ATS Work through the Committee on Race and Ethnicity, 2000–2014

Daniel O. Aleshire and Deborah H. C. Gin
The Association of Theological Schools

Willie James Jennings
Yale University Divinity School

ABSTRACT: After 14 years of sustained effort surrounding the issue of race and ethnicity in theological education through the Committee on Race and Ethnicity (CORE), ATS paused programming in 2014–2015 to evaluate the impact of these efforts and to identify issues for future efforts. In this article, the authors summarize the program's history, share findings of a mixed-methods research effort, and make recommendations about strategies for future ATS programming and activities in this area.

Background

The work of the Committee on Race and Ethnicity in Theological Education has been evolving since its original appearance in 1978 as the Committee on Underrepresented Constituencies. The initiative began as an effort to encourage inclusiveness in institutional and educational standards. In the ensuing decades, it has responded to the changing needs of the communities it was intended to serve by expanding its scope and shifting its focus, from curricular change in the 1980s, to the lived experiences of racial/ethnic individuals in theological education in the 1990s, to institutional capacity building in the new millennium.[1]

1 For a brief summary of the 15-year review, see Janice Edwards-Armstrong and Eliza Smith Brown, "Committee on Race and Ethnicity completes 15 years of work," *Colloquy Online* (January/February 2016). For a more complete overview, see Janice Edwards-Armstrong, "CORE: An Evolving Initiative," *Theological Education 45,* no. 1 (2009): 71–76.

Summary of program activities 2000–2014

The programming of the past 14 years since the founding of CORE can be divided into three major units. The first involved an extensive range of conferences designed to support racial/ethnic faculty and administrators, with some attention to institutional capacity issues. The second cycle of programming focused on informational approaches to increase institutional capacity regarding race and ethnicity through educational conferences. The third cycle of work also focused on institutional capacity-building, but through a focus on strategic diversity planning.

First cycle: nurturing racial/ethnic faculty and administrators 2000–2005

Between 2000 and 2005, ATS hosted an extensive series of consultations and seminars with the intention to provide space for participants, mainly racial/ethnic faculty and administrators, to exchange stories of their experiences in predominantly white institutions. No programming on race and ethnicity had been attempted in more than a decade, and these early meetings were designed to identify issues of concern for racial/ethnic persons in ATS schools and reasons why some ATS schools had a greater percentage of racial/ethnic faculty and administrators than others as well as principles about institutional change evident among these schools and best practices concerning appointment and support for racial/ethnic faculty. Participants chronicled experiences of isolation, marginalization, and perceived lack of institutional support and identified recurring challenges in areas such as promotion and tenure, development of junior faculty, mentoring, visibility, and institutional hospitality. The results of these initial conferences led to the production of the *ATS Diversity Folio.*[2]

This cycle of work continued with the first of two cross-racial dialogues among African/African American and Hispanic/Latino(a) faculty and administrators in ATS schools. It continued with a series of two conferences for faculty and administrators from historically black theological schools, two conferences for Hispanic Latino/a faculty and administrators,

2 The portfolio, a collection of materials produced by ATS without copyright, contains essays, statistics, case studies, and other resources for use by ATS member schools. It is expected that the current study will produce new resources to supersede the *Diversity Portfolio.*

and two conferences for Asian/Asian North American faculty and administrators. This series of six conferences was designed to provide support and nurture for racial/ethnic faculty and administrators. In one way or another, all of them sought to provide a venue in which participants could engage in constructive dialogue about the contributions, challenges, and opportunities of constituents from each of these racial/ethnic groups and identify ways in which ATS programming can support these constituents. CORE also collaborated with the Women in Leadership program to sponsor a major conference for women of color.

Second cycle: informational capacity building 2006–2008

The second cycle saw a shift from individual care and support toward institutional learning and building capacity for diversity, inclusion, and excellence through information. In this segment, the Association provided racial/ethnic individuals with opportunities to explore the dynamics that influence their work in theological schools and strategies to cope with difficult institutional realities and to grow professionally. And for institutions, ATS hosted four events to share best practices for healthy, inclusive campus climates, employment, faculty development, and cross-racial dialogue.

The first event was jointly sponsored by ATS and The Fund for Theological Education (FTE)[3] and sought to identify successful strategies and best practices leading to racial/ethnic diversity among ATS institutions. Following this conference, ATS sponsored a series of three conferences, "Enhancing Ethnic Diversity in Theological Education," which focused on white privilege, employment of racial/ethnic faculty, and developing educational capacity for racial/ethnic students. Unlike the conferences in the first cycle of work, these conferences included white representatives from participating schools in addition to racial/ethnic constituents.

Although these conferences were evaluated positively by participants, there was little evidence that educational conferences contributed to institutional change. ATS had been working with other schools on developing skill in the assessment of student learning, and it was increasingly clear that information about assessment was an inadequate predictor of whether an institution was able to implement effective assessment strategies.

3 FTE is now known as the Forum for Theological Exploration.

Information-focused conferences were replaced with workshops in which teams from schools worked with coaches on very practical issues.

Mid-point evaluation 2008–2009

At the conclusion of eight years of programming, ATS commissioned a peer review of CORE work to date. Terrell Jones, vice provost for educational equity, and Mike Blanco, senior diversity planning analyst, both of Pennsylvania State University, conducted the peer review. They evaluated materials developed as part of the program, interviewed staff involved in the programs, and conducted a conference call interview with members of the Committee on Race and Ethnicity. Their written report identified strengths of the programming and areas where new strategies might be attempted. Chief among the recommendations was that ATS work with schools on strategic planning efforts that would focus on institutional issues related to diversity. In planning for the third cycle of work, ATS combined this recommendation with what it had learned from efforts to help schools develop capacity related to assessment of learning, which involved teams from schools working with a coach.

