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ADAPTIVE CHALLENGES ON A CHANGING LANDSCAPE

For more than 50 years, FTE has partnered with theological schools to increase diversity among their faculties. The need to do so continues today on an ever-changing landscape. Higher education is in a period of systemic and historic change. This wave of change is generating new norms for the field of theological education. Our field faces a persistent diversity deficit in the midst of a new set of complex environmental factors. The rising tide of contingent faculty, patterns of increasing enrollment among Evangelicals and people of color, new models of congregational life, trends in online education, and the so-called 2040 reality—shorthand for the year when we expect there will cease to be a racial majority in the U.S.—represent just a few of the factors instigating shifts in the way leaders of theological schools think about preparing future faculty and the enterprise of graduate theological education.

These changes amount to what Ronald Heifetz calls “adaptive challenges.” In contrast to technical problems, adaptive challenges resist easy answers often derived from experts and authorities. Instead, these challenges call for deep listening and reflection on our values and assumptions about what’s important, who matters, and why we do what we do. Adaptive challenges require us to tap into collective wisdom. Siloed expertise loses its value here. Collective discernment and decision making is the only approach that can help us to adapt toward a resilient future.

Heifetz advises that leaders who will effectively help their constituents face adaptive shifts must first take a look at the challenge “from the balcony.” That involves withdrawing from on-the-ground activity, which tends to limit our field of vision, to gain a broader perspective. Then we may begin to recognize patterns and relationships among actors and events. Observing and interpreting patterns “from the balcony” is a key leadership practice. It enables organizations and individuals to productively engage adaptive challenges.

During the 2012-2013 academic year, FTE decided to step back and review its work from the balcony. To observe and interpret the changing patterns in the field of theological education, we commissioned this review of available statistical data, research, and programmatic resources that pertain to the cultivation of scholars of color within theological education. We intend for this review to serve as a learning document, both for FTE and its partners. We offer this resource as a tool to help academic executives and other leaders in theological education gain an essential “view from the balcony.”

Beyond expanding the reader’s view, however, this document encourages the reader to be much more than a mere spectator. Insights gained from this project and other organizational learning initiatives will inform the design of FTE’s future strategic interventions in collaboration with institutional partners. In tandem with our 60th anniversary in 2014, we will launch a new set of programs that aim to identify and cultivate wise, courageous and diverse leaders for the church and academy. We hope that you, too, will find in this review both perspective-broadening information and an impetus for your own strategic action.

The Fund for Theological Education (FTE)
In preparation for the 2013 Fund for Theological Education (FTE) Consultation on Doctoral Theological Education, FTE commissioned an extensive review of resources relevant to the cultivation of persons of color within doctoral theological education. Resources that provide focus and insight on the cultivation of persons of color in the field are limited. As a result, researchers drew from resources across higher education—first targeting the humanities, and then incorporating science, technology, engineering and math (STEM), and business and law. All of these fields have greater resources allocated to the cultivation of diverse and innovative talent.

This review examines literature, institutional resources, and data regarding the participation and experiences of persons of color in higher education, broadly, and in theological education specifically. The project team decided to include a statistical overview of the status of persons of color in theological and religious education, based on the most current data available. The review also provides thematic summaries and annotations of literary resources.

Section One includes statistical data, key themes, and emerging practices relevant to the cultivation of persons of color in higher education, with a particular focus on doctoral theological education and potential pathways into doctoral education. Using quantitative data from the Association of Theological Schools (ATS), the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), and the United States (U.S.) Census Bureau, this section notes statistical patterns in enrollment, degrees awarded, and faculty appointments of persons of color at the post-baccalaureate levels of theological and religious education. Data was disaggregated by race and ethnicity, as well as by gender, to expose patterns unique to a particular ethnic group, gender group, educational level, or a combination of all three variables.

This review is intended to serve as a reference document for institutional leaders and decision makers who live, work, learn and lead in a world with a rapidly changing religious and academic landscape.

In addition, using scholarly literature, noteworthy white papers, recent program initiatives and institutional reports published over the last decade, Section One offers key themes and emerging practices that show promise in broadening the participation of persons of color within theological education and in the changing academic job market. Salient issues revealed during the review that are not explicitly addressed in the literature are noted within the concluding remarks of Section One.

Section Two of the review contains an annotated list of funding, mentoring, research and development resources, especially as they pertain to persons of color. Hyperlinks are provided for each resource.

Section Three comprises an annotated bibliography of reports, programs, books, and articles (mostly published since 2000) that permit a snapshot of the state of theological education (and higher education more generally) regarding the recruitment, retention, and development of persons of color for the vocation of teaching and scholarship. An annotated digital Endnote Library, with full-text documents, was created as a depository of the references and resources listed in this report. Access to the library is available upon request to the author. Duplication of full-text documents is subject to the guidelines of distribution expressed by the respective publishing institution.
This review is intended to serve as a reference document for institutional leaders and decision makers who live, work, learn and lead in a world with a rapidly changing religious and academic landscape (Aleshire, 2010). It also aims to provide sufficient preliminary quantitative and qualitative data to expand research agendas regarding the cultivation of persons of color in theological education, moving beyond the aggregated studies of minorities that fall short of informing the achievement of racial/ethnic diversity in scholarship and practice (Cascante, 2010).

**FTE commissioned an extensive review of resources relevant to the cultivation of persons of color within doctoral theological education.**

There is a clear need for a national longitudinal study of persons of color within theological education—one that attends to trends in enrollment, retention, performance, leadership, degree completion, career placement, and personal characteristics of students and faculty over an extended period of time. Such aims are beyond the scope of this review. For this review, researchers were limited to existing published and publicly accessible data.

**Methods**

The primary source of quantitative data used in this review was obtained from the Association of Theological Schools (ATS) 2011-2012 Annual Data Tables available on the ATS website.\(^1\) ATS is a membership organization of graduate schools in the United States and Canada that conduct post-baccalaureate professional and academic degree programs to educate persons for the practice of ministry and for teaching and research in theological disciplines (ATS, *Factbook on Theological Education 2006-2007*). ATS data is collected from member schools during the fall of each year. Figures and tables were constructed based on ATS enrollment, degrees awarded, and faculty data from 2007-2011.

The second source of quantitative data was acquired from the U.S. Department of Education’s National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). NCES data is obtained from a multiyear, annual survey of postsecondary colleges and universities. NCES degree data were merged with basic institutional data from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data Systems (IPEDS)\(^2\) to obtain master’s and doctoral degree data, distinguished between professional research degrees at the institutional level. Figures and tables were created using NCES data across two degree categories: theology and religious vocations, as well as philosophy and religious studies. The decision to include philosophy and religious studies data was driven by the incorporation of degrees related to religion conferred in ethics and sociology within this category. Both ATS and NCES degree data are used in order to explore the status of persons of color within and beyond ATS member schools.

Qualitative sources were derived from searching institutional, journal, and national scholarly databases. Researchers also searched religious organizations’ websites for published reports and papers regarding the mentoring, leadership, and development of persons of color.

Statistical data allowed a macro-level view of the current status of persons of color in theological and religious education. This is explicitly intended to enhance conversations and practices that improve racial/ethnic diversity in theological education. The qualitative empirical data creates a frame in which to interpret the quantitative data (Gutiérrez y Muhs et al, 2012).

---


2. Extracted from the IPEDS Data Center <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/datacenter/> on 4/24/2013
Person of color continue to be underrepresented within theological and religious education at all levels of higher education in the United States. Hispanics in particular are significantly underrepresented, since they represent 20% of the U.S. population between age 25-29, and 11% of the population age 30 and older (AFT, 2010). Population experts predict that by 2060 there will not be a single racial/ethnic majority population in the U.S. The Hispanic population will have almost doubled, growing from 17% to 31% (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012; see Appendix A). Based on these changing and compelling population demographics, it is essential that barriers to the recruitment, retention, and development of persons of color in higher education be identified and addressed. This is a vital pathway for the United States to sustain a leading talent pool in the global market of innovation and knowledge production. It is also vital to serving the needs of local communities. A brief review of the enrollment, degree, and faculty data illuminate opportunities for the cultivation of persons of color within theological/religious education.

Currently, most doctoral students in theological education are recruited from master’s programs in theological education. A review of master’s enrollment and degree data reveals patterns for potential pathways into doctoral education.

**Enrollment**

In 2011 there were a total of 74,193 people enrolled in theological education at the post-baccalaureate levels in ATS member schools (see Appendix A: Table 2.13). This reflects a decrease from the 79,244 people enrolled in these same schools in 2007. Asian Americans, Blacks, and Hispanics were 7%, 13%, and 5% of the total enrolled in 2011, respectively (Figure 1.1).

Additional complexities materialize when data is disaggregated by race and ethnicity, as well as by gender. The National Center for Education Statistics projects that women will represent approximately 60% of post-baccalaureate enrollment in post-secondary schools by the year 2015 (NCES, Projection Summaries, 2012). In 2011, women were 34% of total enrollment in theological education. White women represented 55.1% of the total number of women enrolled in theological education at the post-baccalaureate level. Asian women represented 7%, Black women 18.1%, Hispanic women 4% and Native American women represented 0.4% of female enrollment at ATS schools (Table 1.1).

