those nominated from the floor. Voting members will be instructed to vote for no more than the number of individuals originally nominated for the committee(s). Thus, action is taken on all nominations in Business Session II.

Business Session III

Any ballots cast in Business Session II will be tabulated by the Committee on Reference and Counsel and reported to the membership in a third Business Session.

The slate of Commission nominees for 2010–2012 follows this report.

Members of the 2010 Nominating Committee were David Esterline, Chair (McCormick Theological Seminary), Richard Benson (St. John's Seminary [CA]), Marsha Foster-Boyd (Ecumenical Theological Seminary), Dennis Hollinger (Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary), and Barbara Mutch (Carey Theological College).

Commission on Accrediting Slate of Nominees

Board of Commissioners**Nominated for Class of 2016**

Alton Pollard, Dean, Howard University School of Divinity, Washington, DC

John Martin, President, Roberts Wesleyan College and Northeastern Seminary, Rochester, NY

Phillip Zylla, Academic Dean, McMaster Divinity College, Hamilton, ON

William Cahoy, Dean, St John's University School of Theology–Seminary, Collegeville, MN

Nominated Public Members for Class of 2012

James Wind, President, Alban Institute, Herndon, VA

Ron Mercier, Rector, Bellarmine Jesuit Community, Saint Louis University, St. Louis, MO

Nancy Washington, Professor Emerita, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA

Continuing Commissioners**Class of 2012**

Mary Ann Donovan, Faculty, Jesuit School of Theology of Santa Clara University, Berkeley, CA

David Esterline, Dean of Faculty and Vice President for Academic Affairs, McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, IL

Melody Mazuk, Library Director, Palmer Theological Seminary of Eastern University, Wyncroft, PA

Barbara H. Mutch, Academic Vice President, Carey Theological College, Vancouver, BC

Class of 2014

David Hogue, Director of Institutional Assessment, Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary, Evanston, IL

Alice Hunt, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, Vanderbilt University Divinity School, Nashville, TN

Mark Latcovich, Academic Dean, Vice President/Vice Rector, Saint Mary Seminary and Graduate School of Theology, Wickliffe, OH

Robin Steinke, Dean of the Seminary, Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, Gettysburg, PA

Tite Tienou, Academic Dean, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

Audit Committee**Nominees**

Patrick Cunningham, Vice President for Finance and Administration, Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, PA

Elizabeth Littlejohn, Vice President of Financial and Administrative Services, Interdenominational Theological Center, Atlanta, GA

Kurt Gabbard, Vice President for Business Affairs, Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Austin, TX†

Association Treasurer (to be determined)

Commission Treasurer (to be determined)

Appeals Panel**Nominees**

Leland Eliason, Retired, Bethel Seminary of Bethel University

Wendy Fletcher, Principal, Vancouver School of Theology, Vancouver, BC

Hillary Gaston, Chief Operations Officer, Fellowship of Reconciliation, Nyack, NY

Mark Ramseth, President, Trinity Lutheran Seminary, Columbus, OH

Edward Wheeler, President, Christian Theological Seminary, Indianapolis, IN

† Continuing member

Report of the Association Board of Directors

During the 2008–2010 biennium, the ATS Board of Directors advanced the work of the Association in accord with its mission statement, core values, and vision. The board met four times during this period to direct the affairs of the Association as outlined in the bylaws. Over the course of those meetings, the board supervised the Association's planning and implementation of its programs, reviewed assessments of the effectiveness of the programs, authorized grant proposals for new work, monitored all fiscal and property matters, and oversaw preparations for the Biennial Meeting. A major project of the board during this period was drafting four new policy guidelines that will be reviewed and voted on by the membership at the Biennial Meeting. Some of the highlights of the Association's work in various areas are as follows.

Leadership Education

Professional development for presidents, deans, development officers, chief financial officers, and student personnel officers continued to provide an orientation for those new to those roles and skill development for seasoned leaders. Programming for women leaders in theological education culminated in the presentation of new research on women presidents and deans. Programming for racial ethnic leaders now includes efforts to build capacity of schools to better nurture learning environments for future clergy and other leaders who will serve in diverse racial and cultural contexts. In all educational programming, there is an increased use of technology-assisted delivery formats such as Webinars.

With the completion of the grant-funded work on the role of faculty in governance, attention has been given to hosting new faculty events and consultations on other topics. ATS sponsors an annual presentation at AAR or SBL, in alternating years, of a senior scholar to articulate the role of the scholar teaching in theological schools and to stimulate discussion. An annual conference for newly tenured faculty was inaugurated this biennium, paralleling the conference ATS already hosts for new faculty. The two programs ATS sponsors to fund faculty research continued with grant renewals of funding from Lilly Endowment and the Henry Luce Foundation.

Issues and Initiatives

Two new projects were launched during the biennium.

Institutional Viability and Financially Stressed Schools, funded by Lilly Endowment, responds to the economic crisis that has negatively affected most schools. The project gathered data regarding the financial impact on schools and their projected responses to it, and it reported findings to better inform the schools of the overall situation and trends. Now underway, the second phase of the project involves work with peer groups from a sample of the schools to assist in developing and implementing plans for achieving financial equilibrium. Findings from these schools will be shared with all schools in hope that what has been learned will be broadly beneficial. Work began in spring 2009.

Christian Hospitality and Pastoral Practices in a Multifaith Society, funded by the Henry Luce Foundation, aims to build educational strategies appropriate to the three broad ecclesial families to which ATS schools are related (evangelical Protestant, mainline Protestant, and Roman Catholic/Orthodox) that will increase their competency in Christian pastoral ministry in an increasingly religiously plural context. Work began in spring 2010.

Communications and Data

The format for *Colloquy* was updated to a magazine, and online communication strategies were implemented to inform ATS schools regarding time-sensitive news. The Association journal, *Theological Education*, continues to publish scholarly work completed in conjunction with special ATS projects but is also attracting increasing numbers of unsolicited articles.

In addition, the project that has completely redeveloped the Association's database was completed during this biennium. The new database offers many improvements over the previous database, including efficiency in publishing the *Annual Data Tables* and speedier production of reports to the schools as well as greater ease in querying in response to specific data requests from the schools

and the media. There was also an increased use of Web-based resources for ATS administration, including many committee meetings.

Following research conducted by the Auburn Center on the Study of Theological Education on graduates of ATS schools, the Association developed and implemented the Alumni/Alumnae Questionnaire (AQ) for regular use by member schools, along with the Entering Student Questionnaire (ESQ), the Graduating Student Questionnaire (GSQ), and Profiles in Ministry (POM).

Association Support

In addition to its regular activities to oversee the Association's resources and facilities, the board gave special attention this biennium to the impact of member schools' changing financial realities on ATS revenue and expenditures. The board also monitored the Association's Program Support Fund through a turbulent time in the equity markets.

Recommendations

1. The Board of Directors recommends to the ATS membership that Baptist Seminary of Kentucky in Lexington, Kentucky, having met the necessary criteria, be admitted as an Associate Member.
2. The Board of Directors recommends to the ATS membership that China Evangelical Seminary North America in West Covina, California, having met the necessary criteria, be admitted as an Associate Member.
3. The Board of Directors recommends to the ATS membership that Lubbock Christian University Graduate Studies Program in Biblical Studies in Lubbock, Texas, having met the necessary criteria, be admitted as an Associate Member.
4. The Board of Directors recommends to the ATS membership that Moody Bible Institute, Moody Theological Seminary and Graduate School in Chicago, Illinois, having met the necessary criteria, be admitted as an Associate Member.
5. The Board of Directors recommends to the ATS membership that Northwest Nazarene University School of Theology and Christian Ministries in Nampa, Idaho, having met the necessary criteria, be admitted as an Associate Member.
6. The Board of Directors recommends to the ATS membership that Puritan Reformed Theological Seminary in Grand Rapids, Michigan, having met the necessary criteria, be admitted as an Associate Member.
7. The Board of Directors recommends to the ATS membership that Redeemer Theological Seminary in Dallas, Texas, having met the necessary criteria, be admitted as an Associate Member.
8. The Board of Directors recommends to the ATS membership that Shepherd University School of Theology in Los Angeles, California, having met the necessary criteria, be admitted as an Associate Member.

Grants

During the 2008–2010 biennium, the Association received grants from Lilly Endowment for continuing its theological school faculty research grant program (\$1,993,950), for continuing its support for leadership in theological education (\$4,033,000), and for launching a new project to enhance financial viability in a time of financial stress for the schools (\$850,000). The Association received grants from the Luce Foundation to continue the faculty research grants program (totaling \$620,000) and for launching a program for building multifaith competency as part of the educational curriculum for future church leaders (\$390,000).

The Fund for Theological Education

ATS is the sole corporate member of The Fund for Theological Education (FTE), and on behalf of the Association, the board of directors received routine program and financial reports from FTE, appointed its trustees, reviewed its audit, and received the election of its officers. A report of the Fund is included in this book.

THE ASSOCIATION

9. The Board of Directors recommends to the ATS membership that St. Mark's College in Vancouver, British Columbia, having met the necessary criteria, be admitted as an Associate Member.
10. The Board of Directors recommends to the ATS membership that Saint Paul University Faculty of Theology in Ottawa, Ontario, having met the necessary criteria, be admitted as an Associate Member.
11. The Board of Directors recommends to the ATS membership that Theological College of the Canadian Reformed Churches in Hamilton, Ontario, having met the necessary criteria, be admitted as an Associate Member.
12. The Board of Directors recommends to the ATS membership that the Association for Doctor of Ministry Education (ADME) in Austin, Texas, be granted Affiliate Status.
13. The Board of Directors recommends to the ATS membership that Unification Theological Seminary in Barrytown, New York, be granted Affiliate Status.
14. The Board of Directors recommends the actions reflected on page 91 with respect to the existing Policy Statements of the Association.
15. The Board of Directors recommends adoption of the proposed policy guidelines on "Striving for Culturally Competent School Communities," which begins on page 91.
16. The Board of Directors recommends adoption of the proposed policy guidelines on "Faculty Reductions During Financial Crisis," which begins on page 94.
17. The Board of Directors recommends adoption of the proposed policy guidelines on "Faculty Resignations, Leaves, and Retirements," which begins on page 96.
18. The Board of Directors recommends adoption of the proposed policy guidelines on "Student Financial Aid," which begins on page 98.

Officers and directors during this biennium

John Kinney, President	Samuel DeWitt Proctor School of Theology of Virginia Union University
Richard Mouw, Vice President	Fuller Theological Seminary
Laura Mendenhall, Secretary	The Texas Presbyterian Foundation
Mary McNamara, Treasurer	United Theological Seminary of the Twin Cities
Donald Senior, Past President	Catholic Theological Union
Michael Battle	Formerly of Interdenominational Theological Center
Dorcas Gordon	Knox College
James Holsinger, Jr.	Public Member
James Hudnut-Beumler	Vanderbilt University Divinity School
Myron McCoy	Saint Paul School of Theology
Elaine Park	Mount Angel Seminary
John Phelan, Jr.	North Park Theological Seminary
Mark Ramseth	Commission Representative
Dorothy Ridings	Public Member
Cheryl Sanders	Howard University School of Divinity
Patricia Schoelles	St. Bernard's School of Theology and Ministry
Brian Stiller	Tyndale University College & Seminary
Richard Stover	Public Member
Junias Venugopal	Columbia International University-Seminary & School of Missions
Edward Wheeler	Christian Theological Seminary
Craig Williford	Trinity Evangelical Divinity School

Approved New Policy Guidelines

Striving for Culturally Competent School Communities

Rationale and goals

The value of a culturally competent community lies in the benefits that accrue from experiencing a broad range of individuals with a broad range of perspectives and gifts. In the past four decades, higher education has made significant strides in its thinking and implementing of policies supporting just and diverse academic communities. At the same time, shifting demographics in the United States promise to tip the scales of racial balance in the coming decades. Continued vigilance is therefore required to ensure that institutional policies provide opportunities for diverse populations, build capacity in schools to serve those populations, enhance the educational experience for all constituents, and equip graduates to embrace a commitment to diversity and inclusion—in all their forms—as they minister in their congregations and communities.

This policy views cultural competency as a strength in theological education and encourages ATS schools to live toward a vision of including and valuing the full spectrum of God's people—with their multiplicity of characteristics—in theological education and ministry. It seeks to honor the ATS commitment to respecting diversity as a core value within the schools while at the same time respecting their different expressions of faith and varying understandings of theology, polity, religious leadership, and social commitments. The guidelines provided may be adapted to the particular situation of each school.

Definitions

Cultural competency is proficiency in responding effectively and respectfully to a diverse cultural context. It is the process by which individuals and institutions become aware of and think theologically about assumptions, biases, and knowledge about themselves and others.

Culturally competent communities are communities that foster mutual respect and care for others and in which all individuals are recognized as persons loved by God. In a culturally competent

community, members know how to relate to those qualities and conditions that are different from their own, how to manage the dynamics of difference, and how to benefit from the diversity around them.

Discrimination is any activity that creates and sustains privileges for some while creating and sustaining disadvantages for others.

Capacity building is any activity that enhances an organization's effectiveness (i.e., its resources, competencies, and ability) in fulfilling its mission and sustaining itself within the cultural context in which it operates.

Guiding principles

1. Culturally competent communities create environments in which individuals enjoy mutual respect, cooperation, and caring.
2. Theological schools should hold themselves accountable to ensuring that they contribute in a positive way to a diverse and multicultural society.
3. Diversity has many dimensions and manifests itself in the uniquenesses of individuals, communities, and their identities.
4. Initiatives toward building a culturally competent community should take a comprehensive and institution-wide approach with the full support of institutional leadership.
5. Opportunities for interaction among all members of the school community will promote discovery of common ground in shared ideals, values, and principles.
6. A culturally competent community promotes freedom of independent thinking and civil discourse and creates a dynamic learning environment.
7. Students and the communities they will serve benefit from teaching, learning, and research born out of a culturally competent environment.
8. Personal, cultural, and institutionalized discrimination creates and sustains privileges for some while creating and sustaining disadvantages for others.

9. Building capacity in the area of cultural competency enhances a school's ability to serve its mission, including education of graduates to function effectively in increasingly diverse societies.
10. A culturally competent theological school will regularly assess its mission and work to determine any areas in need of appropriate response.

Recommended practice

With these goals and principles in mind, theological schools should conduct ongoing assessments of their institutional climates and practices with respect to issues of cultural competency.