Third cycle: institutional capacity building through strategic diversity planning 2010–2014

ATS programming in this segment was structured as a four-year program entitled "Preparing for 2040: Enhancing Capacity to Educate and Minister in a Multiracial World." In the Preparing for 2040 project, ATS worked with 40 schools that had expressed some desire or commitment to increase their capacity to educate for ministry in a multiracial world. Specifically, participants from these schools sought to work on issues of faculty culture, reframing teaching and learning, understanding race and ethnicity, and conflict resolution.

The program utilized a process approach to help schools develop strategies, approaches, or techniques that would optimize institutional change in the area of each school's choosing. Participating schools were divided into four groups; each followed the same pattern of work, beginning with a weekend conference during which teams from each school met with a coach to identify issues and consider strategies for addressing it. Consultants were also present at the conference to make presentations and facilitate discussions. Each school team then worked for two years on its issue, consulted its coach as helpful, and at the end of the two years,

returned as a team for a second conference to work with coaches and consultants one more time and report on the overall results of their collective efforts.

Evaluation of this effort led to the following conclusions, among others: (1) that some schools are further along in their capacity to address diversity issues than others; (2) that most schools had chosen to work on issues of "faculty culture" and "reframing teaching and learning"; (3) that the two conferences served as important framing and reference points for the overall school efforts; and (4) that small institutional achievements in this area contributed to strengthening overall institutional capacity.

At the conclusion of these four years of work, institutional teams asked for ongoing support as they continued either to develop strategic diversity plans further or to implement the plans that had been developed. In response, ATS conducted a series of web-based meetings to provide ongoing coaching and guidance for the schools to solidify the gains that had been attained and to help schools take necessary next steps. The initiative concluded with institutional teams preparing brief reports on what they had accomplished, what they had learned that could be of benefit to other institutions, and what they planned to work on next.

Research and evaluation 2014–2015

After 14 years of sustained effort surrounding the issue of race and ethnicity in theological education, ATS paused programming in 2014–2015 to evaluate the impact of these efforts and identify issues for future efforts. The year involved four major evaluative activities—both qualitative and quantitative research—involving past participants in CORE programming as well as current students and recent graduates.

The impact study was rooted in the following questions:

1. How has the Association's programming to address issues related to race and ethnicity influenced the life of the schools?

2. What difference has the programming made?

3. What has been effective? What has been ineffective?

Methodology: three phases

As has been typical of ATS research, this study utilized a mixed-methods approach to its data gathering and analyses and demonstrated how lived experience and empirical research can inform one another.[4] It incorporated (1) focus-group conversations around the study's design and methodology; (2) a comprehensive survey, structured according to the cycles of work, to capture effectiveness and impact of the programming; and (3) interpretive consultations with faculty and administrators who were past participants in CORE programming and with students from Preparing for 2040 schools.

Phase 1: CORE focus-group conversations

Members and consultants of ATS' Committee on Race and Ethnicity (CORE) met in fall 2014 to determine both *what* kinds of information to collect and *how* best to collect such information. Early questions that were formulated include the following, among others: How do institutions measure success in their diversity work? And what has been the effect of CORE work on member schools and institutional relationships to faculty of color, as well as to white faculty?

Phase 2: Survey

In 2014–2015, a survey was sent to all known participants in all years of programming soliciting their reflection on the effects of the programming on their work individually and, where appropriate, on their institutions.

The need for advanced quantitative analyses. In the world of theological education, quantitative research reports typically center round what statisticians refer to as frequency analysis. This would include answers to "how many faculty of this race do we have?" or "what percent answered a certain way to questions about effectiveness?" For example, if we asked what percent agreed/disagreed on the item "I was satisfied with the ATS programming to support racial/ethnic faculty and administrators in theological education," what does it tell us about the work when results were skewed to the right, other than the conclusion that survey participants were happy with the work? Or, if asked whether participation in CORE

4 See the methodology section of "Three Insights about Faculty Development," *Theological Education 50,* no. 2 (2017): 81–85 for a rationale on mixed-methods approaches.

programming contributed to institutional change and responses landed in a "normal" distribution (about the same number agreeing as disagreeing, in a bell-shaped curve), does this tell us anything?

Could we ask other types of questions of the data? The following are some of the questions that advanced quantitative analyses are able to address:

- Group differences—Would faculty have experienced institutional change the same way? Would perceptions of that institutional change differ by race, gender, or type of program they participated in? Or would such perceptions differ by various attributes of the *institution*?

- What's related to what—In what ways are institutional learning and individual benefit related? *Are* they related? Can we assume that an institution's increased capacities around diversity are trickling down to benefit the constituencies for which the learning was designed?

- Ensuring program effectiveness—If we were to do a certain programming again, what would predict our success? Which components do we keep, and which do we let go? Are there certain conditions under which programming would be more successful? Could we figure out *in advance* who would most benefit, be most satisfied, have the greatest learning, or see the most lasting institutional change?

Asking other types of questions of the data help to tell a more complete story, paint a more complete picture, from responses that survey participants provide. Advanced quantitative analyses are tools we use to answer these questions.