**Persons of color continue to be underrepresented within theological and religious education at all levels of higher education in the United States.**

**FIGURE 1.1: PERCENT ENROLLMENT IN THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION BY RACE/ETHNICITY, 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage Enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visa</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Association of Theological Schools, 2011-2012, Table 2.12
TABLE 1.1: FEMALE PERCENT OF TOTAL ENROLLMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RACE/ETHNICITY</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASIAN</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>1,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACK</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>4,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISPANIC</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>1,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIVE AMERICAN</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISA</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>1,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>14,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT REPORTED</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>2,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Association of Theological Schools, 2011-2012, Table 2.12

Interestingly, Black women’s representation in theological education reflects unusually high levels of enrollment in comparison to their male counterparts. Black women are 49% (4,605) of the 12.6% total enrollment of Blacks at the post-baccalaureate levels, higher than any other female representation within a given ethnic group (Figure 2.1). Asian women represented 28% (1,455) of the 7.1% Asian American enrollment, Hispanic women 29% (1,041) of the 4.8% of total Hispanic enrollment, and Native American women were 43% (104) of the 3.1% Native American enrollment.

FIGURE 2.1: PERCENT FEMALE ENROLLMENT WITHIN RACIAL DEMOGRAPHIC, 2011

Women represent 25% of the total number of students enrolled in advanced research doctorate degree programs in 2011 (See Appendix A: Table 2.12). White women represent more than half (53%) of the women enrolled. Women of color represent approximately 20% of female enrollment, including 7% (110) Asian American women, 9% (135) Black women, 3% (46) Hispanic women, and 0.5% (8) Native American women (See Appendix A: Table 2.12). The other 27% comprises women of two or more races or of unknown race, and also women with a visa who are studying in the U.S.

Between 2007 and 2011, total enrollment in advanced research doctorate degree programs, such as the Ph.D. and the Th.D., increased slightly from 5,937 to 5,988 at ATS member schools. Based on population density, Asians, who comprise 5% of the U.S. population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012), are overrepresented at advanced research levels of theological doctoral education enrollment. Asian Americans represent approximately 8% of total enrollment during that same time period (Table 1.0). Blacks and Hispanics, who represent 13% and 17% of the U.S. population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012), have garnered approximately 6% and 3% of enrollment, respectively (Table 2.1). Native Americans have remained at 0.4% of doctorate research enrollment for the past three years. Combined, persons of color represent a mere 17% of enrollment in doctoral advanced research programs.

TABLE 2.1 PERCENT ENROLLMENT IN DOCTORAL ADVANCED RESEARCH PROGRAMS, BY RACE/ETHNICITY, 2007-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RACE/ETHNICITY</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIAN</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACK</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISPANIC</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIVE AMERICAN</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISA</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT REPORTED</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Association of Theological Schools, 2011-2012, Table 2.12

The percentage of female representation within each ethnic group, when isolated to doctoral research, is lower than the representation observed at the post-baccalaureate level. Blacks still have the highest percentage of female representation (39%), while remaining significantly
underrepresented (5.7%) among advanced research enrollment (Figure 3.1).

FIGURE 3.1: PERCENTAGE OF FEMALE ENROLLMENT WITHIN RACIAL DEMOGRAPHIC IN ADVANCED RESEARCH PROGRAMS (ARP), 2011

In summary, enrollment data continue to reflect significant gender and racial disparities within theological education. Women, projected as the largest population within post-baccalaureate higher education in the near future, remain underrepresented in theological education at both the master’s and doctoral levels of enrollment. Blacks, Hispanics, and Native Americans continue to be significantly underrepresented at advanced research levels of enrollment within doctoral theological education. This reveals the need for altered approaches to the recruitment and retention of persons of color into advanced research doctoral degree programs. Nonetheless, female representation data suggest that neither gender nor race alone are sufficient lenses of analysis to fully understand the barriers to the cultivation of persons of color in theological education.

Black, Hispanics, and Native Americans continue to be significantly underrepresented at advanced research levels of enrollment within doctoral theological education.

Degrees Awarded

In our review of both ATS and NCES data, Hispanics are significantly underrepresented among degree recipients in theology, philosophy, and religious studies at both the master’s and doctoral levels among institutional cohorts. At ATS member schools, a total of 11,846 master’s degrees were awarded in theology during 2011 (Appendix A: Table 2.18). Asian Americans, Blacks, Hispanics and Native Americans received 6.1%, 11.2%, 3.4%, and 0.3% (approximately 21% combined) of the total number of master’s degrees awarded, compared to Whites, who received 62.7% of the master’s degrees awarded in theology in 2011 (Figure 4.1).

FIGURE 4.1: DEGREES AWARDED IN THEOLOGY BY RACE/ETHNICITY AND DEGREE TYPE, 2011

Using NCES data, similar patterns are revealed for master’s degrees awarded in theology and religious vocations. A total of 13,191 degrees were awarded in theology and religious vocations, while 1,833 master’s degrees were awarded in philosophy and religious studies (see Appendix A: Table 3.01). Asian Americans, Blacks, Hispanics and Native Americans received 4.3%, 12.7%, 3.5%, and 0.6% (approximately 21% combined) of the total number of master’s degrees awarded, compared to Whites, who received 63.6% of the master’s degrees awarded in theology and religious vocations (Figure 5.1). Interestingly, while Asian Americans are overrepresented in advanced degree programs, they are underrepresented in degrees awarded within this cohort of theological education.
At the doctoral level, there were a total of 1,020 degrees awarded in advanced research among ATS member schools (Appendix A: Table 2.18). Compared to their share of master's-level degrees awarded, Whites, Blacks, Hispanics, and Native Americans decrease in representation among doctoral research degree recipients, representing 54.9%, 5.1%, 1.9%, and 0.2%, respectively.

Women received 21.7% of the total research doctorate degrees awarded during 2011 at ATS member schools while women of color obtained a mere 4.1% (42). Asian women were awarded 2.2%, Black women were awarded 1.4%, and Hispanic women were awarded 0.6% of advanced research doctorate degrees (Figure 6.1).

ATS post-baccalaureate degree data demonstrates that Black women continue to garner the highest percentage of female representation among degree recipients at both the master's and doctoral levels, when compared to their male counterparts (see Figure 7.1).

Based on NCES data, there were 1,089 doctoral research degrees awarded in theology and religious vocations, while 799 doctorate research degrees were awarded in philosophy and religious studies (see Appendix A: Table 3.01). Persons of color, combined, received 18.7% (204) of the research doctorate degrees in theology and religious vocations (Figure 5.1). Asian Americans, Blacks, and Hispanics acquired 4.2%, 11.2%, and 3.3%, respectively.

Women earned 21.7% of the total research doctoral degrees awarded during 2011. Women of color obtained a meager 5.3% (57). Asian women were awarded 1.3%, Black women were awarded 3.6%, and Hispanic women were awarded 0.4% of advanced research doctorate degrees in theology and religious vocations (Table 3.1).

![Figure 5.1: NCES Degrees Awarded in Religion by Race/Ethnicity and Degree Type, 2011](image)

![Figure 6.1: Female Percent of Total ATS Doctorate (Research) Degrees by Race and Ethnicity, 2011](image)

### Table 3.1: Female Percent of Total NCES Doctorate (Research) Degrees, by Race/Ethnicity, 2010-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RACE/ETHNICITY</th>
<th>THEOLOGY &amp; RELIGIOUS VOCATION</th>
<th>PHILOSOPHY &amp; RELIGIOUS STUDIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASIAN</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
<td>.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACK</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISPANIC</td>
<td>.40%</td>
<td>.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIVE AMERICAN</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>9.50%</td>
<td>21.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISA</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>6.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Center of Education Statistics (NCES), Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS)
By focusing on advanced research degrees at the doctoral level, data exposes that the representation of Asian American, Black, and Hispanic females within each ethnic group exceeds that of other racial/ethnic groups. Asian American women were awarded 25% (22) of the 8.6% research doctorates obtained by Asian Americans. Black women earned 27% (14) of the 5.1% research doctorates obtained by Blacks. Hispanic women earned 31.6% (6) of the slim 1.9% of research doctorate degrees awarded to Hispanics (Figure 7.1).

Using NCES data, shifts in female representation at the doctorate (research) level of theology and religious vocations are striking (Figure 8.1). Particularly, White women decreased to 15.6% (103) of the 61% of research doctorates awarded to Whites, and Hispanic women are 11.1% (4) of the 3.3% of research doctorates awarded to Hispanics in theology and religious vocations.

Overall, persons of color have a higher percentage of representation among recipients of the master’s and doctoral degrees oriented toward ministerial leadership. This may be connected to funding, church-related initiatives, or expected career outcomes associated with ministerial degrees. However, most racial/ethnic groups are still underrepresented, even within these degree categories. Particularly, the low percentage of ministerial master’s and doctoral degrees awarded to Hispanics, as the fastest growing minority population, illuminates an area where targeted diversity initiatives are needed.

Among ATS member schools, diversification of full-time faculty has not kept pace with changes in student enrollment.