Mission and resources

1. A theological school's mission and resources should be reviewed regularly to assess readiness and capacity for improvement in achieving cultural competency.
2. A theological school should develop a policy reflecting its aspirations and realistic goals for creating a culturally competent community.
3. A theological school should acquire, allocate and provide access to resources such as library, information technology, and student services, that reflect its commitment to cultural competency.
4. A theological school should develop steps to ensure that accountability structures are in place that will both lead to enhanced practices of inclusion and assist the school to identify and address ongoing areas of exclusion.

Campus climate

5. A theological school should endeavor to create a hospitable and welcoming culture.
6. A theological school should promote activities that foster interaction and discovery among all campus constituents.
7. A theological school should establish a procedure and a forum for discussion of any challenges or conflicts or any new initiatives related to cultural competency.

Representation

8. A theological school should strive to ensure that its communications and admissions processes, including recruitment and financial aid policies, maximize access to a full range of prospective students of varied identity and background, as appropriate to the school's particular expression of faith and understanding of theology, polity, religious leadership, and social commitments.
9. A theological school should strive to recruit, to hire, and to retain, through tenure and promotion activities, a qualified faculty and staff whose composition reflects and serves the particular identity and background of its student body.

Curriculum, scholarship, and outcomes

10. A theological school should make resources available to faculty, students, staff and administration for the purpose of enhancing educational effectiveness in the service of diversity.
11. A theological school, through its faculty, should develop pedagogies and curricula that make learning more effective for the diversity of the student body.
12. Curricular offerings should cultivate the capacity of leaders to respond to diverse populations in ministry, teaching, and congregational settings.
13. Evaluation of scholarship should consider the influence of societal diversity on scholarly inquiry.

Relationships with church bodies

14. A theological school should work cooperatively with church bodies to diagnose and correct conditions that inhibit the achievement of culturally competent congregations.

Financial commitment

15. A theological school should endeavor to reflect the above commitments in its budget allocations.

Faculty Reductions During Financial Crisis

Rationale and goals

1. Proactively leading institutions in making difficult yet necessary changes to the finances of theological schools may prevent them from reaching severe financial crises. When extreme financial crisis warrants, the following principles and practices may help guide an institution in making those difficult decisions to balance the survival of the school with the protection of its employees.
2. Financial exigency is declared when an institution needs to take extraordinary action to reduce expenditures and preserve resources.¹
3. This policy guideline is in full harmony and compliance with the mission and standards of the Association.

Guiding principles

1. Fundamental to the determination of the need for reductions of tenured faculty or contracted staff is a careful and credible statement of the nature and dimension of the financial exigency of the school. Appropriate constituencies of the school should be involved in understanding the facts if a declaration of financial exigency is to be deemed credible. Adopting a collaborative approach to this challenge may increase community-wide trust and support.
2. It should be understood that eliminating contracts of employment may be necessary for the long-term survival of the institution.
3. Institutions should focus on the viability, health, and integrity of the whole enterprise of education for ministry while balancing institutional survival with fair treatment of faculty and contracted staff members.
4. A flexible, equitable, and nondiscriminatory process that is consistent with the overall mission and values of the school should be adopted for making decisions about reductions of faculty or contracted staff members.
5. Appropriate amounts of time and resources should be spent on strengthening current rev-

enue streams while developing new, sustainable revenue sources.

6. Mergers or redefining the institutional mission may be additional considerations.

Recommended practice

1. Schools should seek human resource experts and legal counsel knowledgeable in the applicable law of the state(s) or province(s) where the school operates before incorporating these guidelines into policies.
2. A panel of outside and disinterested qualified persons could be invited to confirm the reality of the financial exigency and assist in designing documents that best communicate the financial realities. It is understood that costs may prohibit this approach; however, local experts may be willing to donate their time and expertise if requested.
3. Schools should develop and implement appropriate personnel policies and procedures in accordance with General Institutional Standard 9.1.3.
4. At the earliest possible time, full and detailed information regarding the nature and extent of the financial exigency should be made available to all persons and groups potentially affected by the crisis. Compassionate transparency without violating confidentiality may prove useful.
5. Regular disclosure of appropriate information about the finances and financial health of an institution to its constituencies is the first step toward creating a climate of understanding when a school's finances may necessitate staffing reductions.
6. The processes used in reduction of tenured faculty or contracted staff and the announcement of those reductions with termination of contract or employment should be carried on in a compassionate spirit that results in the least damage of the sense of worth of those whose employment is terminated and provides as much transitional financial support as is prudent.

1. In addition to the suggested guidelines from ATS, schools will find helpful a statement from the Association of American Colleges titled "Statement on Financial Exigency and Staff Reduction" and a statement from the American Association of University Professors titled "On Institutional Problems Resulting From Financial Exigency: Some Operating Guidelines."

THE ASSOCIATION

7. All legitimate and practical means of dealing with the financial crisis should be exercised before terminating contracts. This includes a careful analysis of increased endowment spending to eliminate deficits.
8. Any reduction in faculty employment should be done with a clear eye toward such reduction's impact on the quality and scope of education offered to students. Educational needs of the institution must be balanced against other values such as seniority in times of genuine financial exigency.
9. Alternate forms and places of service for those who suffer from reduction in numbers, either within the institution or elsewhere, should be explored.
10. Institutions may consider not increasing salaries or taking across-the-board reductions in salaries as a means toward meeting the exigency.
11. Institutions may offer incentives for early retirement for eligible faculty as a means toward achieving ongoing payroll reduction.
12. Members of a faculty and administrative staff may wish to modify their compensation from the school in order to continue their life and work together.
13. Those with adequate financial means may wish to offer contributed service for part or all of their employment costs for a specified period in order to prevent termination of employment of themselves or of colleagues.
14. The board and administration may consider asking current full-time faculty to serve on a part-time basis until the financial conditions improve.
15. The board, administration, and faculty may consider eliminating or temporarily suspending certain employee benefits (e.g., employer contributions to retirement or sabbaticals).

Faculty Resignations, Leaves, and Retirements

Rationale and goals

Faculty members are among the greatest resources of theological schools. Appropriate employment treatment of them is crucial for the financial and academic well-being of the schools. Both faculty members and the institutions that employ them need to follow guidelines for institutional procedures that protect the interests of both and contribute to the fruitful fulfilling of institutional mission and individual vocation.

Resignations

Guiding principles

1. Faculty considering resignation should provide sufficient notice so that the academic program of the school does not suffer unduly.
2. As appropriate, faculty considering resignation should conduct discussions sufficiently in the open that the school from which the resignation is contemplated has an opportunity to enter into the conversations.

Recommended practice

3. Tenured faculty members considering resignation should provide notice of a minimum of six months; for an untenured faculty member, the minimum notice should be three months.
4. A school may engage a faculty member at another school in conversation at any time regarding possible employment.

Sabbatical leaves

Guiding principles

1. A school is responsible for making provision of time and support for the continued intellectual and spiritual growth of faculty members.
2. A member of the faculty is responsible for taking and using the sabbatical as an opportunity for intellectual and spiritual growth to the benefit of the school and the church.

Recommended practice

3. A sabbatical leave should be provided for each member of the faculty on indefinite tenure after an agreed upon period of full-time service, provided plans are made to make use of the leave in line with the conditions suggested below.

4. The minimum length of such leave with full salary should be six months, but where a longer leave seems desirable, salary adjustments should be arrived at through appropriate discussion.
5. Sabbatical leave should be conceived of by the faculty member and the administration as a time for deeper study, research, or writing. Where possible, location in another center of learning will add breadth to the faculty member's point of view.
6. Normally the faculty member will agree to return to the school that has granted the sabbatical leave and to remain at the school for a minimum of one year after the leave.

Retirement

Guiding principles

1. The retirement policy and plan should be attractive to individuals engaged in educational work, increase the morale of the faculty, permit faculty members with singleness of purpose to devote their energies to serving their institution, and make it possible for them to enter retirement with a sense of security.
2. The occasion of retirement can offer the opportunity for institutional self-reflection about future needs.

Recommended practice

3. The retirement policy and plan of an institution should be clearly defined and be well understood by both the faculty and the administration of the institution.
4. Due to the complexity of federal and state or provincial laws regarding retirement policies and programs in higher education, the institution should engage the services of appropriate retirement consultants and plan administrators in the development of retirement policies, plans, and procedures and should seek legal counsel knowledgeable in the applicable law of the state(s) or province(s) where the school operates before incorporating these guidelines into policies.
5. Institutions may find that a policy allowing for early retirement may be helpful to members of the faculty, even though such a policy may result in a theological school losing gifted faculty members.

Student Financial Aid

Rationale and goals

Historically, seminaries have been concerned with providing financial aid to those who evidenced financial need in pursuit of their theological studies. Though that is still a major concern, the current environment also demands recognition of academic achievement or other forms of merit. Theological schools need highly qualified students regardless of financial status. In addition, students, schools, churches, and judicatories have expressed growing concerns regarding the increased debt load of students graduating from theological school and entering ministry. These factors lead to the following goals for financial aid provided by ATS member schools:

1. Theological schools should take into account aid granted on the basis of both financial need and merit.
2. Theological schools should counsel students regarding the consequences of educational debt.
3. Theological schools must take into account the many federal, state, and provincial regulations required of institutions participating in government loan programs.

The Association recommends that schools consider the following definitions, guiding principles, and practices in their financial aid procedures.

Definitions

Financial aid consists of scholarships, grants, loans, and work-study/institutional employment.

Need-based aid is defined as aid granted to a student to meet the difference between the total cost of attending a particular institution and the amount of resources available to the student.

Merit-based aid is defined as aid granted to a student on the basis of academic performance, cocurricular involvement, or other form of merit.

Guiding principles

1. The student has the major responsibility for his or her educational and living expenses. The school's aid will augment the student's efforts.
2. A student's financial resources will include consideration of merit scholarships; funds available from church, judicatory, and denomination; earnings of student and spouse; savings; veterans' benefits; and outside gifts.
3. Financial aid is not an end in itself but should be administered in such a way as to affirm financial responsibility and integrity of both student and school.
4. The administration of financial aid should be individual, personal, pastoral, and confidential.
5. Theological schools should adopt a financial aid code of conduct to which it and all outside agents (lenders, loan servicers, etc.) must adhere.
6. Need-based financial aid should not exceed the amount of demonstrated student need.
7. Theological schools that are part of larger institutions should coordinate their financial aid policies with those of the larger institution.

Recommended practice

1. A common need analysis system (such as FAFSA for U.S. schools) should be used.
2. The estimate of a student's expenses should include tuition, fees, housing, transportation, food, medical care and insurance, recreation, and contributions to church and charities.
3. A flexible, equitable, and nondiscriminatory system should be developed for processing aid for all students.
4. In packaging aid, each school should take into account the total indebtedness of each student and spouse. Counsel should be given to all students seeking loans that indebtedness, by its very nature, affects ministry options.
5. A theological school must publish its procedures and policies to make certain they are available to students.
6. A theological school should review and change its procedures and practices to meet changing needs.
7. A theological school should provide for an annual review of each student's need.

Plan for the Work of ATS 2010–2016

The mission of The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada is to promote the improvement and enhancement of theological schools to the benefit of communities of faith and the broader public.

The Association seeks to implement this mission with attention to four key values:

Diversity. ATS values the different expressions of faith that are represented by member schools and seeks to respect the varying understandings of theology, polity, religious leadership, and social commitments.

Quality and Improvement. ATS schools value quality in the practice of ministry and in educational practices. Quality is always linked to improvement; even schools that have achieved a high degree of quality can improve. The Association encourages schools to advance in quality.

Collegiality. ATS values the contributions that schools make to one another. Regardless of differences in theological perspective, organizational complexity, or institutional size, ATS schools, as peer institutions, can learn from one another, cooperate on common tasks that benefit the broader community of theological schools, and hold themselves accountable to common practices and quality.

Leadership. ATS values leadership and considers it essential for schools to attain their missions. ATS is committed to developing the skills and capacities of administrators, faculties, and boards of member schools.

In addition to these core values, the Association values formal education for ministerial leadership and advocates on behalf of its benefits for religious leaders, religious institutions, and the work of religion in broader publics; values justice in society and institutions and seeks to embody justice in its organizational life; values accountability for student learning; and both values and advocates for quality in the practice of ministry.

In support of this mission and these values, the Association has three core functions that it performs on behalf of graduate, professional theological education in the United States and Canada: leadership education, issues and initiatives, and communications and data. The Association maintains a plan that identifies strategies and relates those strategies to the core functions of the Association. The plan of work extends for six years and is revised biennially; the current plan is based on, and updates, the 2008 version of the plan of work.

Core functions

Leadership Education. The Association provides a venue for the education of senior administrative officers through conferences and seminars, and the development of faculty through regranting programs and workshops related to skills, perceptions, and knowledge crucial to their work as theological educators.

Issues and Initiatives. The Association conducts applied research and convenes conversations about critical issues in theological education that need to be addressed in order to enhance understanding of theological education or to enable the schools to develop new skills or perspectives necessary for their development and improvement.

Communications and Data. The Association publishes the *Bulletin* as the formal record of its work; a journal, *Theological Education*; the *Fact Book on Theological Education*; and a variety of publications in support of various programs and emphases. The Association and the Commission on Accrediting maintain databases on student attitudes and perceptions and a comprehensive database on the member institutions. These data provide resources that serve the member schools, the media, and the scholarly study of theological education and the theological disciplines.

Strategies related to the core functions of the Association 2010–2016

The strategies listed below do not describe every aspect of the Association's work; rather, they are

the ones that require authorization by the ATS Board of Directors because they undertake new work or require grant funding from external sources. In most cases, the current grants supporting areas of work will expire during this six-year time frame, and continuation funding will need to be sought. If no funding has been identified, it is noted with the agenda item.

As the Association implements its work during this six-year planning cycle, it will give attention to continuing the grant-funded work of leadership development and support and initiate a new effort to expand the pipeline for presidents and deans, especially as it might include racial/ethnic persons and women, as appropriate to different ecclesial communities. It continues directions in racial/ethnic work in building capacity in schools. It continues to offer support to women in leadership in theological education, with particular attention to women in senior roles. Grant-funded work for faculty is expanded to include active discussion of topics of critical importance in these times: governance, educational curriculum, interdisciplinary issues, and the relationship of schools with churches and ecclesial communities. In all areas, there is attention to increased use of technology to advance educational and communications strategies.