Characteristics of the final sample. The final response set includes 86 useable cases, corresponding to a 33 percent response rate. While the response rate is acceptable (25–30 percent being the current standard for

online surveys), the number of cases is small, which may limit generalizability of conclusions.[5]

The final sample comprised 40 percent female respondents; 20 percent African/African American/black, 20 percent Asian/Asian North American, 20 percent Hispanic/Latino(a)/Latino(a) American, <5 percent Native American/First Nations/Alaskan Native/Inuit, and <5 percent international respondents.[6] About 52 percent of the sample held an administrative position at the time of the survey, and >95 percent of those were in either executive or academic administrative roles. About 90 percent indicated they were members of the faculty, with the following distribution by rank: 2 percent non-ranked, 2 percent assistant professor, 39 percent associate professor, and 56 percent professor.

Institutionally, the final sample consisted of 37 percent participants from evangelical Protestant schools, 51 percent from mainline Protestant schools, and 12 percent from Roman Catholic/Orthodox schools. About 10 percent were from smaller schools (1–100 students by head count) and approximately 30 percent from each of mid-sized (101–200 students), large (201–400 students), and largest (>400 students) schools.[7]

Phase 3: Faculty, administrator, and student consultations

Faculty and administrators. In February 2015, 38 invited administrators and faculty gathered for an interpretive consultation (1) to reflect on the results of the survey research, (2) to seek an enhanced understanding of the issues that impact theological education, and (3) to identify future programming options in light of the research and understandings of theological education. They met in variously constructed focus groups (by separate and mixed racial groups) to discuss *why* and *in what ways* the data surface

5 It is also important to note that the number of faculty and administrators of color in ATS schools is still very small (e.g., approximately 700 racial/ethnic faculty in 2013), which limits the number of potential respondents to any survey of ATS constituents on this or related topics.

6 While response patterns of two groups, Native American/First Nations/Alaskan Native/Inuit respondents and international respondents, are important to identify, because of the small numbers in this response set and in the interest of confidentiality, these responses were not included in most analyses.

7 Institutional percentages are only for those who disclosed their institution's name, which was 75 percent of the final sample.

underlying realities. Consultation participants discussed findings in each cycle of work, addressing the following three questions:

- Cycle 1—In what ways does support and nurture of individual racial/ethnic administrators and faculty contribute to positive institutional change? Groups were to consider the effect of the individual's race and the institution's size and other characteristics in their discussions.

- Cycle 2—Given ATS/CORE programming, why do constituents report not benefiting from institutional efforts to professionally develop racial/ethnic constituents? Groups were encouraged to consider the impact of the institution's best practices and the individual's use of resources on race/ethnicity in their conversations.

- Cycle 3—Institutional change appears to be taking place as a result of the "Preparing for 2040" programming. What, if anything, has ATS/CORE contributed to this change? Groups were asked to consider the role of the individual's race and the institution's ecclesial family.

In each discussion, participants were also encouraged to consider (1) the strategies used in that cycle's programming and (2) how the particular discussion would inform recommendations for future work in this area.

Students and recent graduates. Also in spring 2015, 40 students and recent graduates from schools that had participated in the "2040" program of the proceeding four years were convened as consultants to the Association, each receiving a small honorarium for participation. They were asked to assess their educational experiences, especially in the context of their racial/ethnic identity and the ministry settings in which they anticipated serving or had just begun to serve. The conference agenda placed participants in a series of small group discussions that varied by composition and focus questions.

Findings and discussion

Key survey findings will be reported by cycle of work, incorporating consultation reflections throughout, with substantive discussion sections at the end of each cycle.

Cycle 1: Support and nurture

Findings. The three items with the strongest agreement in this section referenced the personal benefits experienced from participation in programming:

- helped me to make/renew **meaningful connections** with other theological faculty/administrators of color[8]
- contributed to a sense that **my race/ethnicity is a value** in theological education[9]
- encouraged me to revisit or continue to **emphasize issues of race/ethnicity in my role** as faculty/administrator[10]

The item with the least agreement was "My participation in ATS programming contributed to positive institutional change related to race/ethnicity at the theological school . . ."[11] When we crosstabulate responses by race, statistically significant patterns emerge.[12] As seen in Table 1 on the next page, responses from participants of African descent[13] are fairly evenly distributed; responses from participants of Asian descent are situated around the middle; responses from participants of Latin descent skew toward disagreement; and responses from white participants skew toward agreement. And looking across rows for each type of response, we

8 Mean response 3.34, on a scale of 1–4, strongly disagree to strongly agree.

9 Mean = 3.24, same scale.

10 Mean = 3.28, same scale.

11 Mean = 2.66, scale of 1–4.

12 Differences were statistically significant at the .05 level ($X2 = 23.338$, $df = 9$). Note: results should be read with caution, as nine cells returned with expected values less than 5. T-tests were also run to compare average responses between groups (White group mean = 3.21 and group of color mean = 2.42). Mean differences were statistically significant [$t(62) = 3.774$, $p<.001$, Cohen's $D = 1.05$].

13 For better visual accessibility, the following descriptors will be used for corresponding racial categories throughout the remainder of the article:
African descent (Afr) for African/African American, Black
Asian descent (Asn) for Asian/Asian North American, Pacific Islander
Latin (Lat) descent for Hispanic, Latino(a)/Latino(a) American
White (Wht) for White, Anglo/Euro North American

see that almost half of those who marked "Disagree" were respondents of Asian descent, that strong agreement was limited to white respondents or respondents of African descent, and that strong disagreement was felt only among respondents of African or Latino descent.