Further, data reveals significant racial and gender disparities in the awarding of research-focused doctoral degrees. For example, women of color acquired approximately 5% or less of the research doctoral degrees awarded in 2011, in the midst of rapidly growing female and student of color enrollments in theological education (Aleshire, 2012). Research doctoral degree recipients are the main source of future faculty and scholarship in theological education. The lack of diversity at this level is worthy of concern and institutional action.

Faculty

Faculty is a central resource in the life and vitality of any discipline (AFT, 2010; Berman, 2012). Faculty members in theological education often serve both the academy and the church. The span of theology faculty also moves beyond theological colleges and schools into several other types of post-secondary institutions. While the use of ATS data affords only a limited depiction of the faculty landscape of theological education (since it provides data from theological schools only), the data is consistent with trends in the larger landscape and analysis of broader statistical data highlighted in this review.

Among ATS member schools, diversification of full-time faculty has not kept pace with changes in student enrollment. When enrollment numbers are analyzed in relation to faculty, a significant ratio imbalance is revealed.
The ratio of students of color to faculty of color (approximately 30:1 or greater) is twice as great as the 15:1 ratio of White students to White faculty (See Table 4.1). Sedlacek et al (2008) argue that this imbalance has adverse effects on graduate-level mentoring, as it requires traditional faculty to garner skills that enable them to mentor nontraditional and traditional students with equal effectiveness. Further, the lack of faculty of color and the reluctance of some professors to enter into a cross-race mentoring relationship creates environments of isolation for students of color as well as additional cultural demands for faculty of color (Sedlacek, 2008).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RACE/ETHNICITY</th>
<th>RATIO OF ENROLLMENT TO FACULTY</th>
<th>ENROLLMENT</th>
<th>FACULTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASIAN</td>
<td>27:1</td>
<td>5,243</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACK</td>
<td>35:1</td>
<td>9,312</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISPANIC</td>
<td>29:1</td>
<td>3,591</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIVE AMERICAN</td>
<td>49:1</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>15:1</td>
<td>41,931</td>
<td>2,844</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Association of Theological Schools, 2011-2012 Data Table 2.12 and Table 3.1-A

In 2011, women represented 24% (849) of full-time faculty at ATS member schools. White women represented 77.4% (657) of female full-time professors (See Appendix A, Table 3.1). Women of color comprised 19% of the 24% of full-time female faculty at ATS member schools. The remaining 3.6% comprises women of two or more races or of unknown race, and also women with a visa. Asian American women are 6.2%, Black women are 9.1%, and Hispanic women are 3.9% of full-time female faculty (see Figure 9.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RACE/ETHNICITY</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASIAN</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACK</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISPANIC</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIVE AMERICAN</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Association of Theological Schools, 2011-2012 Data Table 2.12 and Table 3.1-A

The relatively high percentage of Black female representation in enrollment and degree awards is not translated to or reflected within the professoriate. Black women were 29% (77) of the 7.5% (265) total of Black full-time professors in 2011. Black female senior professors are fewer than 9% (23) of Black full-time faculty (Figure 10.1).
Hispanic female faculty account for 26% (33) of the 3.5% (126) full-time Hispanic professors teaching at ATS schools in 2011 (Figure 11.1). Hispanic female senior professors are 9.5% (12) of full-time Hispanic professors. At the associate professor level, Hispanic women were only 3.2% (4) of the Hispanic full-time professors (Figure 11.1), suggesting significant concern for the advancement of Hispanic females to full professors in the near future.

Quantitative and qualitative data that examines student-to-faculty ratios and relationships beyond ATS member schools and by institutional type (such as research, seminary, HBCU, Tribal and others), race, and gender, may be more illuminating as we seek to fully understand the impact that the lack of faculty of color has upon the overall recruitment, retention, and cultivation of persons of color within theological education.

Nonetheless, the statistical landscape of persons of color within theological and religious education suggests that specific, disaggregated attention is needed to address the underrepresentation of Hispanics at all levels, as well as the underrepresentation of Asians, Blacks, Native Americans, and women of all ethnicities at the more advanced levels. Further, the data calls for institutional initiatives that consider and address the imbalances in the climate, culture, and economic impact of doctoral education. The next section of this review illuminates key themes and emerging practices that address recruitment, retention, development, leadership, and the vocational aims of doctoral students in new and innovative ways.

**KEY THEMES**

During our review of the resources and literature compiled for this study, careful attention was given to salient themes that emerged across disciplines, particularly as they point to what is changing in the landscape of theological education, and how those changes might impact scholars of color. Four key themes are:

**Racial Dynamics and Practices within Institutional Culture**

Race continues to play a significant role in the supervising, mentoring, and scholarship of persons of color within higher education. Each of these is a crucial element of doctoral education, and the impact of race in each area is even more pronounced at higher degree levels. The new challenge for institutions relates to larger changes in racial populations, foreign student populations, and eroding issues of access, all of which create the illusion of post-racial institutional climates. Yet, race is still at the forefront of everyday experiences for persons of color, and thus it impacts self-efficacy, self-censorship, and the adoption or rejection of norms and rules of meritocracy and “acceptable” scholarship, particularly for Hispanic and Black doctoral students (Gildersleeve et. al., 2011). Marginalization,
isolation, and microaggression are the forms of racism prevalent within the new millennium academy. These insidious forms of racism create hostile campus climates for persons of color (Gay, 2004; Hall and Burns, 2009; Yusso et al, 2009). To ignore or to not acknowledge the racial dynamics and practices that persist in higher education can constrain and erode any positive results the mentor and advisor relationship has to offer (Sedlacek et al, 2008), especially in a cross-cultural mentor-mentee relationship (Johnson-Bailey, 2004). Consequently, it becomes necessary for academic executives to develop institutional support and to build structures that explicitly acknowledge racial experiences—and then effectively respond to those experiences by changing ideology and cultural norms, and by creating spaces and networks where racially charged experiences can be examined, diffused and deconstructed (See Gildersleeve et al, 2001; Bernal et al, 2009).

Mentoring Networks, Consortia, and Cohorts

To support the cultivation of persons of color within higher education, there is a growing emphasis throughout the literature on the development of mentoring networks, consortia, and cohorts, as opposed to single mentor-mentee relationships. Due to the critical nature of mentoring in higher education, the disparities in faculty demographics, and the power dynamics of hierarchical relationships, the one-to-one mentoring model can create places of contestation and injustice for women and persons of color (Bell-Ellison and Dedrick, 2008). The network and cohort model provides an alternate way of leveraging limited resources. It might also better provide for educational, mentoring, and development needs among both students and faculty.

For women and for persons of color, a sense of “call” is often a major driver and motivator for pursuing an advanced degree.

Mentoring networks or consortia can be collaborations at the institutional, discipline, or racial level, or a combination thereof. Underrepresented groups tend to benefit from a cooperative, non-hierarchical, multiple-mentor relationship, one that attends to personal and emotional needs as well as academic needs (McGuire and Reger, 2003; Sorcinelli and Yun, 2007). However, Agnew et al (2008) warn that if left to a more organic social network structure, mentoring networks—while creating stronger communities—can have socially isolating effects for men and for students of color. Therefore, experts advise that mentoring networks be comprised of intentional cohorts and supported at inter-institutional levels.

Ph.D. Training and Return on Investment (ROI)

For women and for persons of color, a sense of “call” is often a major driver and motivator for pursuing an advanced degree in theology/religion (Longman, 2011). At the same time, the nebulous future economic viability of the degree in the job market has a significantly negative impact on recruitment and retention initiatives. For several years, the humanities in general, and theological/religious education in particular, have seen a shift in the number of faculty positions available versus the number of degrees awarded. For example, for more than two decades, the number of available academic positions in the field of history has been approximately half of the number of newly awarded doctorates (Grafton and Grossman, 2011). The American Academy of Religion (AAR) and the Society of Biblical Literature (SBL) concluded that the job market for religious scholars is shifting towards non-tenure track, full-time positions, with a major growth in modern and comparative world religions, particularly Islam (SBL and AAR, 2010). Further, employers are expecting candidates to have prior teaching experience and interdisciplinary research skills and experiences (SBL and AAR, 2010). Accordingly, many disciplines and departments are reevaluating how they are preparing their Ph.D. students for alternate job market possibilities.

Ph.D. programs are typically geared to prepare emerging scholars for academia. In order to meet the demands of a changing marketplace, Ph.D. programs may need to alter their curriculum and their degree requirements to intentionally inform and prepare students to acquire skills for a broader range of employment opportunities. Alternatives may include inter-contextual and interdisciplinary reading strategies, vocation-focused seminars and courses, and collaborative project base studies.
(Ruiz, 2001; Grafton and Grossman, 2011). Internships, entrepreneur, and non-academic curriculums should also be considered as doctoral program options (Greenwald, 2010; Cassuto, 2012).

The full-time tenure track professor is no longer the main teaching resource of the academy. In a national survey of more than 10,000 part-time employees teaching at two-year and four-year colleges and universities, researchers concluded that colleges and universities rely heavily on part-time faculty members. They are the largest segment of the postsecondary teaching workforce (Coalition of the Academic Workforce -CAW, 2012). Interestingly, “Part-time faculty members in the humanities represented the largest set of survey respondents, accounting for 42.3%” (CAW, 2012, pg. 8). Unfortunately, the growing reliance on part-time faculty may benefit the universities’ cost model, but this practice does not consistently result in adequate support, compensation or future opportunity for the part-time faculty, particularly with rewards that appropriately reflect their credentials.