In the context of the ongoing core functions of the Association, the following strategies are being or will be implemented. While work may rightly be classified in more than one ATS function and, at times, may best be understood in terms of its importance for more than one function, this plan identifies strategies within the function of the Association with which they are most closely related in terms of the kind of work the strategy primarily entails. This document does not include all ATS work, just new work or continuing work that requires grant funding.

1. Leadership education

ATS will maintain and enhance its system and curriculum for the ongoing education of administrative leaders and the development of faculty, addressing the interconnection of accreditation issues and leadership education events, as well as those pragmatic concerns specific to each group. It will continue to administer grants programs in support of faculty development and the advancement of scholarship in the theological disciplines. While these programs will benefit individual

administrators and faculty, they will be conducted with the goal of enhancing and improving theological schools.

1.1 *Education for administrative leaders*

1.1.1 *Presidents.* ATS will continue to conduct the annual New Presidents Seminar, the week-long Presidential Leadership Intensive, and the University Deans Meeting and will develop an event for those presidents, deans, or principals whose schools are nested within other educational entities. In addition, support will continue for educational events in particular settings, such as the yearly gathering of African American Presidents. (Funding provided by participant fees and ATS Leadership Education for Theological Educators grant through 2013.)

1.1.2 *Professional development organizations for administrative officers.* ATS will continue to foster the work of four organizations for specific leadership groups: the Chief Academic Officers Society (CAOS), the Chief Financial Officers Society (CFOS), the Development and Institutional Advancement Program (DIAP), and the Student Personnel Administrators Network (SPAN). ATS will provide ongoing support for the steering committees of each of these programmatic organizations in planning, implementing, and evaluating educational events. The Leadership Education Council will coordinate work across programmatic organizations. (Funding provided by participant fees and ATS Leadership Education for Theological Educators grant through 2013.)

1.1.3 *Cultivating potential senior administrative Leaders.* ATS will explore ways to develop and implement a comprehensive program of support aimed at cultivating potential candidates for senior administrative positions in ATS schools, including racial/ethnic persons, men, and women, as appropriate to varying ecclesial communities. (Funding will need to be secured to implement this effort.)

1.2 *Education for women and racial/ethnic faculty and administrators*

1.2.1 *Women in leadership.* ATS will continue its programmatic support for women in leadership in theological education, including both faculty and administrators, and with particular attention to women in senior roles in ATS schools. ATS will ex-

plore ways to thread throughout all its educational programming during this time period attention to the enhancement of the capacity of schools to provide hospitable environments for the leadership of women as they contribute to the common work of theological education. (Funding provided by the ATS Leadership Education for Theological Educators grant through 2013.)

1.2.2 Racial/ethnic leadership. ATS will focus building the capacity of ATS schools to function more effectively as racially inclusive environments and as educators of both white and racial/ethnic students for ministry in racial/ethnic and multicultural contexts. It also will continue programming support for racial/ethnic administrative leaders and faculty in theological schools. (Funding provided by ATS Leadership Education for Theological Educators grant through 2013.)

1.3 Faculty development

1.3.1 Newly appointed faculty. ATS will continue the annual New Faculty Seminar for recently appointed faculty who are new to theological education. The seminar is structured to explore the collective vocation of faculty as a corporate entity and individual vocational issues raised by employment in these institutions. (Funding provided by participant fees and ATS Leadership Education for Theological Educators grant through 2013.)

1.3.2 Mid-career faculty. ATS will host periodic conferences for newly tenured faculty. This effort is designed to help mid-career faculty engage the variety of issues that challenge them in their work, especially as related to their service within theological schools. (Funding provided by participant fees and ATS Leadership Education for Theological Educators grant through 2013.)

1.3.3 General faculty development. ATS will become a regular presence at large gatherings of faculty, that is, at the American Academy of Religion and the Society of Biblical Literature. ATS will host periodically a session related to the vocation of the theological educator led by a senior scholar. On other occasions ATS will host consultations on focused topics, ultimately aimed at producing Web-based resources for dissemination to a wider audience of all member schools to assist in faculty development. Focused topics may include but are not limited to the following: governance, curricular issues, interdisciplinary issues,

and the relationships of the school with churches and ecclesial communities. (Funding provided by participant fees and ATS Leadership Education for Theological Educators grant through 2013.)

1.3.2 The Henry Luce III Fellows in Theology Program. ATS will continue to administer this premier program in theological research, in consultation with the Henry Luce Foundation. The program provides salary and benefit replacement funds, and when matched by the fellow's institution, offer a full year of research leave to a scholar whose research will have a significant impact on the field. ATS also will engage the participation of Luce Fellows in other ATS conferences and workshops to cultivate their leadership as scholars in the broader work of the Association. (Funding provided on year-by-year basis by the Henry Luce III Fellows in Theology grant through 2010.)

1.3.3 The Lilly Theological Research Grants Program. This program makes three kinds of grants to faculty in ATS member schools: grants to faculty who have an approved research leave, grants to faculty as research stipends in lieu of some teaching responsibilities in the academic year or summer, and grants for expenses related to research, such as travel. Proposals related to the scholarly understanding of theological education will be considered as well as proposals for research that advances theological disciplines. The project sponsors an annual workshop for faculty that focuses on proposal development, finding resources for faculty research, and writing for different audiences. (Funding provided by Lilly Theological Research Grants Program grant through 2013.)

2. Issues and initiatives in theological education

During the period of this plan of work, ATS will extend its work on two projects:

2.1 Institutional Viability and Financially Stressed Theological Schools. A significant number of ATS schools are experiencing substantive and enduring financial stress that threatens their ability to attain their respective missions. In this project, ATS seeks to identify underlying issues that result in chronic financial stress, patterns of institutional responses that could ameliorate the impact of this stress while schools are seeking a remedy, and patterns of institutional effort that

could provide for healthier financial futures for these schools. In collaboration with the Auburn Center for the Study of Theological Education and In Trust, Inc., the Association will redevelop the *Strategic Information Report* to strengthen its usefulness by the schools in the areas of governance, administration, and institutional planning and assessment. ATS will also develop instructional guides to enhance the usefulness of the *Institutional Peer Profile Report* and the *Strategic Information Report*. (Funding provided by Lilly Endowment through 2012.)

2.2 *Christian Hospitality and Pastoral Practices in a Multifaith Society.* Among the many changes that are occurring in North America is the growth of religious communities other than the Christian and Jewish faiths with which ATS schools have been most closely identified. The increasing number of adherents to these other faiths in North America will invariably affect the practice of Christian ministry. Ministers and priests will need to be better informed about the commitments and practices of these religious communities; they will need to expand their own theology with a theology of world religions; and they will need to be able to minister in the contexts of interreligious interaction and engagement in the settings where they will serve. Religion has been both a uniting and dividing influence, and ATS schools will need to identify those practices that the majority religion in North America should undertake to ensure religion's positive contribution as the continent experiences the increasing presence and cultural power of other faiths. (Funding provided by the Luce Foundation through 2012.)

In addition, the Association will seek funding to initiate five new projects:

2.3 *Educational models.* This comprehensive project will research new educational models for accredited theological education. Theological education needs both the models that have developed over many years and new models that will extend theological education to the increasing variety of individuals who need it. The project will work with schools developing new models to assess their effectiveness and viability for use by other schools in the Association. This work will be conducted in a variety of ATS venues. (Funding will need to be secured to implement this effort.)

2.4 *Theological education and environmental issues.* This concern is pervasive in many areas of society, including member schools. This project will seek to discern methods by which member schools can embody the stewardship of creation in terms of curriculum, theological reflection, and institutional practices. (Funding will need to be secured to implement this effort.)

2.5 *Theological schools and the church.* A project was completed in 2008, and it was suggested that ATS maintain an ongoing emphasis in a variety of its activities to enhance churches' understandings about the function of theological schools in the context of the churches' missions, the schools' understandings of the function of the religious leadership "workforce," and the relationship of these to the theological purposes, educational goals, curriculum, and educational practices associated with graduate professional degree programs conducted by ATS member schools. (Funding will need to be secured to implement this effort.)

2.6 *Support for funding theological education.* ATS is uniquely positioned to articulate the case for funding theological schools to foundations and other donors. ATS will work collaboratively with its own funding partners to raise awareness among family foundations and other potential donors of the value of theological education and its need for their support. ATS also will convene meetings of ATS presidents and major donors of ATS schools to create a setting for these unusual peers to encourage one another in their support for theological education. (Funding will need to be secured to implement this effort.)

2.7 *Science and religion.* The American Association for the Advancement of Science has invited ATS to partner with it in a project for which the AAAS has received grant funding from the Templeton Foundation. The goal is to encourage literacy in science among theological faculty and thereby influence future church leaders and people of faith. The project will also encourage theological literacy among scientists through a mutual exchange of ideas in each others' professional contexts. (No ATS funding will be needed.)

3. Communications and data

ATS has a comprehensive information technology system, institutional and student information databases, Web site, and an array of print publications that support its work. The primary work planned for 2010–2016 focuses on promoting the use of these resources among the member schools and expanding efforts to communicate electronically with key constituencies in the schools.

3.1 *ATS publications and resources.* The Association maintains an extensive publications program in both print and electronic formats. During this cycle of work, the Association will make expanded use of electronic communication with various member school constituencies to direct them routinely to new editions of publications and other pertinent resources as they appear on the Web site. ATS will explore the development of an online resource center that will include such com-

ponents as frequently asked questions, samples of institutional and administrative policies developed by the schools, and links to job postings by theological schools. (Funding from ATS operational budget.)

4. Association support

The function of Association Support undergirds the work and mission of ATS.

4.1 *Strategic development plan.* The Association will implement a development plan that addresses the need for additional revenue sources and increased unrestricted revenue. (Funding may be needed to implement this effort fully.)

4.2 *Organizational structure.* ATS will review internal organizational structures to enhance performance and sustainability. (Funding provided by ATS operational budget.)

Report of the Association Treasurer

This treasurer's report of the Association presents audited financial data for fiscal 2008 and fiscal 2009, projected financial data for fiscal 2010, and budget for fiscal 2010.

Fiscal year ended June 30, 2008

The audited financial statements for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2008, were reviewed by the ATS Audit Committee and the ATS board. The ATS Audit Committee is comprised of the ATS treasurer, COA treasurer, and three chief financial officers from member schools. The audited financial statements, which included an unqualified opinion by the firm of Maher Duessel, are available on the Association's Web site at www.ats.edu/Private/Documents/ATS-FS2009.pdf. Hard copies of the audit will also be available for review at the Biennial Meeting.

The statements show an Unrestricted Net Asset balance of \$13,151,275. Of this amount, \$3,000,000 was designated as the ATS Operating Reserve, \$9,378,787 was designated as the ATS Program Support Fund, \$551,782 represented net property and equipment, and \$220,706 was undesignated. Temporarily Restricted Net Assets, consisting of grant funds and commitments received in advance of grant expenditures, was \$2,971,176.

Operating expenditures for the fiscal year 2008 totaled \$4,632,020. Operating revenues and grants released from restrictions amounted to \$4,571,206. As a result, the Association recorded a net operating deficit of \$60,814 before operating transfers from the ATS Program Support Fund of \$60,000.

Fiscal year ended June 30, 2009

The audited financial statements for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2009, were reviewed by the ATS Audit Committee and the ATS board. The ATS Audit Committee is comprised of the ATS treasurer, COA treasurer, and three chief financial officers from member schools. The audited financial statements, which included an unqualified opinion by the firm of Maher Duessel, are available on the Association's Web site at www.ats.edu/Private/Documents/ATS-FS2009.pdf. Hard copies of the audit will also be available for review at the Biennial Meeting.

The statements show an Unrestricted Net Asset balance of \$10,793,636. Of this amount, \$3,000,000 was designated as the ATS Operating Reserve, \$6,958,749 was designated as the ATS Program Support Fund, \$535,816 represented net property and equipment, and \$299,071 was undesignated. The decrease in Unrestricted Net Assets is due exclusively to the losses sustained in the stock market. Temporarily Restricted Net Assets, consisting of grant funds and commitments received in advance of grant expenditures, was \$7,885,083. This increase is the result of receiving several new grants whose activities will run through 2014.

Operating expenditures for fiscal year 2009 totaled \$4,489,151. Operating revenues and grants released from restrictions amounted to \$4,360,554. As a result, the operating surplus for fiscal year 2009 was \$128,597 before an operating transfer of \$225,000 from the ATS Program Support Fund. Revenues for fiscal 2009 consisted of grants, 59 percent; member dues, 7 percent; fees and reimbursements, 30 percent; and investment, 4 percent.

Current fiscal year 2010

The budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2010, was approved by the board of the Association. No adjustments to the budget have been made during the year.

Financial data for the Association for the ten months ended April 30, 2010, and a projection for the remainder of fiscal year 2010 is shown in relation to the budget on page 124. The budget and projected results anticipates a transfer from the ATS Program Support Fund of \$326,000, which represents a transfer from the Association's quasi-endowment funds. At the end of fiscal year 2010, the Association anticipates an excess of revenues and transfer over expenditures of about \$151,000, or 3 percent of projected revenues. The surplus is ahead of the budgeted excess of \$107,400.

Budget for fiscal year 2011

The budget for the Association for fiscal 2011 was reviewed and approved at the April 2010 meeting of the Association's board. The budget reflects sustainable revenues, expenditures that are

consistent with fiscal 2010, and a projected excess of about \$43,000. The budget also includes charges to the Commission in the amount of \$708,000 for personnel and \$179,000 for indirect services. The budget reflects a change in the tiers within the dues structure by inflation that was approved at the 2006 Biennial Meeting. This change in the tiers resulted in an average increase of less than \$125 to individual schools and resulted in total additional dues of about \$20,000, with 25 percent, or \$5,000, designated for the Association.