Table 1 My Participation Contributed to Positive Institutional Change by Race

	African/African American, Black (N=12)	Asian/Asian North American, Pacific Islander (N=18)	Hispanic, Latino(a)/ Latino(a) American (N=15)	White, Anglo/Euro North American (N=19)
Strongly Agree	25%	0%	0%	37%
Agree	33%	44%	40%	47%
Disagree	25%	56%	40%	16%
Strongly Disagree	17%	0%	20%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

A second item in this section addresses the impact of the institutional change. Here also, significant patterns emerge when we crosstabulate responses by race.[14] Four responses were possible for the item "The changes I implemented/tried to implement [related to race/ethnicity] at the theological school . . . as a result of participation in ATS programming:

1. . . were major, lasting changes in the school"
2. . . were small but signified enduring forward movement."
3. . . eventually faded away."
4. . . were never implemented."

Table 2 on the following page shows a different kind of distribution. Within racial groups, among respondents of African descent, many more indicated some kind of enduring change than did not; among those of Asian descent, more responded that change did not endure; respondents of Latin descent were split, with about half indicating enduring change and half not; and for white respondents, all respondents reported change that endured.

14 Differences were statistically significant at the .05 level (X2 = 20.697, df = 9). Note: results should be read with caution, as twelve cells returned with expected values less than 5. Group means (White = 3.28, Of color = 2.47) were statistically significant [t(58.6) = 4.662, p<.001, Cohen's D = .99]].

Table 2 Impact of Institutional Change by Race

	Afr (N=14)	Asn (N=18)	Lat (N=15)	Wht (N=18)
Were major, lasting changes in the school	21%	11%	0%	28%
Were small but signified enduring forward movement	57%	33%	47%	72%
Eventually faded away	7%	39%	27%	0%
Were never implemented	14%	17%	27%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Finally, reports of the impact of institutional change also differed by size of the participant's institution.[15] Table 3 reveals additional patterns, but most notable are two: (1) responses among those at mid-sized and large schools tended toward lasting change, and (2) major, lasting changes were found almost exclusively in large schools.

Table 3 Impact of Institutional Change by Size of Institution (Number of Students by Head Count)

	Size by Head Count			
	Small 0-100 (N=2)	Mid 101-200 (N=16)	Large 201-400 (N=17)	Largest 401+ (N=15)
Were major, lasting changes in the school	0%	6%	41%	0%
Were small but signified enduring forward movement	50%	56%	41%	73%
Eventually faded away	0%	31%	12%	7%
Were never implemented	50%	6%	6%	20%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Discussion. The goals of this cycle of work were to provide racial/ethnic faculty and administrators a venue to discuss challenges experienced in their contexts and to provide them with the opportunity to connect with senior racial/ethnic faculty and administrators at predominantly white institutions for support. Considering these goals, it is important to note that respondents felt that they had meaningfully connected, that their race/ethnicity is valued, and that they had been encouraged to attend to race/ethnicity in their roles.

It appears, however, that participation in programming during this cycle did not necessarily translate to lasting institutional change. Survey

15 Differences were statistically significant at the .05 level ($X2 = 19.721$, $df = 9$). Note: results should be read with caution, as 13 cells returned with expected values less than 5.

participants' responses differed by race and by size of institution. What is unclear, however, is what combination of institutional capacity for change, racial group social construction, and individual sense of agency is at play in the response patterns. Literature is abundant in its claim that institutional realities present double, triple, multiple binds for constituents of color and women constituents: there are almost always too few individuals committed to institutional change around diversity, and the limited decision-making positions that constituents of color and women constituents hold further accentuate power asymmetries.[16] Interpretive consultation focus group notes highlight this structural inequity:

> Whose voice makes change? How is a new voice welcomed/valued/honored in the context of the host tradition? Do participants have significant voice coming back from CORE events? We need to consider how to help schools evaluate and reformulate structures of power and leadership, how to get new faces and new voices at your tables.

Might there also be differences, by race or other individual and institutional characteristics, in what constitutes "change" and how "lasting" is defined? What does it mean, for example, that among those who reported their institutions experiencing major, lasting change, half were white respondents and none were of Latin descent? What may be understood as lasting change by one may not be experienced as lasting change by another. And who determines the definition of change at a given institution? How do institutions determine what is success; who gets to speak into those definitions? It should be noted that, while institutional change was not an

16 See Estela M. Bensimon, "Making sense of administrative leadership: The 'L' word in higher education," *The ERIC Digest, ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports,* ED316074 (1989): 1–5; Phyllis Bronstein, Esther D. Rothblum, and Sondra E. Solomon, "Ivy Halls and Glass Walls: Barriers to academic careers for women and ethnic minorities," *New Directions for Teaching and Learning,* 1993, no. 53 (1993): 17–31; S. M. Lee, "Do Asian American faculty face a glass ceiling in higher education?", *American Educational Research Journal 39*, no. 3 (2002): 695–724; Laurence Parker and Octavio Villalpando, "A Race(cialized) Perspective on Education Leadership: Critical race theory in educational administration," *Educational Administration Quarterly 43,* no. 5 (2007): 519–524; and Kristen Betts, David Urias, Jose Chavez, and Keith Betts, "Higher Education and Shifting U.S. Demographics: Need for Visible Administrative Career Paths, Professional Development, Succession Planning & Commitment to Diversity," *Academic Leadership 7*, no. 2 (2009):1–6.

explicit goal of the work in this cycle, the responses to these survey items provide a helpful lens for interpreting benefits for the individual.