These changing dynamics in the job market produce significant challenges for higher education in the humanities and grave concerns for persons of color.

**Funding and Developmental Support**

New initiatives and themes that seek to promote the cultivation of persons of color within theological education are futile without the funding and developmental support needed. Beyond providing financial support at the individual level, institutions and programs must offer the funding and resource support to create the cohorts, consortia, strategic partnerships, and collaborative research opportunities that prove most beneficial for persons of color (Aspray and Bernat, 2000; Greenwald, 2010; Williams, 2010; Santiago et al., 2010). For example, the Compact for Faculty Diversity is a partnership of regional, federal and foundation programs that focuses on minority graduate education and faculty diversity. It provides individual funding, but it also incorporates scholars into a cross-disciplinary cohort through a four-day institute on teaching and learning; a scholarly database (available to participating colleges and universities); and strategic mentor networks. The following section shows that the most effective programs include collaborative models of developmental support.

**New initiatives and themes that seek to promote the cultivation of persons of color within theological education are futile without the funding and developmental support needed.**

**EMERGING BEST PRACTICES**

Below are brief descriptions of institutional initiatives designed to address the key themes presented in the previous section. Many of these initiatives are in their early stages. They reflect emerging and innovative practices occurring within various disciplines of higher education. Since several disciplines share similar challenges to those in theological education—such as meeting the needs of a growing minority population and attending to the changing culture and higher education job market—these emerging practices in other fields can inform future initiatives for theological education.

**Mentoring Networks**

Due to the limited number of faculty of color within theological education departments, extra demands are often placed on the current faculty of color to mentor a disproportionate number of students of color. As a result, many faculty of color have found mentoring to be an additional, and sometimes overwhelming, demand in the midst of their other academic obligations. As previously shown, the ratio of Black enrollment to Black faculty is 35:1 and Native Americans experience a 49:1 student to faculty ratio, reflecting a larger student-to-faculty ratio in theological education than other underrepresented groups. On the one hand, expecting faculty of color within the same racial and gender demographic, at any particular institution, to assume the responsibility of mentoring all students of color at an individual level must be reconsidered. On the other hand, simply leaving the onus on students to find the right mentor, or expecting shared scholarly interests (without consideration of racial dynamics) to sustain adequate mentoring for persons of color has also not proven to be effective (Smith et al., 2000).
At the University of Massachusetts Amherst, two Mellon-funded faculty grant programs were established to promote “mutual mentoring” (University of Massachusetts Amherst-UMA, 2011). The Mellon Mutual Mentoring Team Grant Program “supports faculty-driven, context-sensitive projects based at the departmental, school/college, interdisciplinary, or inter-institutional levels” (UMA, 2011). The Mellon Mutual Mentoring Micro Grants are “individual mentoring grants that are intended to encourage pre-tenure faculty to identify desirable areas for professional growth and opportunity and to develop the necessary mentoring partnership to make such change possible” (UMA, 2011). Micro grants may include travel expenses for a cohort meeting among mentoring partners or the creation of writing groups and peer review teams. Applications for grants are evaluated based on their attention to mission, innovation, inclusion, action, and prospects for replication (For more details, See UMA, “Mutual Mentoring Initiative,” 2011).

The development of mentoring networks, rather than one-on-one mentoring practices, proves to be beneficial in meeting the needs of mentors and mentees within graduate education. A strategy that combines the use of virtual and physical spaces is often necessary to sustain mentoring networks over longer periods of time.

**E-Advising and E-Quads**

Emerging practices are capitalizing on digital media and technology to cultivate students for the vocation of teaching and learning. The development of E-Advising and E-Quads includes the creation of online advising programs that utilize technology (such as Blackboard) to create an online community for faculty-student, mentor-mentee, and peer-peer advising and mentoring (Waldner et al., 2012). This practice allows students to take the initiative in obtaining information and tips shared by faculty with other students in previous multi-disciplinary cohorts, as well as to seek customized information and advice relevant to their particular vocation and academic context. The E-Quad might consist of live video teleconferencing, instant messaging, and discussion forums. All members of the online advising and mentoring community share responsibility for responding to and engaging in mentoring and developmental processes (See Walden et al, “The eQuad: A Next-Generation eAdvising Tool to Build Community and Retain Students,” 2012).

**Multi-Track Ph.D.**

A group of scholars in humanities at Stanford University submitted a white paper proposing a radical shift in doctoral education. The multi-track Ph.D. reexamines the requirements for a Ph.D. based on the needs and career goals of students (Cassutto, 2012). The proposal offers both academic and vocational Ph.D. pathways to decrease the length of time to a student’s completion of the doctoral degree and to diminish funding challenges. Bearman et al (2012) also clearly outlined key student, department, and institutional responsibilities involved in the multi-track Ph.D. options. The proposal calls for changes in curriculum, exams, and vocation-focused training during the doctoral education process.

**Cross-Institutional Mentor & Immersion Leadership Program**

The American Council on Education has a Leadership Development Fellowship, which fosters the development of emerging leaders at participating universities. It engages fellows in key meetings with senior leadership at major institutions, allowing them to take on specific problems and projects under an assigned mentorship. Fellows also participate in and visit problem-solving teams at cross-institutional sites. The fellowship develops a network of higher education leaders at the vice president, president, and chief executive levels. According to ACE,

The Fellows Program enables participants to immerse themselves in the culture, policies, and decision-making processes of another institution. This unique program condenses years of on-the-job experience and skills development into a single year. As a result, the ACE Fellows Program is the most effective, comprehensive leadership development program in American higher education today. Since 1965, more than 1,800 vice presidents, deans, department chairs, faculty, and other emerging leaders have participated in the ACE Fellows Program (ACE, 2013).

The nominating institution covers the salary, travel, and program fees for participation.

The Hispanic Theological Initiative (HTI) is another example of a cross-institutional, multi-dimensional
immersion program that has been successful in promoting Latino development at the doctoral and post-doctoral level. Through scholarships, mentoring, recruitment and other forms of support, HTI attracts and networks Latino doctoral students pursuing doctoral studies in religion, bible, theology and related disciplines. HTI manages the newly developed Hispanic Theological Initiative Consortium (HTIC), a network of Ph.D.-granting institutions committed to recruiting, retaining and supporting Latino doctoral students through the investment of human, financial, and infrastructural resources. The HTIC aims to “help identify and prepare highly trained educators and leaders who can articulate, model, and help teach values and ideas that will inform and make an impact in our Latino faith communities and communities in general.”

Studies that explore retention and persistence across variables for persons of color in theological education seem to be missing.

Innovation Labs for Higher Education

In 2012, Northeastern University School of Law (NUSL) established the nation’s first Legal Innovation Lab to identify and cultivate visionary new approaches to legal education and to the delivery of legal services. Part physical and part virtual, the Legal Innovation Lab functions in many ways. Physically housed at Northeastern, it serves as a hub where individuals and groups can convene in a multidisciplinary environment to develop concepts and to experiment in a structured setting built around design thinking. It engages clients who seek assistance with concerns that require specific and individual attention. It also draws together interested parties with expertise across disciplines to engage in large and small gatherings that focus on issues of broad concern. In addition to its physical space, The Innovation Lab will exist as a virtual location where open-source dialogues will address challenges of common interest through collaborative problem-solving from around the globe.

CONCLUSION

The changing landscape of higher education presents challenges and opportunities unique to the current historical era. For theological and religious education, the cultivation of diverse faculty, students, and scholarship is imperative to the academy’s ability to remain a vital partner in the future landscape of higher education and to be a relevant entity that serves communities and the larger society. This will require increased use of technology, considerations of multiple pathways that acknowledge the economic implications of traditional doctoral education, and institutional investment in inter-institutional and inter-disciplinary partnerships.

Education is also shifting within the context of a global market and global trends—as demonstrated by the growing presence of non-resident aliens in U.S. higher education.

Significantly, the enrollment of non-resident aliens/visa students in U.S. theological education at advanced ministerial and advanced research levels surpasses the enrollment of all traditionally underrepresented groups and U.S. populations of persons of color (Table 2.1).

While these shifting dynamics are being explored within narrow contexts, studies that explore retention and persistence across variables for persons of color in theological education seem to be missing from the literature. In 1988, Girves and Wemmerus called for retention studies that investigate dropout rates, variances in field choice, departmental performance, and financial support as predictors of completion for women and minorities at each stage of the education pipeline (Girves and Wemmerus, 1988). More than 20 years later, very few national or inter-institutional studies have materialized.

Other disciplines are able to supply specific examples of knowledge obtained by conducting multi-variable analysis. They are also able to expose pertinent gender dynamics regarding recruitment and retention. Such studies of theological education are rare.

For example, in the field of engineering, when disaggregated by racial/ethnic group as well as by gender, studies show that Black males and females have lower rates of persistence.