Mary McNamara
Association Treasurer

The Association of Theological Schools

STATEMENT OF ACTIVITIES—BUDGET vs. PROJECTED ACTUAL

	OPERATIONS—Actual vs. Budget				
	Thru 4/30/2010	Projected May-Jun	Projected FY10	Budget FY10	Variance Good(Bad)
Revenues:					
Member dues	304,694	-	304,694	295,000	9,694
Sales and subscriptions	33,213	-	33,213	32,000	1,213
Tuition and fees	330,934	81,000	411,934	427,000	(15,066)
Personnel services—COA	473,942	105,000	578,942	740,000	(161,058) a
Indirect services—COA	115,656	22,334	137,990	136,000	1,990
Investment income, net	137,573	8,000	145,573	150,000	(4,427)
Satisfaction of grant restrictions	2,314,715	247,800	2,562,515	2,638,950	(76,435)
Miscellaneous	5,776	-	5,776	-	5,776
ATS Program Support Fund	-	326,000	326,000	326,000	-
	<u>3,716,503</u>	<u>790,134</u>	<u>4,506,637</u>	<u>4,744,950</u>	<u>(238,313)</u>
Expenditures:					
Staff costs	1,356,231	261,000	1,617,231	1,688,000	70,769
Staff costs for COA	473,942	105,000	578,942	740,000	161,058 a
	<u>1,830,173</u>	<u>366,000</u>	<u>2,196,173</u>	<u>2,428,000</u>	<u>231,827 b</u>
Workshops	562,888	25,000	587,888	554,000	(33,888) c
Awards	747,427	-	747,427	800,000	52,573 d
Consultants	257,767	4,000	261,767	242,000	(19,767) e
Committees	5,191	-	5,191	23,500	18,309 f
Administration	69,141	73,000	142,141	165,000	22,859 e
Travel	15,850	8,000	23,850	33,000	9,150
Publications	30,299	2,500	32,799	25,000	(7,799)
Biennial meeting	8,646	125,000	133,646	130,000	(3,646)
Overhead—administration	59,183	19,000	78,183	83,000	4,817
Overhead—building	116,806	30,000	146,806	154,050	7,244
	<u>3,703,371</u>	<u>652,500</u>	<u>4,355,871</u>	<u>4,637,550</u>	<u>281,679</u>
Excess for contingency	<u>13,132</u>	<u>137,634</u>	<u>150,766</u>	<u>107,400</u>	<u>43,366</u>

Variations +/- \$10,000 and 5%

- a** - Major portion of vacated positions are COA, so reimbursements from COA are reduced.
- b** - A professional and a support staff position are vacant plus 3 percent matching program was suspended.
- c** - Additional workshop that was not budgeted was held but was grant funded.
- d** - Awards related to Luce and Lilly programs are based upon requests from awardees and were under budget.
- e** - Nothing significant noted.
- f** - Much committee work is now done via conference calls saving travel costs.

**The Association of Theological Schools
The Commission on Accrediting**

BUDGET 2010-2011

	Total <u>ATS</u>	Total <u>COA</u>	Combined <u>Operations</u>
Income:			
Member dues	300,000	900,000	1,200,000
Sales and subscriptions	32,000	-	32,000
Tuition and fees	327,000	20,000	347,000
Foundation support	2,707,300	-	2,707,300
Investment income	100,000	10,000	110,000
Accrediting fees	-	97,000	97,000
Reimbursed travel	-	110,000	110,000
Program Support Fund transfers	326,000	-	326,000
<i>Total income</i>	<u>3,792,300</u>	<u>1,137,000</u>	<u>4,929,300</u>
Direct expenses:			
Staff	1,765,000	708,000	2,473,000
Workshops	677,000	35,000	712,000
Awards	790,000	-	790,000
Consultants	206,000	3,000	209,000
Committee	28,500	35,000	63,500
Administration	168,000	47,000	215,000
Travel	33,000	15,000	48,000
Publications	15,000	5,000	20,000
Reimbursed travel	-	110,000	110,000
<i>Total direct expenses</i>	<u>3,682,500</u>	<u>958,000</u>	<u>4,640,500</u>
Indirect expenses:			
<i>Total indirect expenses</i>	<u>246,000</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>246,000</u>
<i>Total expenses</i>	<u>3,928,500</u>	<u>958,000</u>	<u>4,886,500</u>
<i>Excess(deficit) of revenues before support service charges</i>	(136,200)	179,000	42,800
Charges to COA from ATS			
<i>through Support Service Agreement</i>	179,000	(179,000)	-
<i>Excess for contingency</i>	<u>42,800</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>42,800</u>

Report of the Association Nominating Committee

The Association Nominating Committee for the 2010–2012 biennium conducted its work by conference call and email communication. The committee conducted its work according to guidelines that have been used by the Association since 2001 and are included in this report. The Nominating Committee followed the guidelines' "Criteria for the Constituency of Committees" and sought to present a slate of nominees that, as a group, meets the following criteria:

Committees, as groups, should reflect and be inclusive of the Commission constituency. Insofar as possible, the committees should reflect (1) the three broad theological communities (mainline Protestant, Roman Catholic/Orthodox, and evangelical Protestant) with which the member schools are identified; (2) the binational character of the Commission (United States and Canada); (3) the presence of men and women; (4) the presence of racial/ethnic persons, and (5) persons who are fundamentally respectful of the range of theological traditions and commitments represented in the member schools. In addition, the Nominating Committee should consider the value to the ongoing work of committees by both continuing members and new members.

The committee began its work by reviewing the names of individuals that had been forwarded to the committee in response to an email sent to all presidents and academic deans in October 2009. The email request included a form to be used in making recommendations. Responses were received from representatives of approximately twenty member schools. ATS staff also made recommendations (clearly indicated as coming from the staff) of persons who have served as leaders and facilitators of ATS educational events, served on accreditation committees, and/or contributed in significant ways to recent ATS activities.

The Nominating Committee recommends that the election process at the Biennial Meeting adhere to the 2001 procedure, as follows:

Nomination and election process at the Biennial Meeting

The Nominating Committee brings to the Association membership at the Biennial Meeting a full slate of nominees for officers, the board of directors, and all Association committees, with the slate including the names of continuing committee members. The slate and the procedures for nominations from the floor are distributed in advance of the Biennial Meeting through publication in the *Program & Reports* book, or by some other means. The slate is presented in the first business session and voted upon in the second business session. In the event of nominations from the floor by a voting member in the first business session, and given the bylaw limitations on the number of persons who can be elected to each committee, the following procedure will be followed:

Business Session I

The chair of the Nominating Committee makes the report on behalf of the committee in Business Session I and places the full slate in nomination before the membership. Nominations may be made from the floor by any voting member during this business session, provided that persons being nominated have agreed in advance to serve, if elected. Nominations from the floor also require the endorsement of five voting members, which is equal to the number of institutions represented on the Nominating Committee.

Business Session II

The election takes place in Business Session II. If there were no nominations from the floor in Business Session I, the slate is voted upon as presented. In the event of nominations from the floor in Business Session I, printed ballots will be distributed to voting members for the committee(s) that received nominations from the floor. The ballots will list the names of all nominees for the committee(s), both those brought by the Nominating Committee and those nominated from the floor. Voting members will be instructed to vote for no more than the number of individuals originally nominated for the committee(s). Thus, action is taken on all nominations in Business Session II.

Business Session III

Any ballots cast in Business Session II will be tabulated by the Committee on Reference and Counsel and reported to the membership in a third business session.

The slate of Association nominees for 2010–2012 follows this report.

Members of the 2010 Nominating Committee were Katarina Schuth, Chair (Saint Paul Seminary School of Divinity of the University of St. Thomas), Leslie Andrews (Asbury Theological Seminary), Alan Hayes (Toronto School of Theology), Myron McCoy (Saint Paul School of Theology), and John Phelan (North Park Theological Seminary).

Association Slate of Nominees

Officers**Officer Nominees for 2010–2012**

President	Richard Mouw , President, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA
Vice President	Dorcus Gordon , Principal, Knox College, Toronto, ON
Secretary	Patricia Schoelles , President, St. Bernard's School of Theology and Ministry, Rochester, NY
Treasurer	Mary McNamara , President, United Theological Seminary of the Twin Cities, New Brighton, MN
Personnel Committee Chair:	John Kinney , Dean, Samuel DeWitt Proctor School of Theology of Virginia Union University, Richmond, VA

Current Officers (2008–2010)

President	John Kinney , Dean, Samuel DeWitt Proctor School of Theology of Virginia Union University, Richmond, VA
Vice President	Richard Mouw , President, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA
Secretary	Laura Mendenhall , Senior Philanthropy Advisor, The Texas Presbyterian Foundation, Irving, TX
Treasurer	Mary McNamara , President, United Theological Seminary of the Twin Cities, New Brighton, MN

ATS Board of Directors**Continuing members**

Elaine Park	Faculty, Mount Angel Seminary, Saint Benedict, OR
Jay Phelan	President, North Park Theological Seminary, Chicago, IL
Dorothy Ridings	Past President, Council on Foundations, Louisville, KY*
Cheryl Sanders	Faculty, Howard University School of Divinity, Washington, DC
Richard Stover	Managing Principal, Birchmere Capital, Wexford, PA*
Junias Venugopal	Academic Dean, Columbia International University–Seminary & School of Missions, Columbia, SC

Nominated for second term

James Holsinger	Charles T. Wetherington Jr. Chair in the Health Sciences, University of Kentucky School of Medicine, Lexington, KY*
James Hudnut Beumler	Dean, Vanderbilt University Divinity School, Nashville, TN
Myron McCoy	President, Saint Paul School of Theology, Kansas City, MO

* Public member

THE ASSOCIATION

Nominated for first term

Heidi Hadsell	President, Hartford Seminary, Hartford, CT
Mario D'Souza	Dean of the Faculty of Theology, University of St. Michael's College Faculty of Theology, Toronto, ON
Charles Kosanke	Rector/President, SS. Cyril & Methodius Seminary, Orchard Lake, MI
Jan Love	Dean, Candler School of Theology of Emory University, Atlanta, GA
Steven Land	Pentecostal Theological Seminary, Cleveland, TN
Rod Wilson	President, Regent College, Vancouver, BC

Audit Committee

Patrick Cunningham	Vice President for Finance and Administration, Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, PA
Elizabeth Littlejohn	Vice President of Financial and Administrative Services, Interdenominational Theological Center, Atlanta, GA
Kurt Gabbard	Vice President for Business Affairs, Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Austin, TX†
Association Treasurer	(to be determined)
Commission Treasurer	(to be determined)

Committee on Race and Ethnicity in Theological Education (CORE)

Peter Cha	Faculty, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School of Trinity International University, Deerfield, IL†
Sharon Watson Fluker	Vice President for Doctoral Programs and Administration, The Fund for Theological Education, Atlanta, GA†
Raul Gomez	Vice President for Academic Affairs, Sacred Heart School of Theology, Hales Corners, WI†
Eddie Kwok	Faculty, Lutheran Theological Seminary (SK), Saskatoon, SK
Juan Martinez	Associate Dean, Center for the Study of Hispanic Church and Community, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA
Jeanette Rodriguez	Faculty, Seattle University School of Theology and Ministry, Seattle, WA†
Emilie Townes	Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, Yale University Divinity School, New Haven, CT

Advisory Committee for Women in Leadership (WIL)

Maxine Clarke-Beach	Vice President and Dean of the Theological School, Drew University Theological School, Madison, NJ†
Wendy Deichman Edwards	President and Chief Executive Officer, United Theological Seminary, Dayton, OH
Barbara Leung Lai	Director of the Chinese Ministry Program, Tyndale University College & Seminary, Toronto, ON
Loida Martell-Otero	Faculty, Palmer Theological Seminary of Eastern University, Wynnwood, PA†
M. Beth McCutcheon	Director of Academic Programs, Knox College, Toronto, ON†
Eleanor Moody-Shepherd	Vice President for Academic Affairs and Academic Dean, New York Theological Seminary, New York, NY
Angela Senander	Faculty, Washington Theological Union, Washington, DC†

† Continuing member

Editorial Board for Theological Education

Efrain Agosto	Academic Dean, Hartford Seminary, Hartford, CT†
Leslie Andrews	Vice President of Academic Affairs/Provost, Asbury Theological Seminary, Wilmore, KY
Michael Attridge	Director of Basic Degree Programs, University of St. Michael's College Faculty of Theology, Toronto, ON†
Stephen Crocco	Librarian, Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, NJ†
Joyce Mercer	Faculty, Virginia Theological Seminary, Alexandria, VA†
Phil Zylla	Academic Dean, McMaster Divinity College, Hamilton, ON†

Advisory Committee for Student Resources

Douglas George	Director of Lay Formation, Christ The King Seminary, East Aurora, NY
Polly Stone	Director of Institutional Assessment, Reformed Theological Seminary, Charlotte, NC†
Alain Silverio	Associate Dean of Academic Administration, Union Theological Seminary, New York, NY†
Carol Klukas	Associate Dean for Student Affairs, Director of Admissions and Registrar, Nashotah House, Nashotah, WI
Natasja VanderBerg	Coordinator of Academic Services and Registrar, Toronto School of Theology, Toronto, ON
Danny West	DMin Director, M. Christopher White School of Divinity of Gardner-Webb University, Boiling Springs, NC

Lilly Theological Research Grants Selection Panel

William Patrick Brown	Faculty, Columbia Theological Seminary, Decatur, GA
Eleazar Fernandez	Faculty, United Theological Seminary of the Twin Cities, New Brighton, MN
Cheryl Bridges Johns	Faculty, Pentecostal Theological Seminary, Cleveland, TN†
Kevin O'Neil	Faculty, Washington Theological Union, Washington, DC
Sharon Ringe	Faculty, Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, DC
Joseph Schnier	President and Rector, Regis College, Toronto, ON†

Advisory Committee for Faculty Development

W. Bingham Hunter	Vice President and Academic Dean, Phoenix Seminary, Phoenix, AZ
David MacLachlan	Academic Dean, Atlantic School of Theology, Halifax, NS†
Nancy Ramsay	Executive Vice President and Dean, Brite Divinity School at Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, TX†
Sharon Tan	Faculty, United Theological Seminary of the Twin Cities, New Brighton, MN†
Thomas Walters	Academic Dean, Saint Meinrad School of Theology, St. Meinrad, IN†
Amos Yong	Director of PhD Program, Regent University School of Divinity, Virginia Beach, VA

† Continuing member

Report of the Council on Leadership Education (CLE)

Coordination of the various leadership education programs is an ongoing activity. The Council on Leadership Education (CLE) is composed of representatives drawn from six groups: (1) Chief Academic Officers Society (CAOS), (2) Chief Financial Officers Society (CFOS), (3) Committee on Race and Ethnicity (CORE), (4) Development and Institutional Advancement Program (DIAP), (5) Student Personnel Administrator's Network (SPAN), and (6) Women in Leadership (WIL). With the exception of WIL and CORE (both of which have advisory committees composed of biennially elected members), the remaining committees are essentially self-perpetuating, quasi-professional entities.

The Council on Leadership Education meets annually, is chaired by ATS staff, and serves as a location for sharing ideas across groups as well as determining strategies for the implementation of agenda initiatives drawn from the Association. CLE increasingly will look to the ATS board for advisement and directives involving leadership education.