Cycle 2: Informational capacity building

Findings. Responses in this section of the survey reflected less agreement overall than responses in the first section. The item with the strongest agreement was "Participation in ATS programming contributed to my increased understanding about dynamics (e.g., related to power, peer collegiality, racial/ethnic underrepresentation) influencing my work in my institution."[17] The items with the least agreement were "I benefited from the
institution's . . . best practices for professionally developing its racial/ethnic faculty"[18] and "I utilized ATS resources on race/ethnicity that were available to the institution . . . ."[19]

Building informational capacity involves at least two realms, the individual and the institutional, and success in building such capacity is based on achieving success in both realms. Success can be defined in many ways (e.g., sense of feeling valued, personal satisfaction, knowledge gained, ability to support target groups, enhanced reputation of the school). For this cycle of work, success was operationalized by two items:

- **I was satisfied** with ATS programming related to providing information to enhance capacity to address issues related to race/ethnicity.[20]

- **The institution** . . . has **increased in its capacity** to meet the needs of racial/ethnic students and employees.[21]

The first deals with the individual; the second, with the institution (although both capture reports from the individual participant).

In order to determine what aspects of ATS programming point to these indicators of success, we ran two multiple regressions to predict success.

---

17 Mean = 2.96, on a 4-point scale, strongly disagree to strongly agree.

18 Mean = 2.37, same scale.

19 Mean = 2.36, same scale.

20 Mean = 2.91, same scale.

21 Mean = 2.73, same scale.

The first predicted individual satisfaction with a series of variables that included background variables (e.g., gender, race, faculty/administrator status), attendance at particular events, benefits from participation, and other variables.[22] Table 4 shows the two variables that entered the regression equation as significant predictors. Individual success (or individual satisfaction) is best accounted for by participation that leads to personal learning and by benefitting from the institution's use of diversity best practices. Recall that the first item had the highest average response ("Agree")[23] in this set of questions; however, the second item had one of the lowest average responses (between "Agree" and "Disagree" but closer to the latter).[24] Though it is a significant predictor of success, participants indicated they hadn't benefited from the institution's diversity best practices.

Table 4 Predictors of Individual Satisfaction

Individual satisfaction is most closely related to:	
Increased understanding about the dynamics of race (e.g., related to power, racial/ethnic underrepresentation)	$\beta = .624$
Sense of **benefiting from institution's best practices** for diverse populations (e.g., related to employment issues, campus climate, cross-racial dialogue)	.398

In the second regression to determine what points to success, we attempted to predict increased institutional capacity for diversity with a number of independent variables, including background variables, participation, perceptions about goals, and others.[25] Table 5 lists the two strongest predictors entering the equation.[26] Of the possible variables, these two were significant and best account for the perception that an institution has

22 We ran a stepwise regression with mean substitution for missing data. The R-square at the final step was .624, indicating that collectively the independent variables predicted 62 percent of the variation in individual satisfaction. We did not include "ATS established appropriate goals" or "ATS utilized appropriate strategies" to avoid possible multicollinearity; no excluded variable tolerances dipped below .30. See Appendix A for full regression results.

23 $\mu = 2.96$, on a 1-4 scale, strongly disagree to strongly agree, S.D. = .908.

24 $\mu = 2.37$, same scale, S. D. = .761.

25 Stepwise regression, with mean substitution for missing data. The R-square at the final step = .817. No excluded variable tolerances below .30, and no correlations above .85. See Appendix A for full regression results.

26 Three variables entered the equation as significant predictors at the final step. However, using the 10 percent rule of thumb for variables considered (no more than 10 percent of the total in the sample), we eliminated the third variable for discussion.

increased in its capacity for diversity. The first item was expected; using best practices for professional development is naturally related to the perceived capacity of an institution to meet the needs of its racial/ethnic faculty. The second item, however, was unexpected and highlights the relationship between the individual and an institution's success in this area. It is also the item with the lowest response (between "Agree" and "Disagree" but closer to the latter).[27] Although it is a significant predictor of institutional success (or increased institutional capacity), participants indicated they hadn't used the diversity resources at their institutions.

Table 5 Predictors of Increased institutional Capacity

Increased institutional capacity is most closely related to:	
Institution's use of best practices for **professionally developing its racial/ ethnic faculty**	$\beta = .694$
Individual's use of ATS diversity resources available at the institution	.474

Discussion. Goals for this cycle of work included providing individual racial/ethnic constituents with information (knowledge about systemic realities related to race/ethnicity and strategies to cope with those realities) and providing institutions with diversity-related resources. The work of CORE in this cycle appears to have met this goal for building informational capacity, particularly for the individual constituent member. However, the data suggest some disconnect between institutional learning and its impact on the constituencies such learning is meant to support.

As stated above, building informational capacity requires both cultivating individual understanding and building institutional capacity. Individuals can learn all they have access to, but as has been the lived experience of members of non-dominant communities in theological education, that is often not enough. The *institution* must also build informational capacity in order for individuals, groups, and the institution to benefit from that learning.

Findings in this section suggest a gap between institutional success (or increased institutional capacity to support racial/ethnic constituents) and individual success (or satisfaction about the programming). Individual satisfaction is most closely related to a sense of personal learning about dynamics of race and a sense of benefiting from the institution's

27 $\mu = 2.36$, same scale as above, S. D. = .727.

use of diversity best practices, but participants didn't feel they benefitted in this way. In addition, an institution is seen as increasing in its capacity to meet the needs of its racial/ethnic constituents when it appears to be using best practices for professionally developing its faculty of color and when constituents of color use diversity resources that are available to the institution, but participants indicated they didn't use such resources. A gap appears to exist between increased informational capacity by an institution and the impact of that capacity, particularly the benefits to racial/ethnic constituents.