Studies that explore retention and persistence across variables for persons of color in theological education seem to be missing.
than White, Asians, and Hispanic males and females. Black males persist at a rate of 48.4%, lower than all other groups, including their female counterparts, who persist at a rate of 51.1%. Further, females of each racial/ethnic group obtained higher GPAs in science and engineering courses (STEM GPA) than their male counterparts. Black women's STEM GPA on average was 2.34 compared to Black men's STEM GPA of 2.10. Consequently, academic performance does not explain gender disparities in engineering within the same racial/ethnic group. Noticeably, women who do not persist in engineering are more likely than men to switch majors, rather than leave higher education altogether (Lord et al., 2009).

Black males' persistence in higher education as a whole is dwindling, with college graduates decreasing from 18.7% in 2008 to 17.7% in 2010 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). These dynamics impact Black women's gender representation (when comparing gender only), since at the same time Black women college graduates increased from 20.4% to 21.4% (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). According to Lord et al., the gender disparities observed in engineering can be attributed to disparities in enrollment rather than to disparities in persistence. Trends for African American women in engineering disclose great implications for recruitment and field choice as opposed to issues of persistence or performance.

A significant talent pool of persons of color for research and faculty leadership in theological education is being lost in the education pipeline.

The lack of such studies for theological education may cause academic leadership and policy makers to misappropriate the needs and challenges for a particular racial/ethnic group based on general categories and patterns of gender, race, field of choice, and degrees awarded. A multi-level, multi-dimensional analysis is needed to adequately identify the particular challenges and barriers to the cultivation of persons of color within theological/religious education. As the population demographics of the U.S. continue to change, all academic disciplines must be vigilant and proactive in order to sustain a vital and diverse talent pool.

Consequently, the following conclusions and recommendations can be used as next steps toward the cultivation of persons of color and the general advancement of the field of theological education:

**What Do the Statistical Findings Tell Us?**

- A significant talent pool of persons of color for research and faculty leadership in theological education is being lost in the education pipeline.

- The low participation of Hispanics in theological education is a critical issue to be addressed within the context of the changing racial demographics of the U.S. population.

- Progress in diversifying advanced research and leadership levels of theological education is slow (a finding upheld by the ATS 2005 report on theological faculty—see Wheeler, 2005), and has become relatively static since 2007.

- Statistical patterns vary within racial/ethnic groups around gender, and within gender groups around race. Yet very little is known about the cause for varying patterns. Analyzing race/ethnicity and gender as two distinct macro demographic categories mask the nuances of diversity that impact persons of color.

**Recommendations:**

- **Longitudinal mixed-methods studies:**
  As previously stated, multi-level, multi-dimensional longitudinal studies that examine macro-level statistics in dialogue with micro-level qualitative data are needed.

  - For example, a study that surveys a representative sample of cohorts related to the North American Indigenous Theological Studies (NAIITS), Hispanic Theological Initiative (HTI), and Fund for Theological Education (FTE) cohorts over a 10 to 20-year period could illumine responses to open questions regarding the participation of persons of color in theological education. This study could address questions related to race, gender, immigration patterns, institutional culture and climate, bachelor and master’s origin institutions,
post-baccalaureate pathways, field choice, funding, and expected career outcomes.

Key questions the study could address include:

What factors contribute to the dismal number of women of color at advanced levels of theological education? What lessons can be learned about gender dynamics and disparities from African Americans’ relatively high female representation in theological education? What trends explain the loss of diverse talent at senior levels of the professoriate? Are there noteworthy disparities within Asian and Hispanic populations based on racial, geographic, or class origins? What can trends regarding student-to-faculty ratio and institutional type (research, seminary, HBCU, Tribal and others) reveal about the impact of the lack and presence of faculty of color upon recruitment, retention, and cultivation of persons of color within theological education?

- **Disaggregate reporting and evaluation practices**
  Aggregated data studies that ignore the nuances of human reality have not yielded the type of results required to establish targeted initiatives, especially for Blacks, Hispanics, and some domestic Asian populations. Further, anecdotal personal testimonies, regardless of accuracy, have not proven to be sufficient to compel significant change within the academy. Research protocols designed to address some of these open questions create collaborative inter-disciplinary research opportunities while simultaneously having significant policy, funding, and resource implications.

What do the key themes, best practices, and literature tell us?

- The religious and academic landscape is changing and thus the curricula of doctoral education and practices within the academy need to take a more multi-disciplinary and multi-track, or "multi-pathway" approach.

- Cultivation of persons of color within theological education should not be left to faculty of color, or to local institutions to address sporadically. The literature and data demonstrate that strategic initiatives are needed—and that current numbers of racial/ethnic minority students, faculty, and administrators are too low at any single institutional level to sustain such initiatives.

- Literature that specifically advances knowledge of theological education as a field, and persons of color within the field, is limited.

**Recommendations:**

- **Establish inter-institutional program initiatives**
  Colleges, universities, departments, administrators, funders, professional societies, government entities, and non-profits should work together to establish explicit cross-institutional partnerships, programs, and tracking/evaluation methods. The Legal Innovation Lab at Northeastern University reveals ways in which institutional initiatives involving collaboration between diverse persons and diverse techniques provide creative means to think through solutions to the growing challenges facing the cultivation of persons of color. Simultaneously, this could create collaborative research opportunities to cultivate a microentrepreneurial atmosphere and to enhance the economic vitality of doctoral/advanced education.

- **Sharing and publication of knowledge across the field**
  The resources and literature review section of this report expose that there are limited pockets of knowledge regarding the status of persons of color within theological education. Most of this knowledge exists on organizations’ websites or within a few single reports. Publishing literature or establishing a resource that can be shared and referenced across the field may compel consistent attention and action to be taken. A commitment to publish an edited volume of theological education, or a collaborative report and/or accompanying journal series, every three to five years is suggested as a strategy of self-assessment and as a way to inform future innovative directions for theological education.
RESOURCES-ANNOTATED LISTING

The Adjunct Project, a service of The Chronicle of Higher Education.
Two-thirds of the faculty standing in front of college classrooms each day aren’t full-time or permanent professors. But getting information about the salaries of this army of adjuncts and about their campus working conditions has been difficult. This site, which is intended to pull together that information and make it publicly available, represents the evolution of a simple spreadsheet created in 2012 by Joshua Boldt, a composition instructor in Athens, GA. The Adjunct Project, as an online resource, includes compensation information on adjuncts and opportunities for adjuncts to contribute to the data. It also includes a blog on the working conditions of adjuncts and advice for navigating adjunct employment opportunities. [http://adjunct.chronicle.com/about/]

This online resource provides tips and guidelines for racial and ethnic minorities pursuing careers in religion. The resource includes nine chapters: 1-Introduction, 2-Graduate School, 3-Job Search, 4-Working Toward Tenure, 5-Post Tenure, 6-Alternative Career Options, 7-Dealing with Difficult Issues, 8-Are You Considering the Hire, 9-Suggested Resources. This Career Guide offers help by providing practical professional advice and guidance from the doctoral training years through retirement. The Career Guide is sponsored by the Committee on the Status of Racial and Ethnic Minorities in the Profession, a standing committee of the AAR. The charge of the Committee is to recommend policies and good practices to assure the full access and academic freedom of racial/ethnic minority persons within the Academy and to develop programs to enhance their status in the profession. [From the Author http://www.aarweb.org/publications/arr-career-guide-racial-and-ethnic-minorities-profession]

Coalition on the Academic Workforce (2012). A Portrait of Part-Time Faculty Members Survey Data.
In an effort to address the lack of data on contingent faculty members and their working conditions, the Coalition on the Academic Workforce (CAW) conducted an ambitious survey in fall 2010, seeking information about the courses these faculty members were teaching that term, where they were teaching them, and for what pay and benefits. The survey received close to 30,000 responses, with more than 10,000 coming from faculty members who were teaching part-time at an institution or institutions of higher education in fall 2010. The responses from these part-time faculty members provide the basis for a detailed portrait of the work patterns, remuneration, and employment conditions for what has long been the fastest growing and is now the largest part of the academic workforce. The online resource includes links to survey questionnaires, reports, paths, and requests to access data files. [http://www.academicworkforce.org/survey.html]

Diversity in Theological Education. Association of Theological Schools (ATS) Folio (2002).
This folio is provided as a resource for addressing race and ethnicity in theological education. “Using the Folio” suggests ways in which the various contents of the folio might be used in a range of institutional settings. “Perspectives on Diversity” presents, in a newsletter format, several short essays on diversity in theological education. Faculty member profiles (Asian, African American, and Hispanic) provide specific, personal locations for entry into issues of diversity within theological institutions. Statistics on race and ethnicity provide data on racial/ethnic diversity within theological schools and within the general populace. Issue sheets are designed to be short, provocative entry points into discussion of issues related to tenure, hospitality, isolation, hiring,
and curriculum revision. Seven cases illustrate ways in which institutions have come to work through issues of diversity. Finally, the “Do’s and Don’t’s” sheet identifies a number of concerns regarding diversity and institutional change. An accompanying CD-ROM with all the contents of this folio is included. [http://ats.nurelm.com/resources/publications-and-presentations/diversity-folio/]

**The Fund for Theological Education.**

FTE provides vocational discernment gatherings, mentoring opportunities, fellowships, grants and a community of support to young people within the field and vocation of theological education—young leaders who are on the path to discovering their purpose, passion and call. FTE also provides a hyperlinked list of online resources for young adults discovering their purpose, passion and call; doctoral students of color; new pastors; and partners who are nurturing young leaders on their vocational journey. [Excerpts taken from FTE website retrieved from http://www.fteleaders.org/]