This biennium's meetings centered on the review of programming, the consideration of key learnings, and the examination of the best practices that continue to ensure the quality of our work. Generally, it was felt that the Association should continue to make space available for discussion in the form of networking and informal mentoring opportunities in order to justify the institutional expenditure of funds for the event. In addition, committee members believed that the financial stewardship of resources through the availability of Webinars and other online resources would become increasingly important in the face of tremendous financial uncertainty. Finally, participants discussed the increasingly creative means that they have engaged to ensure and increase attendance as budgets decrease and enrollment numbers are projected to fall.

Members of the Council in this biennium were as follows: CAOS: Tite Tienou (Trinity Evangelical Divinity School), Janet Clark (Tyndale University College & Seminary); CFO: Sandra Lynch (Yale University Divinity School), Michael Joshua, (Knox College); DIAP: Dave Wicker (Covenant Theological Seminary), Gary Hoag (Previously of Denver Theological Seminary); SPAN: Mitchell Bond (Wesley Theological Seminary),

Reid Kisling (George Fox Evangelical Seminary); CORE: Oliver McMahan (Church of God Theological Seminary); and WIL: Anabel Proffit (Lancaster Theological Seminary).

Chief Academic Officers Society (CAOS)

The Chief Academic Officers Society (CAOS) meets annually and coordinates conferences that focus on academic administration, curriculum, academic leadership, teaching and learning, personnel, educational evaluation, and other issues that accrue to senior academic leadership in ATS schools. The meetings offer a combination of plenary addresses, panel presentations, small group discussions, and multiple workshops; they also provide opportunities for peer interaction and engagement. The 2008 CAOS conference themed *Shaping Diversity in Theological Schools* was held in Atlanta, Georgia, and opened with a plenary titled "Only One Mile from Egypt" by Edward Wheeler from Christian Theological Seminary. With 151 people in attendance, the conference continued with workshops titled "How One Seminary Enjoys Diversity and Struggles with Issues of Race and Privilege," "Gifts Differing: Reflections on Racial/Ethnic Diversity in Theological Schools," "How Three Schools See Issues and Possibilities Related to Diversity and Inclusion," and "ATS and Disability Policy."

The 2009 conference in San Antonio, Texas, centered on the theme of *Best Practices* and featured workshops titled "Different Tools for Different Learning Outcomes," "The Integrated Curriculum," "Facilitating the Faculty Life Cycle," and "Best Practices in Searches and Hiring."

Chief Financial Officers Society (CFOS)

In 2008 the Chief Financial Officers Society (CFOS) met in Savannah, Georgia, for what was described by one participant as "... one of the most interesting and informative conferences I've been to." The theme of the conference, *Strategic Partnerships*, focused on the role of the CFO and the importance of establishing and maintaining relationships throughout the school community. Given the current state of the economy, strengthening these alliances is more important than ever for CFOs as

they work together to find ways to best fulfill their mission. Tony Ruger, senior research fellow at Auburn Theological Seminary, presented a preconference workshop titled “Revenue, Expenses, and Strategic Partnerships for Sustainability.” Ronald Bates, managing director and director of socially responsive investments, Legg Mason Investment Counsel, facilitated the workshop “Strategic Collaboration: CFOs and Investment Management.” David Gelinas, director of financial aid at University of the South School of Theology, conducted a workshop on “Financial Aid Programs: A Federal Update.” And Theodore Y. Rodgers, senior consultant for The Focus Group, discussed “Planned Giving—The Important Role of the CFO for a Successful Program.”

The 2009 conference in Scottsdale, Arizona, centered on the theme of *Maximizing the Margin* and was designed by the CFO steering committee to focus on the role of the CFO in helping each institution get the most out of limited resources as schools do more with less in response to the economic challenges they face. Presenters included Nicholas J. Wallace, national director of college and university services at Capin Crouse LLP; June R. Stowe, vice president of finance and administration at Wesley Theological Seminary; Jeffrey L. Miller, chief financial officer at Associated Mennonite Biblical Seminary; and Kim Till, vice president for advancement at Dallas Theological Seminary.

Development and Institutional Advancement Program (DIAP)

The Development and Institutional Advancement Program (DIAP) also meets annually to discuss issues related to fundraising, communications, and institutional development. The conference (held in February each year) features a preconference workshop for new development officers on a special topic and a conference with plenary speakers who generally address fundraising skills, the vocation of the development officer, or issues in theological education, plus multiple workshops. These conferences are unique in that they center around three types of workshops: (1) Benchmarks, in which persons present their schools’ best practices in development, (2) Talk of the Trade, in which the leader presents for one-third of the time and encourages participant interaction for the remaining two-thirds of the time, and (3) Workshops that focus on content presentations.

The 2009 conference took place in New Orleans, Louisiana, and was developed around the theme of *Thankfulness*. Workshops focused participants’ attention on matters such as “Surviving and Thriving in a One-person Shop,” “Practical Tips for Closing a Major Gift,” “Developing Web Services that Communicate all Aspects of your Institution,” and “Stewardship Trends and Their Impact on Your Development Strategy.” A total of seventy-eight participants attended this conference, along with six speakers.

The 2010 gathering themed *Tell Me What’s Working* was held in Atlanta, Georgia. With a timely theme, the conference opened with a plenary titled “Don’t Waste a Good Crisis” and focused on the collection and sharing of “Sixty Great Ideas in Sixty Minutes.”

Presidents’ Steering Committee

Presidents Intensive Week

This week-long event for presidents is designed with a three-year curriculum that gives attention to leadership, institutional finance, development, personnel, governance, legal issues, endowment management, conflict, student recruitment and retention, and cases about theological school leadership. Presidents are encouraged to attend three consecutive years, and priority is given to persons in the first five years of the presidency who have attended the New Presidents Seminar. The Intensive exposes presidents to experts in various subject areas, provides a structure and time for sustained peer interaction, and offers a genuine break from on-campus responsibilities to reflect on their work. This annual event, held in Santa Fe, New Mexico, limits participation to forty registrants (many of whom bring their spouses), plus a group of experienced presidents who serve as worship leaders and small group leaders throughout the week. The 2008 Intensive Week encouraged the presidents to engage in conversations around dealing with personnel and legal issues, recognizing financial potential and creating diverse communities for teaching and learning. Workshops titled “Managing Risk,” “Birthing Institutional Future,” and “Multiracial Formation for a Multiracial Church” stimulated interchanges that were helpful for the ongoing work that confronts and engages presidents as theological leaders. The 2009 conference focused on the three revenue streams in theological education (tuition, endowment, and major gifts) as well as the leadership role of the president and featured Barbara Wheeler

of the Auburn Center for the Study of Theological Education; E. Brooks Holifield, Charles H. Candler Professor of American Church History at Candler School of Theology of Emory University; Theodore Wardlaw, president of Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary; and Mark Hostetter, chief executive officer with Vinik Asset Management LP.

New Presidents Seminar

This event has become an important feature of the Association's leadership education program, as it provides an important orientation opportunity for presidents new to their positions. This weekend seminar introduces new presidents to a variety of issues about the role and work of presidents in theological schools, including transitions into the presidency, the role and vocation of the president, finance, governance, leadership, and the relationship of the president to other constituencies in theological education. Presidents are also introduced to ATS resources, including the *Strategic Information Report*. The seminar is led by experienced presidents and specialists in theological education. It is held in January each year and involves twenty to twenty-five registrants, most in their first or second year of the presidency. The New Presidents Seminar typically serves as a prerequisite for the Presidential Leadership Intensive. The 2009 seminar in San Antonio, Texas, featured presentations titled "The President's Administrative Leadership Team," "The President's Role in Finance," and "The President's Role in Governance." The 2010 gathering, also in San Antonio, featured speakers Barbara Wheeler and Tony Ruger of Auburn Center for the Study of Theological Education, Brian Stiller from Tyndale University College & Seminary, and Dennis Hollinger from Gordon Conwell Theological Seminary.

Student Personnel Administrator's Network (SPAN)

The Student Personnel Administrator's Network (SPAN) includes a variety of persons who are engaged in student services such as recruitment officers, registrars, financial aid personnel, and deans of students. SPAN meets annually in April for a three-day conference. These conferences focus on broad areas of concern, including position nomenclature (student personnel officers hold numerous titles for similar jobs), administrative structures in various sized institutional settings, vocational identity, best practices, and other issues such as spiritual formation and community within the seminary. The theme of the 2009 conference in San Diego, California, was *Spanning the Vocational Life: Supporting Students through Seamless Collaboration, Teamwork, and Hospitality*. Workshops and plenaries titled "Collegial Best Practices Between the Development and Financial Aid Offices," "Making the Case for Collaboration," and "Mentoring the Multitude" focused on students and their preparation, readiness, and effectiveness for ministry. The 2010 conference in Chicago, Illinois, maintained a similar theme—*Growing the Future of the Church: A Student-Centered Approach to Cultivating, Nurturing, and Harvesting Leadership for Ministry*—and featured speakers Maria Marella, FSA, Program Management Services, U.S. Department of Education; Soong-Chan Rah, associate professor of church growth and evangelism, North Park Theological Seminary; and LeRoy Rooker, director of the Family Policy Compliance Office, American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO).

Report of the Committee on Race and Ethnicity in Theological Education

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 meeting annually to plan programs for leadership development of racial/ethnic persons as well as programs for their nurture and support; collecting data on the hiring, retention, and promotion of racial/ethnic persons at ATS schools; and emphasizing mentoring by and for racial/ethnic persons to ensure their retention and enhance their well-being.

During this biennium, the Association coordinated the third and final annual consultation on Building Multiracial Capacity in Predominantly White Theological Schools. This seminar was designed to help predominantly white schools develop overall institutional capacity on behalf of their racial/ethnic constituents. The seminars address topics around three areas of focus: church and community, power and privilege, and pedagogy. The seminar themed *Strategies for Enhanced Institutional Practices in Race/Ethnicity* took place in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and featured such speakers as Nancy Ramsay, Brite Divinity School; Richard Benson and Sr. Leanne Hubbard, St. John's Seminary (CA); and Alvin Padilla, Boston Campus, Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary.

New directions

ATS has now begun the implementation of a new cycle of grant-funded work under the direction of the Committee on Race and Ethnicity. The work begins this fall with a conference on Preparing for 2040: Enhancing Capacity to Educate and Minister in a Multiracial World.

Background

In an August 2008 report presented by the Brookings Institution, William H. Frey, senior fellow in the Metropolitan Policy Program, forwarded the following prediction:

The Census Bureau's new projections through 2050 portend a more accelerated

transformation of the nation's population on race-ethnic dimensions than was previously supposed. These new projections show that the minority majority tipping point—the year when the white population dips to below half of the total—will occur in 2042, eight years sooner than in the Bureau's projections just four years ago.

While the number is different in Canada, the direction is the same. North American demographics are changing much faster than was anticipated a decade ago when ATS began the current cycle of work on race and ethnicity. The missional future of theological schools rests, in part, in their attending to this major demographic transition. As a result, ATS is undertaking a four-year effort to enhance the capacity of ATS schools to educate racial/ethnic and white students for ministry in a multiracial context. Enhancing capacity of schools in any area requires institutional leadership and allegiance and takes institutional effort over time. During the next four years, ATS will work with teams from a minimum of thirty-six schools on enhancing institutional capacity to educate for ministry in a multiracial world.

Goals

During the past decade, ATS has worked with racial/ethnic faculty and administrators to support their work and with a number of historically white institutions on issues related to employment and support for racial/ethnic faculty and administrators. Attention is now turning to education, with the following goals for this series of conferences:

1. Institutional leaders will be supported in their efforts to increase the capacity of schools to educate students for ministry in a multiracial world.
2. Schools will develop increased educational skill in their efforts with racial/ethnic students, with particular attention to the ministry contexts in which they will serve (including predominantly racial/ethnic settings, multiracial settings, and predominantly white settings).

COMMITTEE REPORTS

3. Schools will develop increased educational skill in working with white students to increase their ability to work in transracial ministry settings.

Conference design

ATS will invite four cohorts of nine schools each to participate in a series of two conferences and engage in some institutional work between them. Each cohort will consist of a team of three persons from each school, which must include the president and/or dean. The initial conference will have two major elements. The first will be content presentations about shifting demographic realities and effective strategies used in other institutions. The second will be work with a coach on the analysis of individual institutional contexts and goals and development of a *process* to address diversity within individual institutions. Potential points of entry to these process discussions include faculty culture, teaching and learning, or understanding educational efforts in the contexts of race and ethnicity and international student presence. Each school team will identify an area of work that

holds greatest promise, develop an action plan, and pursue that plan following the meeting. Each cohort of schools will then meet again two years after the first meeting to assess how the work is proceeding and explore other relevant issues. One coach will work with three schools and will initiate contact before the first meeting, between the first and second meetings, and following the second meeting. As the teams begin to develop strategies, ATS will develop ways to make their learning available to other schools.

In October 2009, ATS hosted its first CORE consultation on Preparing for 2040. A second conference was held in March 2010.

Members of the CORE Committee for this biennium were as follows: Peter Cha (Trinity Evangelical Divinity School), Ekron Chen (Logos Evangelical Seminary), Sharon Watson-Fluker (The Fund for Theological Education), Raul Gomez (Sacred Heart School of Theology), Oliver McMahan (Church of God Theological Seminary), and Jeanette Rodriguez (Seattle University School of Theology and Ministry).

Report on Women in Leadership in Theological Education

In October 2008, the Women in Leadership committee hosted its annual fall seminar in Pittsburgh. This event—one in a sequence of annual seminars ATS hosts each fall for women faculty and administrators—was aimed at achieving three results: (1) the development of enhanced leadership skills, (2) the establishment of relationships with other women leaders in theological education, and (3) the creation of personal leadership curriculums. Themed *Women Exploring their Future in Theological Education Leadership*, the 2008 seminar combined worship, plenaries, small groups, mentoring, and workshops. The majority of the seminar time engaged participants in small groups, mentoring, and workshops. Participants were asked in advance to prepare a one-page leadership development curriculum. At the seminar, they reflected on the curriculum in small groups guided by an experienced facilitator.

The March 2009 retreat for women presidents and deans, *Leading in Financially Stressful Times: Financial Order Out of Chaos*, was held in conjunction with the 2009 Chief Academic Officers Society gathering in San Antonio, Texas. With the recent economic downturn, financial stress characterizes all ATS schools to some degree and in some cases elevates the school's situation to crisis level. This retreat offered participants the opportunity to hear stories of how some women presidents and deans representing a variety of schools addressed this challenge.