What remains unclear for both individual learning and institutional capacity is why: Why did participants feel they had not benefitted from the institution's use of diversity best practices? Is an institution's use of diversity best practices enough, or are more systemic and comprehensive strategies needed in order that constituents of non-dominant groups sense some benefit? And why did participants not use the resources on race/ethnicity at their institutions? Were they the right resources? Are "best practices" resources what is needed, or are more scholarly resources needed in this context of theological education, resources that address theologies of diversity or theoretical treatments of race?

Cycle 3: Strategic capacity building

Findings. The two items with which respondents agreed most in this section had to do with ATS establishing appropriate goals[28] and using appropriate strategies to help schools with strategic diversity planning (mean = 3.05, same scale). Respondents agreed least with the item "The institution . . . has enjoyed a measure of success in preparing its students to minister in a multiracial world because of ATS [Preparing for 2040: Enhancing Capacity to Educate and Minister in a Multiracial World] programming . . . ."[29]

A single item was used to operationalize the programming's effectiveness in this cycle of work: "I witnessed some institutional change as my school participated in the Preparing for 2040 phase of ATS programming related to race and ethnicity." The mean response for this item was 2.89.[30]

---

28 Mean = 3.03, 4-point school from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

29 Mean = 2.58, same scale

30 On a 4-point scale, strongly disagree to strongly agree. $\mu = 2.89$, same scale as above, S.D. = .786.

Group mean responses were compared on this item to determine the salience of the respondent's race in programming effectiveness. A comparison between white respondents (mean = 3.13) and respondents of color (mean = 2.62)[31] showed the difference was not significant.[32] However, when groups were adjusted, based on findings not presented in this article, analysis indicated there is a significant difference[33]: the non-underrepresented minority group's mean was 3.18[34] and the underrepresented[35] minority group's mean was 2.45. Responses by racial group differed significantly, with respect to witnessing institutional change from the Preparing for 2040 program: on average, white respondents and respondents of Asian descent felt (between agree and strongly agree) there had been institutional change, while respondents of African and of Latin descent were between agreement and disagreement.

Skip logic was inadvertently not enabled for this item in this section, which allowed non-participants of the Preparing for 2040 program the opportunity to respond. The average response of participants of the 2040 program was 2.90 (on a 4-point scale, strongly disagree to strongly agree), and the average response of non-participants was 2.13 (same scale). The mean difference was statistically significant.[36] Preparing for 2040 partici-

---

31 μ (White) = 3.13, same scale as above, S.D. = .516; μ (Of Color) = 2.62, same scale, S.D. = .961.

32 $t(26) = 1.811$, $p = .05$, Cohen's D = .66

33 $t(26) = 2.619$, $p < .05$, Cohen's D = .96.

34 μ (non-URM) = 2.89, same scale as above, S.D. = .529; μ (URM) = 2.45, same scale, S.D. = .934.

35 The "underrepresented minority" group included respondents of African descent and Latino descent only. It is noted that the category has not historically been used in theological education. Group labels that use "minority" are inadequate and do not reflect the minorit*ized* status such labels continue to perpetuate. In addition, the term "underrepresented" has not been used consistently to reflect that certain racial/ethnic groups—a term suggested by ATS' Committee on Race and Ethnicity—such as Asian/Asian North American students, are over-represented in ATS schools, as compared to percentages in US higher education. In this report, we use "underrepresented minority," in alignment with diversity literature in higher education, to refer to historically underrepresented groups, namely groups of African descent, Latino descent, and indigenous peoples (see, for example, Daryl G. Smith, *Diversity's Promise for Higher Education: Making It Work*, 2nd ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2015). Even so doing, we recognize that the labels remain complicated, as Asian/Asian North American faculty and administrators occupy a minoritized space in theological education, in both number and power.

36 $t(52) = -3.604$, $p < .001$, Cohen's D = 1.12.

pants felt they had witnessed institutional change at their schools, whereas non-participants felt they had not. It could be argued that disagreement was more a reflection that the institution had not participated than that the participant had not witnessed institutional change; however, it is an interesting finding that the views of participants and non-participants of the Preparing for 2040 program differed on this effectiveness item.

An open-ended item prompted respondents to name evidence of the institutional change they observed. These were coded for themes, four of which emerged: hiring practices, faculty/administration formation or training (ranging from diversity awareness training to providing safe spaces for difficult conversations), curricular changes (from systematic syllabus review to complete overhauls of curricula, all with an eye to be diversity inclusive), and structural changes (related to board actions, faculty evaluation/tenure, and adopting an institutional theological rationale for diversity). Table 6 lists examples of the type of institutional change reported on the open-ended item.

Table 6 Types of Institutional Change Reported from Preparing for 2040 Program

Type of Change	Implementation
Hiring practices	"Establishment of new policies to enable greater multiracial diversity in student recruitment and in all hiring (faculty, staff, and administration)"
Faculty/administration formation or training	"Faculty professional growth sessions with members of racially non-dominant communities"
Curricular changes	"Holding seminary chapel in congregations of color"
Structural changes	"Collaborating with the dean's office, faculty members led a new project…creating new spaces to have on-going and generative conversation on race."

Discussion. The main program of this cycle of work was "Preparing for 2040." The goal of this program was to assist schools in constructing and implementing strategic diversity plans toward enhancing institutional capacity to educate students for ministry in a multiracial world. Plan foci included faculty culture, reframing teaching and learning, understanding race and ethnicity, and conflict resolution. The program involved 65 schools in eight cohorts, working with diversity coaches identified from among ATS schools. According to survey self-report, both the goal and the strategies used were appropriate in this cycle.