**The Louisville Institute.**

The Louisville Institute is a funding and collaborative inquiry resource for persons pursuing degrees in theological education. The Louisville Institute seeks to fulfill its mission to bring together religious leaders and academics through three separate but related programs: 1) grant making, 2) fellowships in theological education, and 3) collaborative inquiry teams. The Louisville Institute is a Lilly Endowment-funded program based at Louisville Seminary. [Excerpts taken from website retrieved at http://www.louisville-institute.org/Grants/currentprograms.aspx/]

**Wabash Center for Teaching and Learning, Online Resources.**

The Wabash Center website provides an updated list of grants, workshops, and consultations offered through the Wabash Center. It also has an annotated guide to a wide variety of electronic resources of interest to those who are involved in the study and practice of religion, including syllabi, electronic texts, electronic journals, web sites, bibliographies, liturgies, reference resources, and software; as well as an annotated guide to resources about effective teaching in higher educational settings (including, but not limited to, resources particular to teaching in theological schools and teaching religion to undergraduates). [http://www.wabashcenter.wabash.edu/home/default.aspx/]

**The National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity (NCFDD)**

The National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity (NCFDD) is an independent membership organization that is 100% dedicated to helping underrepresented faculty make a successful transition from graduate student to professor. They work with colleges, universities, organizations, and individuals to ensure faculty success. Our programs and services help new faculty to increase writing productivity, improve work-family balance, create broad networks of collegial support on their campus, and develop a committed stance toward their institutional home. NCFDD offers our 7,500 members on-line and on-site training workshops and intensive leadership development programs for graduate students, post-doctoral researchers, and faculty members. For colleges, universities, and professional organizations who want to offer the NCFDD’s resources for an unlimited number of graduate students, post docs, and faculty members, we offer an annual institutional membership for $20,000. This membership provides the following:

- The Monday Motivator (a weekly email with productivity tips)
- Access to monthly training webinars facilitated by Kerry Ann Rockquemore
- Access to our special guest expert webinars facilitated by faculty development experts from around the country
- Audio recordings, slides, and transcripts of all of our workshops so faculty can learn at their convenience
- Access to our private networking forum
- Access to our moderated monthly writing challenges
- Monthly mentor matches

[http://www.facultydiversity.org/]

---
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The Mentor. Penn State.
The Mentor, an academic advising journal, is a peer-reviewed scholarly publication about academic advising in higher education. The journal is free and published only online. The goal of the journal is to provide a mechanism for the rapid dissemination of new ideas about advising and for ongoing discourse about advising issues. Toward this goal, articles in the journal are published continuously. Each article is archived and is accessible online indefinitely. Although the journal encourages the submission of research-based articles, it also seeks articles based on the theory and philosophy of academic advising, descriptions of exemplary practices in advising and innovative advising programs, summaries of conference presentations, personal perspectives and reflections, and other concise forms of writing related to advising. In addition, the journal invites responses to a bimonthly Advising Forum topic. Each topic and the responses submitted by readers are archived. [http://dus.psu.edu/mentor/]

Emerging Practices Resources

American Council on Education (ACE) Leadership & Advocacy in Higher Education.
To serve the multifaceted needs of diverse campuses around the country, ACE offers leadership development programs and activities that equip leaders with the tools they need to make practical day-to-day decisions and plan for future success. Our programs are organized around the work of three intersecting groups: The Executive Leadership Group focuses on presidents and other senior leaders; The Emerging Leaders Group focuses on rising administrators; The Inclusive Excellence Group helps foster greater diversity and inclusion in higher education, particularly in the senior leadership ranks. Some of the programs include: Presidential Roundtables, ACE Leadership Academy for Department Chairs, National Women's Leadership Forum, Fellows Program, and Spectrum Executive Leadership Program. [For more information see http://www.acenet.edu/leadership/Pages/default.aspx]

The Compact for Faculty Diversity. Southern Regional Education Board (SREB).
The Compact for Faculty Diversity is a partnership of regional, federal and foundation programs that focus on minority graduate education and faculty diversity. To date, the Compact partnership consists of the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE), the National Institutes of Health (Bridges to the Professoriate NIGMS-MARC), the National Science Foundation (Alliance for Graduate Education and the Professoriate), and the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation and the Office of Federal TRIO Programs, United States Department of Education (Ronald E. McNair Program). The Compact for Faculty Diversity has a simple goal: to increase the number of minority students who earn doctoral degrees and become college and university faculty. By supporting and encouraging these minority students, the Compact works to: increase the percentage of these students who obtain the doctoral degree and seek faculty positions, diversify the pool of qualified faculty candidates, and increase the likelihood of success as faculty members in the academic community—teachers, researchers, mentors, academic leaders, and role models. Each year, The Compact for Faculty Diversity sponsors the Institute on Teaching and Mentoring, a four-day conference that has become the largest gathering of minority doctoral scholars in the country. Now in its 17th year, the Institute gives the issue of faculty diversity a national focus and provides minority scholars with the strategies necessary to survive the rigors of graduate school, earn the doctoral degree and succeed as a member of the professoriate. The Compact for Faculty Diversity sustains a scholarly directory accessible by colleges and universities interested in hiring person of color across a spectrum of disciplines. There is time to meet and interview with potential employers during the four-day Institute on Teaching and Mentoring. The Compact also funds doctoral education through its multiple fellowship programs. [http://www.instituteonteachingandmentoring.org/Compact/index.html]

This article overviews key arguments presented in a white paper titled “The Future of the Humanities Ph.D. at Stanford.” Written by Russell Berman, a professor of German studies and comparative literature (and immediate past president of the Modern Language Association), together with five other Stanford faculty members. The document presents the latest and best proposal for more-flexible doctoral instruction, with different tracks aimed at different career goals. The paper focuses on two of the most egregious shortcomings in humanities graduate education. First, there’s the unconscionably high time to degree (now over nine years in the humanities), and second, the failure of graduate schools to prepare students for a “diverse array of meaningful, socially productive, and personally rewarding careers within and outside the academy.” If their proposal is approved—and that’s
a big if—then students at Stanford will submit a ranked list of their career preferences to their departments at the end of their second year of doctoral study. The rest of their time in graduate school would then be customized according to those preferences, with the remaining requirements (such as the comprehensive exam) prepared with their particular career goals in mind. One model for alternative paths to the Ph.D. involves dividing “scholars” from “teachers” by granting them separate versions of the doctorate. The article also addresses some of the criticisms and cautions raised in response to the proposed multi-track Ph.D. model. [http://chronicle.com/article/The-Multi-Track-PhD/134738/]

**Legal Innovation Lab, Northeastern University School of Law (NUSL)**

In 2012, Northeastern University School of Law (NUSL) established the nation’s first Legal Innovation Lab to identify and cultivate visionary new approaches to legal education and the delivery of legal services. Part physical and part virtual, the Legal Innovation Lab functions in many ways. Physically housed at Northeastern, it serves as a hub where individuals and groups can convene in a multidisciplinary environment to develop concepts and to experiment in a structured setting built around design thinking. In this way, the Innovation Lab serves as the premier location for creative solutions at a time of disruption and uncertainty in the legal academy and profession. It also engages clients seeking assistance on matters requiring specific attention while also drawing together interested parties with expertise across disciplines to engage in large and small gatherings focused on issues of broad concern. The Innovation Lab also will exist as a virtual location where open source dialogues will address challenges of common interest through collaborative problem solving from around the globe. [Excerpts taken from website [http://www.northeastern.edu/law/experience/leadership/lab/index.html]]


In the literature of faculty development, mentoring is frequently cited as one of the few common characteristics of a successful academic career, particularly for women and faculty of color. Yet mentoring, as most of us now know it, has traditionally been defined by a top-down, one-on-one relationship in which an experienced faculty member guides and supports the career development of a new or early-career faculty member. “Mutual Mentoring” distinguishes itself from the traditional model by encouraging the development of a broader, more flexible network of support that mirrors the diversity of real-life mentoring in which no single person is required or expected to possess the expertise of many. Within this model, early-career faculty build robust networks by engaging multiple “mentoring partners” in non-hierarchical, collaborative partnerships to address specific areas of knowledge and experience, such as research, teaching, tenure, and work-life balance. In 2007, the Center for Teaching and Faculty Development (CTFD) established two faculty grant programs to encourage the creation of projects and resources that support early-career faculty and faculty of color through Mutual Mentoring. The following grant programs were made possible by a generous three-year grant from The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, which was renewed in 2010 for an additional three-year period. [Excerpt retrieved from http://www.umass.edu/ctfd/mentoring/guidelines.shtml]


The art and practice of eAdvising (defined here as using electronic means to advise online students) continues to evolve. The first generation of eAdvising (termed here as eAdvising 1.0) featured one-way communication between faculty and students, asynchronous communication via email, and even early advancements such as individual faculty web pages that provided resources and information for advisees (e.g., Luna and Medina, 2005; Wagner, 2001). eAdvising 2.0 expanded to develop state-of-the-art eTools, such as virtual advising organizations, virtual office hours, and advising videos and archives employed by individual faculty members (Havice et al., 2009; Woods, 2004). In this article, authors introduce the next-generation innovation, eAdvising 3.0—the eQuad. Most traditional brick-and-mortar campuses have a central location or campus quad where students gather to network, build friendships, work on joint projects, etc. Through strategic use of a course management system, the eQuad offers an online alternative to the traditional on-campus quad by providing a central location for students to access and share information as well as build community with their advisers, faculty, and other students. In addition, the eQuad as an innovative advising system features numerous advantages over previous models, including rich communication tools and enhanced access to online advisees, essentially equipping an entire department’s faculty with a powerful tool to promote advising excellence. [http://dus.psu.edu/mentor/2012/10/equad-eadvising-tool-build-community-retain-students/ ]
LITERATURE REVIEW-ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Scholarly literature has been organized into four categories: Academic Job Market; Leadership, Scholarship & Development; Mentoring; and Race/Racism. Some sources could be assigned to multiple categories based on the cross-section of questions addressed in the material. Thus, it is suggested that abstracts be used as the ultimate guide in reference selection and use.