Marsha Foster Boyd, president of Ecumenical Theological Seminary, shared her thoughts in an opening plenary titled "Financial Leadership at a Relatively New Interdenominational Free-Standing Theological School." Laura Balas, principal of St. Andrew's College, followed with a presentation titled "Financial Leadership at a Historic Denominational Theological School." Anne Yardley, acting dean at Drew University Theological School, closed with "Financial Leadership at a University-Related Theological School." Between plenary presentations, women were invited to share their stories in small groups of what supported and/or impeded their leadership.

Members of the WIL Committee for this biennium were as follows: Anabel C. Proffitt, chair (Lancaster Theological Seminary), Barbara Austin-Lucas (Alliance

Theological Seminary), Sandra Beardsall (St. Andrews College), Maxine Clark Beach (Drew University Theological School), Loida I. Martell-Otero (Palmer Theological Seminary), M. Beth McCutcheon (Knox College), Angela Senander (Washington Theological Union), Catherine Stonehouse (Asbury Theological Seminary), and Barbara Brown Zikmund (Research Project Director).

Women in Leadership research project

Women in Leadership in Theological Education has been an area of work for The Association of Theological Schools since 1997 and a targeted area of work since 2000, when ATS began identifying areas for concerted programmatic attention. The number of women faculty and senior administrators in theological education is growing, although the percentage of women faculty and administrators (27.6 percent) remains smaller than the percentage of women students (36 percent). While respecting differences in theological positions among ATS schools regarding the role of women in religious leadership, ATS seeks to provide critical resources to address the changes occurring as a function of the growing number of women faculty and administrators.

In 2005 ATS received a grant from the Carpenter Foundation that is being used to underwrite the costs of research related to women's leadership in theological education. This research was designed to produce insights to guide the future work of ATS in its efforts to support the professional development of women in theological education, enhance the capacity of theological schools to utilize the gifts and abilities of women faculty and administrators, and inform educational programs for women students.

The research project was completed in 2009 and focused upon women who hold senior leadership positions in ATS schools. Members of the ATS Women in Leadership Advisory Committee conducted structured telephone interviews with approximately eighty-five past and present chief administrative and chief academic officers. These interviews provided depth, texture, and perspective on the more global findings of recent Auburn faculty and administrator survey research. The

COMMITTEE REPORTS

sample of women being interviewed comes from approximately eighty schools.

The results of the research are being used as the basis for a Women in Leadership Research Summit and an issue of the ATS journal, *Theological Education*. ATS will also disseminate the research findings at meetings of chief academic officers, presidents, student services personnel, and other educational venues when ATS convenes faculty and administrators. The findings and various

event-related and publication dissemination strategies will provide ATS schools with resources and information to help them become more effective employers of women, benefit from women's leadership, enhance the satisfaction of women administrators and faculty, and provide critical information to strengthen the theological education of female students.

Barbara Brown Zikmund

Women in Leadership Research Project Director

Leadership Education Events in the 2008–2010 Biennium

CORE Consultation B:

Building Multiracial Employment Capacity

Participants = 37
Pittsburgh, PA
September 26–28, 2008

WIL Seminar

Participants = 56
Pittsburgh, PA
October 3–5, 2008

CFO Conference

Participants = 74
Savannah, GA
November 20–22, 2008

Presidential Leadership Intensive Week

Participants = 34
Santa Fe, NM
December 7–11, 2008

New Presidents Seminar

Participants = 13
San Antonio, TX
January 21–23, 2009

DIAP

Participants = 78
New Orleans, LA
February 5–7, 2009

CAOS Conference

Participants = 75
San Antonio, TX
March 19–21, 2009

WIL Retreat

Participants = 20
San Antonio, TX
March 21–22, 2009

CORE Consultation C:

Building Multiracial Educational Capacity

Participants = 54
Pittsburgh, PA
March 27–29, 2009

SPAN Conference

Participants = 75
San Diego, CA
April 23–25, 2009

CORE Consultation: Preparing for 2040

Participants = 32
Pittsburgh, PA
October 9–11, 2009

WIL Summit

Participants = 38
Pittsburgh, PA
October 23–25, 2009

CFO Conference

Participants = 70
Scottsdale, AZ
November 19–21, 2009

WIL Consultation For Presidents

Participants = 12
Santa Fe, NM
December 5–6, 2009

Presidential Leadership Intensive Week

Participants = 35
Santa Fe, NM
December 6–10, 2009

New Presidents Seminar

Participants = 11
New Orleans, LA
January 21–23, 2010

DIAP Conference

Participants = 87
Atlanta, GA
February 24–26, 2010

CORE Consultation: Preparing for 2040

Participants = 23
Pittsburgh, PA
March 19–21, 2010

SPAN Conference

Participants = 83
Chicago, IL
April 14–16, 2010

CAOS Conference

Participants = TBD
Montreal, QC
June 22, 2010

Report of the Faculty Development Advisory Committee

The Faculty Development Advisory Committee serves faculty of the Association by advising the director, faculty development and initiatives in theological education. The committee discusses faculty development initiatives, reviews evaluations of current and new faculty development initiatives, and provides insight and ideas for future ATS work in the area of faculty development.

The committee began its work with a meeting in Chicago on November 17, 2008. At that meeting, the committee was introduced to the scope of its work, reviewed the plans for ATS work in faculty development, and gave input toward the shaping of current and future programs. The committee continued its work through conference calls on March 16, 2009; November 3, 2009; and March 30, 2010.

During this biennium, a total of eleven events involved about 350 faculty members. The committee monitored the work through review of participant evaluations of the events. The faculty development events all emphasize the importance of faculty members understanding and embracing their role as *theological educators* serving the full range of needs within theological schools, rather than merely specialists in particular academic disciplines. Other important topics for ongoing discussion and emphasis are the rapid and significant *changes* experienced by many faculty members in their institutions; the ecology of institutions that support their schools and employ their graduates, as well as within their own work; the impact on faculty of the *financial stress* in schools; the pattern of *declining enrollment* in theological schools; the crucial role of *deans* in faculty development; and faculty workload.

Two roundtable seminars for newly appointed faculty were held this biennium. Nominated by their academic deans, participants heard from more experienced assistant professors and associate professors about their experiences in their own schools and how they have learned to survive and thrive as theological educators. Academic deans also gave presentations about their support of and expectations for new faculty. In 2008 forty-nine

attended the meeting in Chicago. In 2009 the meeting in Pittsburgh had thirty-three participants.

The first roundtable seminar for mid-career faculty was held in Pittsburgh in March 2010. Participants heard from senior professors about their post-tenure adjustments in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. They also reflected together on their own experiences and what it means to emerge into leadership roles within their schools. Forty-one faculty members attended the event. A preseminar for mid-career women faculty was attended by seventeen.

The Association hosted a presentation and reception at the meeting of the American Academy of Religion in November 2009 in Montreal. The work of E. Brooks Holifield as a theological educator was recognized and celebrated. Approximately forty people attended the presentation by Holifield, titled "History, Seminary, and Vocation," which was followed by a reception.

The Faculty Vocation and Governance Consultation brought together participants from consultations in 2006 and 2007 whose schools had subsequently received minigrants to pursue questions of faculty vocation and governance within their institutions. Representatives from the twenty schools were given the opportunity to share what they had learned with participants from other schools in small group sessions and plenaries. Plenary speakers were "consultation faculty" G. Douglass Lewis, Rebekah Burch Basinger, and David Tiede. In addition, Daniel Aleshire spoke on "Governing the Future: Governance and the Future of Theological Education." The work of the project is presented in an issue of *Theological Education* (Volume 44, number 2, Spring 2009).

Members of the Faculty Development Advisory Committee for this biennium were Elizabeth Conde-Frazier (Claremont School of Theology), Sean Lucas (Covenant Theological Seminary), Sharon Tan (United Theological Seminary of the Twin Cities), Nancy Ramsay (Brite Divinity School at Texas Christian University), Thomas Walters (St. Meinrad School of Theology), and David MacLachlan (Atlantic School of Theology).

Report of the Advisory Committee of the Henry Luce III Fellows in Theology Program

The Henry Luce III Fellows in Theology program is designed to encourage research emphasizing the interdisciplinary character of theological scholarship and education as well as their ability to influence the academy, the church, and the wider society. Since its inception in 1994, it has provided grants for up to six or seven Fellows per year, each to conduct year-long research in one of several areas of theological inquiry. In addition, Fellows present their findings at a yearly conference and submit them for publication in academic and popular theological journals and other appropriate venues.

The categories of research for the 2009–2010 and 2010–2011 Fellows are as follows: *Bible and the Church, Christianity and Contemporary Culture, Christianity and World Religions/World Christianity, Constructive Theology, History of Christianity and the Church Today, and Ministry and Practice of Communities of Faith*. Publicity materials were distributed to all accredited and candidate for accreditation member school faculties. Soon after they are selected, the new Fellows meet at the Luce Foundation offices in New York for an orientation to the program.

The Henry Luce III Fellows in Theology

2009–2010 Henry Luce III Fellows in Theology

J. Matthew Ashley	University of Notre Dame Department of Theology <i>Telling the Universe Story/ies: Christian Theology and Scientific Narratives of Origin</i>
Randall Charles Bailey	Interdenominational Theological Center <i>A Biblical Model for Promoting Dialogues in Churches among Diverse Theologies</i>
S. Mark Heim	Andover Newton Theological School <i>No Handle on the Cross: Muslim and Buddhist Insights on Atonement</i>
Mia M. Mochizuki	Jesuit School of Theology of Santa Clara University and Graduate Theological Union <i>The Netherlandish Print Abroad, 1543–1639: Art, Religion and Economics in the Early Modern World</i>
Barbara R. Rossing	Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago <i>Nor Any Scorching Heat: Apocalypse, Ecology, and the Crisis of Global Warming</i>
Grant Wacker	Duke University Divinity School <i>Billy Graham's America</i>

2010–2011 Henry Luce III Fellows in Theology

John R. Bowlin	Princeton Theological Seminary <i>Counting Virtues: The Difference that Transcendence Makes</i>
Francis Xavier Clooney	Harvard University Divinity School <i>When God is Absent: Toward a Theo-Dramatic Reading of Religious Diversity</i>
Linda A. Mercadante	Methodist Theological School in Ohio <i>Unfettered Belief, Untethered Practice: Thinking Theologically about 'Spiritual but not Religious'</i>
Mary Clark Moschella	Wesley Theological Seminary <i>Anatomy of Joy: A Pastoral Theological Call for Joy in the Ministry and in Life</i>
Carol A. Newsom	Candler School of Theology of Emory University <i>Constructions of Good and Evil in Biblical and Early Postbiblical Literature</i>
Kathryn Tanner	University of Chicago Divinity School <i>Grace and Gambling</i>

2008 and 2009 Henry Luce III Fellows in Theology Conferences

The fourteenth annual Henry Luce III Fellows in Theology Conference was held in November 2008, at the Renaissance Hotel in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. The 2007–2008 Luce Fellows presented papers based on their year of research. Convening responses to the Fellows' presentations were Elizabeth A. Castelli, Barnard College at Columbia University (for Jennifer Wright Knust, Boston University School of Theology); Brian E. Daley, University of Notre Dame Department of Theology (for Lewis O. Ayres, Candler School of Theology of Emory University); Thomas G. Guarino, Immaculate Conception Seminary Seton Hall University (for Hans Boersma, Regent College; Mark D. Jordan, Emory University Department of Religion (for Amy M. Hollywood, Harvard University Divinity School); Douglas F. Ottati, Davidson College (for William Patrick Brown, Columbia Theological Seminary); Don E. Saliers, Candler School of Theology of Emory University (for Mark S. Burrows, Andover Newton Theological School); and Sondra Ely Wheeler, Wesley Theological Seminary (for Maura A. Ryan, University of Notre Dame). D. Bruce Hindmarsh (Regent College) was the chaplain. Preceding the conference was a morning meeting with new Fellows (class of 2008–2009).

The fifteenth annual Henry Luce III Fellows in Theology Conference was held in October 2009, at the Renaissance Hotel in Pittsburgh. The 2008–2009 Luce Fellows presented papers based on their

year of research. Convening responses to the Fellows' presentations were Claudia V. Camp, Texas Christian University Department of Religion (for Carole R. Fontaine, Andover Newton Theological School); Keith J. Egan, Saint Mary's College and University of Notre Dame (for Elizabeth Newman, Baptist Theological Seminary at Richmond); Anne Marie Reijnen, Faculteit voor Protestantse Godgeleerdheid (Brussel) and Institut Protestant de Théologie (Paris) (for Margot E. Fassler, Yale University Divinity School); Sandra M. Schneiders, Jesuit School of Theology of Santa Clara University (for Douglas E. Burton-Christie, Loyola Marymount University Department of Theological Studies); David H. Smith, Yale University Biomedical Ethics Center (for Allen D. Verhey, Duke University Divinity School); Richard Fox Young, Princeton Theological Seminary (for Arun Wayne Jones, Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary); Robin Darling Young, University of Notre Dame Department of Theology (for Demetrios S. Katos, Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology). Maura A. Ryan (University of Notre Dame Department of Theology) was the chaplain. Preceding the conference was a morning meeting with the new Luce Fellows (class of 2009–2010).

Members of the Advisory Committee for this biennium were Richard J. Mouw, chair, (Fuller Theological Seminary), Peter S. Hawkins (Boston University), Margaret M. Mitchell (University of Chicago Divinity School), Robert W. Pazmiño (Andover Newton Theological School), and Katarina Schuth (Saint Paul Seminary School of Divinity of The University of St. Thomas).

Report of the Selection Panel of the Lilly Theological Research Grants Program

The Lilly Theological Research Grants program, inaugurated in 1997, offers grants to aid theological scholarship and publication by faculty members at ATS accredited and candidate schools. The program provides support at varying levels for scholarship of the highest quality that contributes to theological education, informs the life of the church, develops a greater public voice for theology in society, collaborates with other academic disciplines, and offers new perspectives on Christianity in a pluralistic setting. Grant recipients participate in a yearly conference where they share ideas and nurture one another's research.

Perhaps now more than at any time in the program's history, there is a great need for highest level scholarship that speaks to the church and to broader publics. With the rise of religious violence, the increasing attention of the media to religious matters, and the need to inform both those who report on these issues and those who receive their reports, it is vital that theological educators speak

clearly and forcefully from within their faith traditions. The Lilly Research Grants program has provided essential assistance to scholars whose work is thoughtful, transformative, and rooted in the depths of their traditions and the human situation.