Though causality cannot be claimed, there seems to be good indication that participation in the Preparing for 2040 program corresponds to institutional change. Those who participated in the program witnessed

institutional change; those who did not participate did not see change. The types of change witnessed fall into four categories: hiring practices, faculty/administration formation or training, curricular changes, and structural changes.

Perception of impact, however, was mixed among those who had participated. On average, according to white respondents and respondents of Asian descent, there was institutional change related to the Preparing for 2040 programming. For respondents of African and Latina descent, however, institutional change was not as apparent. Reasons for the difference in perception remain unclear, though interpretive consultation focus group notes suggest ways forward:

> Change for what racial/ethnic group? We need to collaborate with change management consultants/leaders inside and beyond higher education to build the capacities of institutional leaders to lead change within already stressed institutions and overextended leaders, with regard to mission, values, policies, and practices; board structures; and faculty and staff.
>
> I strongly recommend [that we] shift our thinking on programming from a primacy on (a) acquiring knowledge or (b) analyzing situations (both of which are essential) to a primacy on (c) reconstructing our communities.

As we saw in the findings from the first cycle of work, perspectives vary by race. This leads us to consider what focuses would be appropriate for the future work of ATS around race/ethnicity. It appears that different racial/ethnic groups benefit in different ways from institutional change around diversity issues. Why is this the case? And how might future work attend to appropriate focuses for *each* racial/ethnic group? In what ways could ATS learn from organizations that are already effectively addressing the needs of various racial/ethnic groups? And what might be learned from change management leaders in order to cultivate lasting missional change to the benefit of students and employees of color, as well as to the schools?

The Phase 3 consultation for students and recent alumni/ae provided some of the most useful outcomes, which were related to two primary question areas.[37]

How have ATS schools attended to racial/ethnic persons? The first question sought participants' perceptions regarding how they were cared for as racial/ethnic students in the schools they attended. The conversation ranged widely, but a cursory content analysis of notes suggests that many of the perceptions could be grouped in one of four categories or themes. One category of perceptions was quite positive, indicating that some schools had done well with its care of racial/ethnic persons. ("The school has worked hard to institutionalize care"; "There is a tradition of hospitality"; "African American staff and faculty have paved the way for students.") A second category of perception indicated that, while some schools were working to care for racial/ethnic persons, there were lacunae the school appeared not to have noticed. ("Resources were present, but there were no explicit courses with race/ethnicity"; "the school was silent about racial/ethnic diversity, but the library collection made the difference"; "diversity should not just involve students, it should be reflected in the staff and faculty"; "the school gets you to the school, but . . . no real effort to include diverse perspectives in the classroom.") Still another category of perceptions suggested that schools need to give attention to issues related to educational or formational issues. (Schools "need to acknowledge the complexity of diversity"; "it is important for students to have space and time to reinvent their identity when arriving at the seminary"; "presence of mentors is important"; "can feel very lonely at these institutions.") Still another category of responses reflected truly negative perceptions about how schools had cared for racial/ethnic persons. ("Schools protect their 'brand,' so underrepresented faculty who bring different methods and questions are not taken seriously"; "seminary not involved in the [racial/ethnic] community surrounding it"; "retaining students of color is a problem.")

How have seminaries prepared students for future work? The second question area provided important perspectives about how well racial/ethnic

37 Other discussion questions focused on issues such as "what ATS should do," and while this focus was extremely helpful in the consultation with faculty and administrators, students' and recent graduates' lack of familiarity with ATS patterns of work or limitations made these perceptions less helpful for future planning.

students perceived themselves to be prepared for their future work. Once again, while perceptions varied, some common themes were evident. One theme identified what participants thought were the needed pedagogical practices for preparing students for future work (e.g., "Need to listen to students' views of new ways of doing ministry"; "connect education for ministry with actual career opportunities—tangible career path"; "importance of partnership with external programs like Hispanic Summer Institute"; "bringing multicultural education from the peripheral to focus.").

Not only did this conference include a new group of participants (current students and recent graduates), but their discussions also pointed to a significant issue that had not been addressed in previous ATS work on race and ethnicity: educational effectiveness for racial/ethnic students. Educational efforts in the first 14 years of programming had explored issues such as institutional practices and culture, employment practices, nurture of racial/ethnic faculty, and white privilege and diversity. While the "2040" cycle of work had focused on strategic planning issues that in some schools had given attention to educational issues, ATS efforts had not directly addressed issues of pedagogy or educational effectiveness for racial/ethnic students.

Conclusions and recommendations

In reviewing CORE's 14 years of work, ATS engaged the Committee on Race and Ethnicity and its consultants, 86 participants in the constituent survey, and consultations with faculty, staff, students, and recent graduates. Their shared wisdom points toward a number of conclusions and recommendations for future ATS work related to race and ethnicity. Some of the conclusions were expected, while others were surprising. The evaluation also shed light on some issues that will require further clarification and study.

Flexibility

ATS programming in the first cycle of work, which successfully provided nurture and support for individuals, and in the third cycle, which used school teams and coaches, may have contributed more effectively to institutional change than did the informational approach of the second phase.

Efforts that contribute to institutional change require strategies that are iterative over time, that invite schools to work on specific issues, and that provide coaching and consulting along the way. ATS may need to develop certain "courses" on issues related to diversity that need to be learned by successive generations of leaders of ATS schools, but participants perceived this kind of education as being less effective at achieving institutional change than strategies that help schools work on certain issues in a coaching model.