Academic Job Market


This paper is the plenary address of ATS president Daniel Aleshire. In this address, Aleshire shares his “perceptions about how religion has changed and speculates about responses that ATS schools should consider making” (p.1). Aleshire addresses changes in denominational structure, Christian identities, religious participation, and religious pluralism. In response, Aleshire offers suggestions for attending to a changing religious climate, including broadening theological education at the baccalaureate level, incorporating more technology in theological education practices, and paying closer attention to non-traditional education partners.


In fall and winter terms 2011/12, a group of senior faculty gathered to discuss the future of the humanities Ph.D. They explored the following questions: Can and should the humanities Ph.D. remain centrally relevant – at Stanford, in the academy, and in an increasingly global and cosmopolitan 21st-century society? The faculty collected and reviewed literature bearing on that question, along with some data from the Humanities and Sciences Dean on humanities Ph.D. programs at Stanford. The data focused on time to degree and the careers of Ph.D.s. The group concluded that freshly minted humanities Ph.D.’s face a difficult job market, one in which only a small fraction can expect to secure tenurable positions at the Research One institutions for which they are primarily, if not exclusively, trained. Many qualified humanities Ph.D.’s do not find permanent positions in higher education. Although doctoral programs often convey the message that the only acceptable career for graduates involves research positions in peer institutions, in fact, many Ph.D. recipients pursue very different careers, including faculty positions in primarily teaching institutions, non-faculty positions inside higher education and opportunities outside of higher education altogether, whether in government, non-profits or the private sector. In light of the massive investment of time, effort, and money on the part of students and universities alike, it is imperative that this genuine range of career outcomes is recognized and that doctoral programs are designed to prepare students appropriately and expeditiously.


For the past 25 years, Auburn has tracked patterns of doctoral preparation of seminary faculty, publishing lists of programs that are the top suppliers of the doctorates held by such faculty, and surveying doctoral students in those programs every ten years. The most recent survey was conducted in 2003. Building on these studies, Auburn Center staff designed a research project of limited scope to address questions about recent developments in the doctoral programs that prepare the majority of faculty
in North American theological schools. Twenty-one North American institutions whose research doctorates are held by one percent or more of theological school faculty were invited to participate. Two did not respond to the invitation to participate. Several institutions had two programs sufficiently different that they are treated separately. Twenty-four programs are included in this report and are listed by type and with brief descriptions in Appendix A. The director of each of these programs was interviewed by telephone. This brief study gives some insight into why structures and procedures are so hard to adjust. Unlike undergraduate and professional programs that can call on all the resources of a school for recruitment of students, admissions, vocational development, co-curricular activities, and post graduation placement, doctoral programs are usually conducted by departments that have very limited administrative and educational support resources of their own. These limitations are especially hard on programs in areas such as theology and religion, whose students are preparing to serve a uniquely configured set of institutions. The findings of this study strongly suggest that various aspects of doctoral programs should operate differently if their goal is to better serve the purposes of the institutions most likely to employ doctoral graduates in theology and religion. For instance, most graduates of the programs we studied, if they end up in teaching positions, will find themselves in settings where the character and vocational formation of students is a central goal. This is the case not only in seminaries in which students are preparing for church ministries, but also in the liberal arts programs that are most likely to offer positions in religion. To prepare teachers for this work, doctoral programs need to change their admissions procedures to focus on character and personal qualities as well as on intellectual capacities. Doctoral students would be well served by structured attention to their own formation and vocational goals because they are likely to be required to provide the same for their undergraduate or seminary students. And all doctoral students in these fields should receive both training and practice in teaching—these should not be optional, as they are in a number of programs.


Coalition on the Academic Workforce (2012). “A Portrait of Part-Time Faculty Members: A Summary of Findings on Part-Time Faculty Respondents to the Coalition on the Academic Workforce Survey of Contingent Faculty Members and Instructors,” 1-52.

In an effort to address the lack of data on contingent faculty members and their working conditions, the Coalition on the Academic Workforce (CAW) conducted an ambitious survey in fall 2010, seeking information about the courses these faculty members were teaching that term, where they were teaching them, and for what pay and benefits. The survey received close to 30,000 responses, with more than 10,000 coming from faculty members who were teaching part-time at an institution or institutions of higher education in fall 2010. The responses from these part-time faculty members provide the basis for a detailed portrait of the work patterns, remuneration, and employment conditions for what has long been the fastest-growing and is now the largest part of the academic workforce.


This article addresses the reality that many people receiving a Ph.D. in History will not obtain a tenure-track position, yet most of the curricula seem designed towards that end. The president and executive director of the American Historical Association (AHA) propose alternative pathways and job opportunities for history Ph.D.’s. They denounce any ideas that the dissertation process should be less arduous or diminished in the theoretical and historical research skills acquired. However, they propose internships, vocational course work, and informational workshops geared towards non-academic doctoral positions implemented during the later (writing) stages of the Ph.D. In lieu of these alternate dissertation options, the extensive manuscript requirement should be reduced to articles or some other complimentary form of writing. The online article includes critical comments from members of AHA.

To many Americans, the liberal arts are a luxury they feel they need to give up to make a living—nice but impractical. The liberal arts need to speak more concretely to the economic as well as the intellectual value of a liberal arts degree. It has been known for many years that younger workers (i.e., recent college graduates) move from firm to firm, job to job and even career to career during their lifetime. What scholars are seeing now, however, is different. As for many Americans, they are hustling from gig to gig, too. These workers, many former liberal arts students, may never know economic security, but they may know success. For many of the new-economy workers, success is measured by more than just money, as freedom, flexibility and creativity count, too. If this is the new economy students are going to inherit, college and university administrators, faculty and staff need to take stock of the programs offered (curricular as well as extracurricular) to ensure that programs serve students’ needs and set them on a successful course for the future. Liberal arts administrators, faculty, and staff also need to be less territorial, and recognize that the professional schools are not the enemy. They have a lot to offer our students. Strategic partnerships between professional schools and the arts and sciences enrich both and offer liberal arts students important professional opportunities long closed off to them. They also need to find ways to be good neighbors to the growing micropreneurial class, either by providing space, Wi-Fi, or interns. Some schools have created successful incubators, which can jump-start small businesses and give their students important ground-floor exposure to the emerging economy. [Excerpt from article, read more: http://www.insidehighered.com/views/2010/10/01/greenwald#ixzz2NTt71ujo]


This report provides detailed analysis of the job market in biblical, religious and theological studies, based on data collected from 2001-2010 by the Society of Biblical Literature and the American Academy of Religion. Analysis regarding the type of jobs advertised, the type of institutions, and changes in job trends and characteristics are reported. The report also includes 16 key findings regarding the job market.


How colleges determine who is recruited, who merits admission, who receives student aid and of what variety, which classes are offered and when, and what kind of assistance is provided to students all comprise a complex system and an emerging field known as enrollment management. That colleges manage their enrollments only makes sense. After all, enrollments make up the bulk of institutional revenue at universities and colleges and students bring the energy, diversity, and talent that comprise the potential for learning and academic success. So it is to be expected that colleges and universities will manage enrollments to meet their particular missions, needs, and interests. What can be said, however, about the way college enrollments are managed on behalf of the public and national interest? This paper addresses this question by examining institutional enrollment goals and the enrollment decisions and strategies that are used in service to them. Further, the paper addresses how institutional goals may be directed in greater measure toward the public interest. In doing so, a framework is provided for better public information and more informed public policy with respect to college enrollment in the United States. It then takes a novel turn by adapting the unlikely example of the National Football League as a promising model to moderate harmful competition, regain public trust, and focus on educational results as measures of quality, as opposed to the present rankings-centered emphasis on characteristics of the incoming student body. Specifically, this paper suggests that American higher education would be more inclusive and results driven if colleges and universities formed a league to establish rules of competition and progress in the public interest. The goals of this “Higher Education League” would be broader participation, increased rates of success, and reduced costs. (Contains 35 endnotes.) [This paper was written with the assistance of Sandy Baum, Robert Frank, Don Heller, Don Hossler, David Kalsbeek, and William Tierney.]


This study examines the efforts of 27 colleges and universities to enhance their faculty racial/ethnic diversity between 2000-2004. The findings revealed that turnover was a significant factor in the lack of advancement of underrepresented minority (URM) faculty. This report includes a practical tool to help campus leaders help measure faculty turnover and recommendations to assist in assessing turnover and diversity efforts.