The program supports four types of grants: Faculty Fellowships, Theological Scholars Grants, Research Expense Grants, and Collaborative Research Grants. Faculty Fellowships offer \$30,000 in support of six faculty members per year who are on sabbatical. Theological Scholars Grants provide up to \$12,000 each in support of six faculty members who are not on a formal research leave. Research Expense Grants provide up to \$5,000 each in support of six faculty members. Collaborative Research Grants provide up to \$16,000 for collaborative projects of two or more scholars. All of these grants support scholars engaged in well-designed and significant research projects in theological scholarship and education.

2009–2010 Lilly Grant Recipients

Faculty Fellowships

Joseph Patrick Chinnici	Franciscan School of Theology <i>Going Public, Becoming Global: American Catholicism and Social Change, 1945–1996</i>
Emmanuel Yartekwei Lartey	Candler School of Theology of Emory University <i>Postcolonializing God: A Postcolonial African Pastoral Theology</i>
Ian Christopher Levy	Lexington Theological Seminary <i>Recovering the Medieval Paul: A Comprehensive Theological Vision for the Church</i>
Eugen J. Pentiu	Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology <i>The Old Testament in Eastern Orthodox Tradition</i>
Todd David Whitmore	University of Notre Dame Department of Theology <i>Crossing the Road: An Anthropological Theology of Risk and Hope</i>
Seung Ai Yang	Chicago Theological Seminary <i>Crossing Boundaries, Building Community: Matthean Discipleship Discourse as a Map for 21st Century American Church and Society</i>
Mitzi Jane Smith	Ashland Theological Seminary (Detroit) <i>Good Girls, Bad Girls, and Violence: The Construction of Virgins, Concubines, and Whores in Ancient Literature</i>

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Theological Scholars Grants

- James K. Bruckner North Park Theological Seminary
Human Health and Ancient Narrative: The Old Testament as a Shaping Resource for Health Care Vocations
- Lois M. Farag Luther Seminary
The Balance of the Heart: Desert Spirituality for Twenty-First Century Christians
- Cynthia Holder Rich Western Theological Seminary
Holistic Faith-based Care for Mental Illness: A Case Study from Madagascar
- Tat-siong Benny Liew Pacific School of Religion
Changing Tools: Writing a Textbook for Teaching Asian American Biblical Interpretation from the Beginning
- Michelle Sungshin Lim New York Theological Seminary
Journey of Korean Christian Fore-Mothers Spiritual Formation from 1898 to 1945: Painting a Theology of Radical Hospitality
- Robert Joseph Priest Trinity Evangelical Divinity School of Trinity International University
Being There: Short-Term Missions and Human Need

Research Expense Grants

- Thomas Cattoi Jesuit School of Santa Clara University
Theodore the Studite: Ecumenical and Inter-religious Perspectives
- Monica A. Coleman Claremont School of Theology
Spirit Possession in African Traditional Religions and Pentecostal Christianity
- Pamela D. Couture Saint Paul School of Theology
"Where's the Peace to Keep?" Peacemaking Practices of the Congolese of Kamina, Democratic Republic of Congo
- Robert C. Fennell Atlantic School of Theology
The Reformers and Regula Fidei: How the Rule of Faith Governed Biblical Interpretation in the Era of the European Reformations
- Michael J. Kruger Reformed Theological Seminary
Authenticating Canon: Theological and Epistemological Approaches to Establishing the Boundaries of the New Testament Writings
- Gerald L. Stevens New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary
Investigating Holdings and Historical Artifacts of Selected Museums of Western Turkey for Their Pedagogical and Illustrative Value in the Classroom for New Testament Backgrounds
- Wolfgang Vondey Regent University School of Divinity
Beyond Pentecostalism: The Task of Global Theology in the Twenty-First Century

Collaborative Research Grants (project leader is listed first)

- Duane R. Bidwell Phillips Theological Seminary, and
Donald L. Batsky, MD The Ohio State University College of Medicine/Nationwide Children's Hospital
Children's Accounts of Hope in Chronic Illness
- Wyndy Corbin Reuschling Ashland Theological Seminary,
Jeannine K. Brown Bethel Theological Seminary, and
Carla M. Dahl Bethel University Graduate School
Becoming Whole and Holy Persons: Interdisciplinary Approaches to Teaching and Learning in Classrooms and Congregations
- Harry O. Maier Vancouver School of Theology, and
Robert A. Daum University of British Columbia
Disturbing Images: Reading Civic Ideals in Early Judaism and Ancient Christianity against the Backdrop of Roman Imperial Iconography
- Martha E. Stortz Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary, and
Lisa Fullam Jesuit School of Theology of Santa Clara University
The Progress of Pilgrimage: Post-Modern Forms of an Ancient Practice

2010–2011 Lilly Grant Recipients***Faculty Fellowships***

Bill T. Arnold	Asbury Theological Seminary <i>The Singularity of God in the Hebrew Scriptures: Foundations for Interfaith Dialogue</i>
David Arthur deSilva	Ashland Theological Seminary <i>Neither Tamil Nor Sinhalese: Reading Galatians From a Sri Lankan Context</i>
Forough Jahanbakhsh	Queen's Theological College <i>The Theological Aspect of Reformed Islam</i>
Dirk G. Lange	Luther Seminary <i>Rethinking Communal Prayer: A Baptismal Discipline</i>
Joel Marcus LeMon	Candler School of Theology of Emory University <i>Picturing Divine Violence in the Psalms</i>
Cynthia Diane Moe-Lobeda	Seattle University School of Theology and Ministry <i>Christian Ethics for the "Uncreators": Morality in the Face of Systemic Evil</i>
Gale A. Yee	Episcopal Divinity School <i>Open Your Hand to the Poor: The Bible and the Millennium Development Goals</i>

Theological Scholars Grants

Max J. Lee	North Park Theological Seminary <i>Greco-Roman Philosophy of Mind and Paul: Mapping the Apostle's Moral Landscape</i>
B. Diane Lipsett	Wake Forest University Divinity School <i>Ancient Interpreters of Matthew's Parables: Rereading Realism, Rewriting Metaphor</i>
Leo G. Perdue	Brite Divinity School at Texas Christian University <i>Subverting Empires: Postcolonial Biblical Interpretation and Contemporary China</i>

Research Expense Grants

Michael B. Aune	Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary <i>All for Love: Conversations about Liturgy and Christology in the Early Twenty-first Century</i>
Jennifer Ryan Ayres	McCormick Theological Seminary <i>Grounded: Embodied Christian Practices of Food, Earth, and Justice</i>
Mark D. Baker	Mennonite Brethren Biblical Seminary <i>Contextualizing Galatians in Peru</i>
Russell William Dalton	Brite Divinity School at Texas Christian University <i>Children's Bibles in the United States: Adapting the Bible for Youth, 1776 to Today</i>
Wil Gafney	Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia <i>Translating God, Translating God's Words: A Womanist and Feminist Biblical Hebrew Translation Primer</i>
Gordon L. Heath	McMaster Divinity College <i>Baptists and the South African War, 1899–1902: A View from Five Countries</i>
Jaroslav Z. Skira	Regis College <i>The Second Vatican Council Diaries of the Ukrainian Eastern Catholic Metropolitan Maxim Hermaniuk</i>

Collaborative Research Grants (project leader is listed first)

Hans Boersma	Regent College, and
Matthew Levering	University of Dayton <i>Heaven on Earth? Exploring Catholic-Evangelical Dialogue</i>
Terry Charles Muck	Asbury Theological Seminary,
Frances S. Adeney	Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary, and
Arvind Sharma	McGill University <i>Participatory Mission Theology</i>

Brooks Schramm
Kirsi Stjerna

Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, and
Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg
Martin Luther, the Bible, and the Jewish People

2009 and 2010 Lilly Conferences on Theological Research

The 2009 and 2010 annual Lilly Conferences on Theological Research were held in Pittsburgh. At each conference, those currently holding Lilly Theological Research Grants attended, along with invited speakers and selected applicants from the ATS New Faculty Seminars. The purpose of each conference was for current grantholders to discuss the results of their research and for participants to examine various elements of the craft of theological research. Carey Newman, director of the Baylor University Press, and Cheryl Tupper, program director at The Arthur Vining Davis Foundations, presented at both conferences, respectively, on skills of academic book publishing and grantseeking for theological researchers.

At the 2009 conference, Brian Daley, University of Notre Dame Department of Theology, spoke on "Crafting Research that will Contribute to Theological Education"; Cheryl Sanders, Howard University School of Divinity, spoke on "Conducting Effective Research Among Other Things"; and Nancy Ammerman, Boston University School of Theology,

spoke on "Who is it for? The Publics of Theological Research." The conference concluded with an open forum to gather ideas and recommendations for the faculty development work of ATS.

At the 2010 conference, Marion Taylor, Wycliffe College, opened the conference with an address on "Conducting Effective Research Among Other Things;" Joel B. Green, Fuller Theological Seminary, spoke on "Crafting Research that will Contribute to Theological Education;" and Miguel De La Torre, Iliff School of Theology, spoke on "Who is it for? The Publics of Theological Research." The conference concluded with an open forum to gather ideas and recommendations for the faculty development work of ATS.

Members of the Selection Panel during this biennium were Mary C. Boys, chair (Union Theological Seminary), Joel G. Green (Fuller Theological Seminary), Dwight N. Hopkins (University of Chicago Divinity School), Cheryl Bridges Johns (Pentecostal Theological Seminary), Thomas J. Massaro (Boston College School of Theology and Ministry), and Joseph G. Schner (Regis College).

Report of the Editorial Board for *Theological Education*

The full Editorial Board met at the ATS office in September 2008. Subsequent meetings were conducted by conference call, and other business was conducted by email.

In addition to providing review of sixteen unsolicited articles for *Theological Education*, the board generated ideas for developing the journal into a more engaging publication and integrating it with other ATS communications by encouraging submission of more unsolicited articles; presenting divergent opinions through point-counterpoint formats; updating the index to past issues; and promoting cross-readership among *Colloquy*, *Theological Education*, and the ATS Web site. Four issues of the journal were published during the biennium.

Volume 44, number 1, reported on a four-year Lilly Endowment funded project, Theological Schools and the Church. The issue features nine articles that contain reports and reflections on the work of a twenty-one-member task force that represented the perspectives of the different ecclesial families represented in ATS as well as the distinctive circumstances of theological education in Canada and the United States. It concludes with a set of recommendations that were presented to the ATS membership at the 2008 Biennial Meeting.

Volume 44, number 2, reports on the Faculty Vocation and Governance project, which hosted thirty-two schools in consultations in 2006 and 2007, from which twenty schools requested minigrants to work on issues at their institutions and then convene in a final consultation in October 2008. The issue contains reports from six of the participating schools as well as three articles by consulta-

tion faculty, a point-counterpoint conversation by two participants in the consultation, an article by Daniel Aleshire on four key disciplines for future success in governance, an essay reprinted from *The Scope of Our Art: The Vocation of the Theological Teacher*, and a reprint of a relevant article from the very first volume of *Theological Education*.

Volume 45, number 1, surveys the landscape of theological education in the United States and Canada and reports on a variety of events, experiences, and projects related to the Association's work on race and ethnicity. It begins with a survey of work by the Association and its member schools since the middle of the twentieth century and an affirmation of the value of race and ethnicity in education, features five articles from different perspectives, and concludes with a look forward to future work planned by ATS.

Volume 45, number 2, in process at this writing, will report on the findings of a project funded by the Carpenter Foundation on Women in Leadership. The project, which included interviews with eighty-five past and present female chief administrative and chief academic officers, generated an expansive research study, a comparative study conducted by Auburn Seminary, and six responses to the findings of the research study.

Members of the Editorial Board were: Barbara Bowe, chair (Catholic Theological Union), Efrain Agosto (Hartford Seminary), Michael Attridge (University of St. Michael's College), Stephen Crocco (Princeton Theological Seminary), Joyce Mercer (Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary), and Phil Zylla (McMaster Divinity College).

* Barbara Bowe resigned from the committee in October 2009 and passed away in March 2010.

Report of the Advisory Committee for Student Resources

The Advisory Committee for Student Resources meets annually to discuss the work in Student Information at ATS. The primary task of this committee during this two-year period was to advance the major developments begun during the prior biennium and to troubleshoot patterns of nonusage of instruments among some member schools. In 2009 the committee began meeting via WebEx, an effective compromise for non-Biennial years designed to meet both scheduling and financial considerations.

Student Information – ESQ, GSQ, AQ

Paper copies of the Entering Student Questionnaire (ESQ) and Graduating Student Questionnaire (GSQ) were entirely phased out July 1, 2008, as the program migrated online. The number of new schools electing to use the instruments balanced the schools choosing not to continue online, erasing the anticipated 10 percent attrition. Indeed, the overall number of schools using the instruments has experienced an increase as shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1 Number of students and schools using the ESQ/GSQ instruments

Academic Year	ESQ students/schools	GSQ students/schools
2006–07	7,198/138	5,118/131
2007–08	6,616/142	4,937/137
2008–09	6,315/144	5,426/149
2009–10	6,077/156	Not available yet

The increase in usage—now at about 60 percent of all member schools—is likely due to both the availability of the instrument online and increased emphasis on data collection for institutional assessment.

The Alumni/ae Questionnaire (AQ), launched in summer 2008, was designed to be administered to graduates from five to ten years out of school. As of May 2010, seventy schools had requested user names and passwords for the AQ, and twenty-five of those schools had completed the survey process. Denominational offices are also seeing the usefulness of the data as they assess their seminar-

ies and evaluate seminary programs to prepare congregational ministers.

In September 2009, an electronic survey was sent to deans at schools not currently using any of the questionnaires to determine their reasons for nonusage. A number of nonuser schools reported their use of other data collection instruments; among other schools, however, turnover in personnel and lack of familiarity with the instruments figured prominently, as did the surveys’ inability to collect the data some schools need. In response to this, the Student Information office will increase awareness and access through ATS events and publications and provide more proactive support to new users.

In light of an increased accrediting emphasis on institutional and program assessment, workshops now focus heavily on the uses of the instruments for assessment and connections between the data and the Commission standards. Despite financial stresses, attendance at workshops has held at previous levels, and evaluations consistently report effectiveness ratings in excess of the 80 percent benchmark.

In light of the need for ongoing training to support the use of the instruments, a trial Webinar was offered in April 2010 to review the additional questions function on the surveys. Thirty-six schools—over

20 percent of the user population—attended the event. The success of the experiment supports the further development of more short, focused, and easily accessed training events for coordinators.