ATS as an agent for change

Institutional change that is not demanded by external forces is difficult for ATS schools. The research suggests that a gap exists between increased informational capacity by an institution and the impact of that capacity, particularly to racial/ethnic constituents. The schools will need to change, however, with regard to their institutional capacity related to race and ethnicity. The rapid change in the North American population and the student bodies of ATS schools demands commensurate change in how schools do their work.

ATS can be an agent for change in the schools (1) by advocating on behalf of racial/ethnic issues to institutional leaders and boards, (2) by identifying and recommending change management consultants who can work with the schools, (3) by helping schools develop and enact practices and habits that contribute to institutional change, (4) by contributing to the capacity of faculty and institutional leaders to lead institutional change, and (5) through accreditation, holding schools accountable for the change they claim that they need to make or are in the process of making.

Cultivating curricular and educational capacity

Many schools are re-evaluating curriculum design and educational strategies. ATS can both advocate for and help schools to address issues of race and ethnicity in curricula and educational practices. This effort would need to give special attention to faculty, especially majority faculty who often hold senior positions and influence faculty governance.

Resources

ATS should develop and disseminate resources to be used by schools as they encounter different institutional tasks related to race, ethnicity, and

diversity. The resources, both print-based and online, would provide the basis for ongoing support for schools and their leaders.

The first of these resources would be a tool for defining an institution's "success" in its institutional and educational efforts related to race and ethnicity. What is the goal that theological schools should strive to achieve in this area? If a definition of success can be attained, ATS should develop and encourage the use of some form of audit instrument and process that would help schools determine where they are on a continuum from present reality to the goal as represented in the definition of success.

The second would be scholarly articles on issues of diversity in theological education. These would include presentations that have been made across the past 14 years of conferences as well as newly commissioned articles.

The third would be a set of "best practices" documents related to various diversity issues, such as identifying, employing, and retaining racial/ethnic faculty and administrators; strategic diversity planning and implementation; institutional support and effective educational strategies for racial/ethnic students; patterns of institutional connection with racial/ethnic communities in the school's own neighborhood, etc.

Strategic initiatives

ATS should work with an identified group of member schools on educational effectiveness with racial/ethnic students. Teams of faculty and students from participating schools would work with coaches and consultants over a two-year time period to identify educational issues of importance for each participating school and then develop strategies that address those issues. (The strategy would follow the one developed in the "Preparing for 2040" cycle of work.) This major effort would focus exclusively on educational issues with the goal of enhancing educational capacity with students of color and cultural competence of all students.

Collaborative relationships

ATS should engage activities to strengthen collaborative relationships with the Asociación para La Educación Teológica Hispana, the Forum for Theological Exploration, the Hispanic Summer Program, the Hispanic Theological Initiative, the In Trust Center for Theological Schools, Louisville Institute, The Wabash Center for Teaching and Learning, and other entities with regard to overall systems of support and engagement

for racial/ethnic seminary students, PhD students, faculty, administrative staff, and institutions committed to serving racial/ethnic constituencies.[38]

Ultimately, all of these strategies should maximize effective engagement with issues of race and ethnicity, responding to an increasingly multiracial world and benefitting not only the member schools and their faculty, administrators, and students but also the communities of faith their graduates will one day serve.

Daniel Aleshire was Executive Director of The Association of Theological Schools until his retirement shortly before this article went to press. Deborah H. C. Gin is Director, Research and Faculty Development for The Association of Theological Schools in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Willie James Jennings is Associate Professor of Systematic Theology and Africana Studies at Yale University Divinity School in New Haven, Connecticut.

38 At the conclusion of the work that has been completed, it is appropriate to express gratitude to the members of the ATS professional staff who have guided this work for 14 years. Marsha Foster Boyd led almost all of the work described as the first cycle, William Myers led much of the work associated with the second cycle, and Janice Edwards-Armstrong led all of the work of the third cycle and supported the conferences involved in this evaluation. Deborah Gin conducted the survey research for this evaluation. Stephen Graham has provided oversight and support for all the areas of ATS leadership education for the past several years. In addition to the participation of ATS director-level staff members, a large number of racial/ethnic faculty members and administrators have served on the Committee on Race and Ethnicity, providing leadership and guidance to the entire effort, and a still larger number have made presentations, planned conferences, led groups, provided coaching and consultations, and in other ways, made this work possible. All of this work has been supported by grants from Lilly Endowment Inc.

Appendix A

Stepwise Regression—Prediction of Individual Satisfaction

Independent Variable	Beta	t	Sig.t
Increased Understanding about Dynamics of Race	.624	4.603	5.966
Benefit from Institution's Best Practices for Diversity	.398	2.933	.000

Dependent Variable = I was satisfied with ATS programming related to providing information to enhance capacity to address issues related to race/ethnicity.
R = .789
R2 = .623
F = 17.371
Sig. F < .001
N = 24

Stepwise Regression—Prediction of Increased Institutional Capacity

Independent Variable	Beta	t	Sig.t
Institution Professionally Developed R/E Faculty	.694	6.802	.000
I Utilized Diversity Resources Available at Institution	.474	4.743	.000
Faculty	.292	2.939	.008

Dependent Variable = The institution where I was faculty/administrator has increased in its capacity to meet the needs of racial ethnic students and employees.
R = .904
R2 = .817
F = 29.843
Sig. F < .001
N = 24