Profiles of Ministry

The committee also oversaw the use and support of the Profiles of Ministry (POM) instrument, designed to assist programs in investigating student ministerial perceptions and preferences. During the 2008–10 biennium, the following developments occurred within the program:

- The field observation and interview components of the instrument were made available in an online format.
- The aesthetics and reporting format of the profiles were improved.
- Online webinars and consultations to support the use of the instruments were offered.
- Contract coders for the interview instruments were tested and recertified.

Despite the impact of the economy in the use of the instrument in some institutions, interest in the instrument remained vigorous. The number of profiles administered during 2008–09 declined sharply, due to the discontinuation of the instrument at two of the largest schools, but numbers began to rebound in 2009–10 as more smaller schools signed on to use the instrument as shown in Table 2.

Workshops designed to introduce new users to the administration and use of the POM instruments were held in October 2008, April 2009, and March 2010. The first Interpretation

Workshop for seasoned users, held as an online Webinar in February 2010, was well-received, with multiple representatives from a dozen school programs in attendance. A number of attendees reported that they would not have had the resources to be present at a face-to-face event. The success of the Webinar experiment has paved the way for additional and more creative uses of technology in supporting POM use among member schools.

What we learned

The primary goal in Student Information is to increase access to instruments and resources, toward the end of greater institutional assessment and well-being. Positive event evaluations and the increased use of the instruments, as well as increased references to the instruments and data in institutional self-study reports, point to success in meeting this goal. The evaluations have also directed some of the programming changes approved by the current committee. Furthermore, an increased call from schools for help with institutional assessment has prompted Student Information presentations at Leadership Education and Accrediting events, including SPAN, CAOS, and the Self-Study Workshop.

TABLE 2 Number of students and schools using the POM instruments

Academic Year	Stage I Students/Schools	Stage II Students/Schools
2006–07	1706/41	261/15
2007–08	1723/38	728/18
2008–09	863/34	287/12
2009–10	1049/39	517/16

Members of the committee during this biennium were Tracy Hartman (Baptist Theological School of Richmond), chair; Polly Stone (Reformed Theological Seminary); Alain Silverio (Union Theological Seminary); Tom Fuller (Beeson Divinity School); David Neelands (Toronto School of Theology); and Joanne Cahoon (Washington Theological Union), who resigned from the committee in fall 2009 due to her departure from WTU and whose position remained unfilled.

Report on the Institutional Viability and Financially Stressed Schools Program

This program with funding from Lilly Endowment is designed to address the financial crisis faced by theological schools and the larger “industry” of theological education. It seeks to gather wisdom, both from those involved in theological education and from those with relevant expertise beyond the community of theological schools. Working intensively with fifteen schools selected to represent the variety of schools in the Association, the program seeks to explore new models that will help theological schools become financially sustainable in the future. Workable models will be shared with the larger community of theological schools in order to broaden the impact of the project.

From the earliest planning stages, this project has involved a close partnership between the Association and the Auburn Center for the Study of Theological Education. The project seeks both to benefit from the expertise of ATS and Auburn staff and to expand the reach and capacity of the two organizations.

The initial activity of the project was to launch revision of the Strategic Information Report. The SIR gathers data from the schools’ Annual Report Forms and presents it in usable form to the schools. The goal is to have the revised SIR available to the schools in 2011.

In April and May 2009 the ATS staff surveyed the chief financial officers of the Association’s 251 member schools. The survey provided very important data about the nature and depth of the financial crisis facing the schools as well as their immediate and longer term plans to address the crisis. On May 14 and 15, 2009, the project brought

together a group of experts from within the theological school community to explore the nature of the financial crisis facing the schools and to gather the best thinking of the group as a baseline for moving forward with the project. At this “intelligence gathering” meeting, participants shared their best thinking about the economic downturn, clarified the circumstances faced by the schools, explored responses being tried by the schools, and shared ideas about how to make the project as effective as possible.

During summer 2009, ATS staff worked to select and recruit the five coaches for the project. Persons were selected who have expertise in higher education and finance but who are not theological education “insiders.” Their expertise will bring fresh insights and new perspectives to the challenges facing theological schools.

Following a request by the Association for letters of interest, fifteen schools were selected by the project steering committee for involvement in the project. Each school agreed to send its president, chief financial officer, and an appropriate member of its governing board to three intensive workshops scheduled for the project.

During summer and fall 2009, the Association offered a series of Webinars for the coaches and teams from the schools to orient them and inform them about circumstances in the larger world of theological education. Participants in the project gathered in Pittsburgh on February 11–13, 2010, for the project’s first peer group meeting. Additional meetings are scheduled for November 2010 and June 2011.

Report on the Christian Hospitality and Pastoral Practices Project

Through funding from the Henry Luce Foundation, the Association has begun a project on Christian Hospitality and Pastoral Practices. The growing religious pluralism in the United States and Canada demands that schools prepare their graduates with knowledge of other faiths and the wisdom to serve effectively. While other projects seek to enhance inter-religious dialogue or to develop theologies of world religions, the focus of this project is pastoral practice. The goal of the project is to enhance the ability of theological schools to prepare their graduates to exercise effective and faithful pastoral practices in contexts of religious pluralism.

The initial meeting of the project was held April 26–27, 2010, bringing together representatives from a variety of ATS schools to explore what is already being done and to identify best practices.

The project will employ writing teams from the three ecclesial families represented in the Association (mainline Protestant, evangelical Protestant, and Roman Catholic/Orthodox), meetings for conversation and discussion of position papers, publications in the Association's journal *Theological Education*, and minigrants to assist schools in their development of both curricular and extracurricular programs.

Summary Report of The Fund for Theological Education, Inc. for 2008 and 2009

The Fund for Theological Education (FTE) advocates excellence and diversity in pastoral ministry and theological scholarship. Through our initiatives, we enable gifted young people throughout the Christian community to explore and respond to God's calling in their lives. We seek to be a creative, informed catalyst for educational and faith communities in developing their own capacities to nurture men and women for the vocations of ministry and teaching. We also aim to awaken the larger community to the contributions of pastoral leaders and educators who act with faith, imagination, and courage to serve the common good.

FTE's mission is fourfold: (1) promoting and supporting ministry as a vocational choice among gifted young people from diverse backgrounds and those who influence them, (2) providing financial support and encouragement for racial and ethnic candidates in doctoral programs for the ministry or for teaching in theology, (3) establishing and maintaining relationships among multiple constituents to advocate for the vocation of ministry and teaching, and (4) achieving a broad base of funding support for operating expenses and endowment.

During 2008 and 2009, FTE accomplished these objectives through a variety of fellowships, events, and other initiatives.

Fellowships

Doctoral fellowships and programs

FTE annually assists approximately fifty gifted African American, Asian American, Native American, and Hispanic doctoral students enrolled full time in PhD or ThD programs in religion, biblical studies, or theology aspiring to teach and do research as faculty in theological schools. Doctoral Fellows, Dissertation Fellows, and North American Doctoral Fellows receive stipends ranging from \$5,000 to \$20,000, as well as the opportunity to participate in themed conferences, workshops on writing and mentoring, and professional meetings. In 2008 forty-five fellowships were awarded, and programs included a Doctoral Conference hosted by Candler School of Theology of Emory

University around the theme of *Next Generation Leaders: Voices and Vocations that Change the World*. In 2009, forty-four fellowships were awarded and program highlights included a conference at Vanderbilt University Divinity School themed *Religion, Social Justice and the Post-Civil Rights Era: The 21st Century Challenge*.

FTE engaged in recruitment events during 2008–2009 with the American Academy of Religion, the Society of Biblical Literature, the Society for the Study of Black Religion, Howard University Divinity School, New York Theological Seminary, Samuel DeWitt Proctor School of Theology at Virginia Union, and Union Theological Seminary. FTE staff also participated in approximately 150 individual meetings with students considering the PhD and produced two promotional DVDs: *The Call to Teach* and *Nurturing the Next Generation of Scholars*.

Since 1999, FTE has achieved measurable impacts toward improving diversity in the academy as follows:

- Four hundred and thirty-four fellowships have been awarded to 234 African American, Asian American, Native American, and Hispanic doctoral students.
- Ninety-one FTE Fellows have completed the dissertation. The students in FTE doctoral programs have a 98 percent retention rate, compared with a 50 percent attrition rate in doctoral programs nationally.
- Seventy-two (79%) are teaching in the academy, twenty-six of whom (36%) reported teaching in theological schools or seminaries over this period.
- Twenty-one percent of Fellows who have completed their degrees serve in the church or other nonprofit settings.

Ministry fellowships and programs

Four different fellowship programs—Undergraduate Fellows, Volunteers Exploring Vocation Fellows, Congregational Fellows, and Ministry Fellows—offer awards ranging from \$1,000 to \$10,000, as well as a network of support, to gifted undergraduate and seminary students who are

exploring or preparing for ministry in MDiv programs. FTE supported 118 Fellows in 2008 and 120 in 2009.

An annual conference on Excellence in Ministry meets at Candler School of Theology of Emory University. The theme for 2008 was *Next Generation Leaders: Voices and Vocations That Change the World* and for 2009 was *Becoming Rich Toward God: Pastoral Leadership and Economic Justice*. Other events during the biennium included the annual Congregational Leadership Intensive and the Closing Retreats attended by the Fellows who have completed their self-designed projects, along with numerous other conferences and retreats.

Over the last ten years, on average, more than 80 percent of Ministry Fellows have completed seminary, pursued ordination, and sought callings as pastors of local churches. Approximately 10 percent of the Fellows are unable to be ordained and serve as local church pastors; however, most of that number continue in service to the church after receiving the MDiv, either as campus ministers, teachers, or leaders in church-related institutions. Of the remaining 10 percent of Ministry Fellows, most have pursued PhD work in theology, biblical studies, and related fields.

Calling congregations

Through its Calling Congregations program, FTE is forming a national network of congregations and church-related organizations committed to nurturing the call to ministry among young people. Highlights of the program are listed below.

Notice Name & Nurture (NNN)

NNN is a four-day retreat for churches and church-related organizations with a desire to create a vocation-rich congregational culture from which young people are called to ministry. Twenty-two congregations (63 participants) attended three NNN events in Atlanta in 2008. In 2009 staff created a curriculum—around Vocation CARE practices—to pilot with six congregations.

Calling: A journal for leaders who nurture vocation

Calling is a quarterly online journal (www.thefund.org/ejournal). In 2008 the journal was updated, streamlining content, adding a podcast, and including more information about all aspects of the

project, highlighting upcoming events and links to other FTE resources. Five issues were published in 2009 with a readership of 827.

Grants to congregations

Grants to Congregations are offered semiannually and awarded through a competitive process in amounts from \$5,000 to \$12,000. In 2008 fifteen grants were made totaling more than \$136,000. In 2009 thirteen grants were made totaling more than \$134,000.

Calling Congregations Conference

The Calling Congregations Conference is held annually for congregations who wish to learn more and meet others who are committed in principle and practice to nurturing vocation. Participants represent congregations, judicatories, campus ministries, seminaries, and church-related organizations from across the United States and Canada with participants numbering eighty-nine in 2008 and ninety-four in 2009.

Research

Research to support Calling Congregations included a staff-written volume of four new profiles of congregations—*Cultures of Call: Exploring Vocational Habits and Practices in Congregations*—for use in engaging members in vocational discernment and in raising the possibility of ordained, pastoral ministry as a career choice, especially among young people. In addition, FTE announced a Scholar-in-Residence who will direct a book project, *Greenhouses of Hope*, which will offer ethnographic studies and systematic reflection by scholars on congregations who nurture vocation.

Relationship building

Through regional trips and outreach workshops during 2008, the four regional directors built a Calling Congregations network of 232 strong contacts that include church-related organizations, racial/ethnic congregations, and congregations of rural or mixed socioeconomic status. In 2009 the network added nearly 200 new contacts.

Volunteers Exploring Vocation (VEV)

FTE partners with fourteen faith-based organizations through which young adults offer a volunteer year of service and works to support the theological exploration of vocation among volunteers by building capacity within the organiza-

tions as well as hosting events for the volunteers themselves. Through these events, the volunteers learn about congregational ministry and theological education, practice discernment, and discover a community of support. During 2008 FTE established an office in Wheeling, West Virginia, for coordination of the VEV work. During 2008 more than 100 current and former volunteers attended VEV events, and grant commitments to volunteer organizations totaled \$299,000. In 2009, more than 130 current and former volunteers attended events, and grant commitments totaled nearly \$177,000.

Project Rising Sun: A leadership academy for the next generation of black church pastors

This project provides young African American pastors with resources to develop their capacities for excellent leadership for the black church through peer learning communities, periodic retreats, and coaching. The program's inaugural class consisted of twenty participants. In 2009 participants attended a one-day opening leadership retreat, *Leading from Within: Exploring Pastoral Identity and Leadership from the Inside Out*, an *Outward Bound* immersion experience, fifteen sessions of personal coaching, and regional peer groups meetings, and they completed collective action learning proposals.

Leading Generations Initiative (LGI)

In 2010 FTE launched a new program to more effectively network its 6,000 Fellows across current and

historical programs. In addition to networking with and among "alumni" through LGI, FTE continues to coordinate the Transition into Ministry Programs—two-year pastoral residency programs in congregations—on behalf of Lilly Endowment Inc.

FTE institutional support

Communications initiatives designed to increase awareness and support of FTE's activities focused on four priorities: leveraging electronic communications through use of social media tools, leveraging leadership assets through media placements and a new blog (FTE OnCall), evolving the FTE brand, and seeking new avenues to market fellowships and programs.

At the end of 2009, the endowment and reserve funds of FTE equal approximately \$4 million, a 20 percent decrease from two years ago due to the financial crisis.

Officers and Members of the Board of Trustees in this biennium include Gary V. Simpson (chair, December 2003–2010), David A. Nasby (vice chair, 2000–2008), Florida Smith Ellis (secretary/treasurer, current vice chair), Daniel Aleshire, Samuel Candler, Verlee Copeland, Trace Haythorn, John W. Kuykendall (2001–2009), Kita McVay, Jonathan Strandjord, Frederick Streets, John Wall (2005–2008), William D. Watley, and John Wieland (2006–2009).

The Reverend Dr. Trace Haythorn
President, The Fund for Theological Education



The Association of Theological Schools
The Commission on Accrediting

10 Summit Park Drive, Pittsburgh, PA 15275-1110
T: 412-788-6505 • F: 412-788-6510 • www.ats.edu