This essay, prompted by the author's experiences as a faculty participant at the 1998 and 2000 recruitment conferences jointly sponsored by the Society of Biblical Literature and the American Academy of Religion, assesses the future of biblical studies in the United States from the vantage point of these and allied efforts to address the problem of the underrepresentation of racial and ethnic minorities in graduate programs and in the professorate. Retracing the steps taken by some of the pioneering voices of the present generation of racial and ethnic minority biblical scholars in the United States, the essay then looks ahead at inter-contextual and interdisciplinary reading strategies and at liberative pedagogical discourses and practices.


While we have witnessed steady growth in the racial and ethnic diversity of the student population, we have not seen similar diversification among college faculty. Despite the efforts of many colleges and universities, racial and ethnic minorities remain grossly underrepresented among the faculty; they make up only 13.8 percent of the total faculty nationwide. The latest annual status report, “Minorities in Higher Education,” indicates the proportion among full-time faculty: 5 percent African Americans (non-Hispanic), 2.7 percent Hispanics, 5.7 percent Asian Americans, and 0.4 percent American Indians (Harvey 2001). Moreover, faculty of color are not evenly distributed across institutional types, disciplines, or academic ranks. For instance, larger numbers of Hispanic faculty are employed at two-year institutions. African Americans, American Indians, and Hispanics are most acutely underrepresented in the fields of science and engineering. Across ranks, Asian Americans comprise only 1.8 percent of academic administrators (Turner and Myers 2000; Harvey 2001). Informed by the growing research literature on racial and ethnic diversity in the faculty, this guidebook offers specific recommendations to faculty search committees. Many of these recommendations are also based on first-hand observations, testimonials, and conversations with faculty of color. The primary goal of this guidebook is to help structure and execute successful searches for faculty of color. Although focused on junior-level faculty searches, many of the recommendations also can be applied across ranks and disciplinary lines. Of course, the specific procedures for conducting the search process will vary from institution to institution, but the analyses and suggested actions presented here are widely applicable. [Excerpt from guidebook] This monograph suggests ways in which an institution can diversify its faculty and facilitate the work of the search committee before a candidate ever reaches the interview stage. It outlines a step-by-step process to improve the likelihood of a successful search, and it recommends items to consider after a hire is confirmed to ensure that the new faculty member will be more likely to stay. The sections are: (1) Before the Search Begins; (2) The Search Process; and (3) After the Search. Appendices contain a checklist of best practices, a list of leading institutions for minority Ph.D.s, a list of baccalaureate institutions identified as producers of numbers of female doctorates; and a list of Web resources of programs for building diverse faculties. An annotated bibliography lists 59 sources for additional information. (Contains 36 references.) [Eric]


This publication reports the results of a 2003 study of theological faculty and doctoral students. Begun in 2001, the present research replicates in whole or in part four of the earlier studies, conducted approximately ten years prior. According to the report, the numbers and percentages of racial/ethnic minority faculty in ATS-member theological institutions remain small. African Americans constituted about 6% of faculty members in 2001, a gain of only about one percentage point in a ten-year period. Gains of other racial/ethnic groups have not been much greater. Schools of different religious traditions have different levels and types of racial diversity: mainline Protestant faculties have the highest percentages of racial/ethnic faculty in total and the best representation of African American faculty, but Roman Catholic schools have the highest percentage of Hispanics, and evangelical Protestant seminaries the highest percentage of Asians and Asian Americans. The prospects for progress in the immediate future are not bright: the younger half of faculty is only slightly more diverse than the older half. And although at first glance the doctoral student body appears to have made real gains in racial diversity in the last ten years, it must be noted that two groups—African-American and Hispanic—have increased in the top supplier schools only to the current level of representation on theological faculties (a little more than 6%, for instance, for African Americans). Asians and Asian Americans are present in impressively high numbers at the doctoral level, but many of these students are non-residents who will return to teach in their home countries [excerpt taken from pg. 7-8].

This study investigated the importance of discipline variations in understanding faculty turnover behaviors. A representative sample of university faculty in research and doctoral universities was obtained from a national database. Faculty members, self-identified into a primary academic area, were grouped into eight discipline clusters according to an established framework. Multiple regression models were constructed to examine within each cluster the relative importance of a list of factors that have been identified to be related to faculty turnover. Cross-discipline comparisons of within-cluster variable prioritization revealed substantial discipline variations with regard to the major factors that are critical to faculty turnover. The findings produced evidence that discipline-specific information was indispensable to institutional administrators and policy makers for effective faculty retention. [From Author]

Leadership, Scholarship & Development


The French and Raven power taxonomy (coercive, expert, legitimate, referent, and reward) was utilized to investigate graduate students’ perceptions of their supervising professors’ power and the relationship between professors’ power and various students’ perceptions, intentions, and behaviors. The results show that faculty power bases are related to several variables that are critical to student satisfaction and success.


A committee convened by the Coalition to Diversify Computing (CDC) released a report entitled Recruitment and Retention of Underrepresented Minority Graduate Students in Computer Science (212 KB PDF). The report offers 25 practical suggestions for graduate departments to consider. Each contains a general discussion followed by a recommended course of action. Scattered through this discussion are examples of successful programs and new programs that seem promising, along with contact information for those who want to explore further. These suggestions cover specific recruitment tactics, means to facilitate early success in graduate school, retention methods, and organizational issues such as best ways of providing financial support. The committee was co-chaired by Andrew Bernat (University of Texas at El Paso) and William Aspray (Computing Research Association). The National Science Foundation and PACI sponsored the study, with staff support from CRA.


Based on a four-year, qualitative study of graduate students, the article discusses graduate student development, students’ perceptions of the academic career, and graduate students’ suggestions for improving graduate socialization experiences. The article concludes with recommendations and policy questions for faculty advisors, chairpersons, teaching assistant supervisors, and graduate deans.


Few studies have focused on graduate student retention or degree progress; rather, the emphasis in the literature has been on attracting the best and/or the underrepresented students to graduate school [13]. What happens to these students once they enroll? The dropout rate differs for women and minorities compared to men and non-minorities at each step along the educational pipeline, including graduate school [5]. However, little information is available on the factors associated with graduate student retention or degree progress or on the reasons why some students stay and others leave before earning a degree. The purpose of this article is to present a model that links department and student characteristics, financial support, and student perceptions of the faculty with student grades, involvement in the program, satisfaction with the department, and alienation in order to predict progress toward the master’s and doctoral degrees.

The article discusses New Jersey's Princeton Seminary and its Hispanic Theological Initiative (HTI) for Hispanic doctoral students. The HTI is said to be ecumenical, multi-ethnic and multi-denominational. Religion students go to HTI from a consortium of 18 academic institutions at various times during their doctoral and postdoctoral training for career-planning assistance.


In this article, authors Deborah Helsing, Annie Howell, Robert Kegan, and Lisa Lahey argue that today's educational leaders face a host of complex demands as they strive to implement lasting, meaningful change in their school environments. As these demands often require a level of personal development many adults may not yet have, there is a need for professional development programs that are genuinely developmental. This article describes one such program that provides the opportunity for participants to make qualitative shifts in the ways that they understand themselves and their work. Using case study methodology, the authors explore the psychological development of one participant as she increases her capacity to determine, and be guided by, her own theories, values, and expectations of her personal and professional relationships and responsibilities.


This grounded theory study provides a conceptualization of the role of calling in women's leadership development based on semi-structured interviews with 16 female leaders in the Council for Christian Colleges & Universities. Centered in the participants' knowing and using their unique talents and strengths, which were often viewed as being clues to God's plan for their lives, the participants conceptualized calling along two dimensions: internal-external and specific-general. Internal-external refers to sources of validation from which women experienced confirmation for their giftedness. Specific-general refers to whether calling was viewed as pointing to a well-defined task or was a generalized way of being, incorporating a sense of purpose or direction. Coding of participant interviews into dominant themes revealed aspects of each dimension, with participants' awareness of calling being enlarged or potentially constricted based on four contextual factors: theological influences, family realities, cultural expectations, and life circumstances. This article connects existing research about calling, leadership, and motivation, and provides a model that emerged from the current research that contributes to the literature about women's leadership development. [ABSTRACT FROM AUTHOR]


Whether Christian institutions of higher learning prepare their students to integrate faith and learning is questionable. American Christian theological seminaries and divinity schools have an anemic interest in church-based Christian education, but even less interest in campus-based Christian higher education. A collaborative doctoral program of studies in Christian Higher Education involving a major evangelical seminary and a nonsectarian, state university is discussed as a new and different model for adoption and implementation among evangelical seminaries and state-supported universities. [ABSTRACT FROM AUTHOR]


Drawing on the largest survey of doctoral students ever conducted, Three Magic Letters provides a compelling portrait of the graduate school experience and identifies key issues affecting the success and failure of doctoral students. Michael T. Nettles and Catherine M. Millett surveyed more than 9,000 students from the top 21 doctorate-granting institutions in the United States. Their findings, based on rational analysis of a vast amount of descriptive data, shed light on multiple factors critical to the progression of the doctoral degree, particularly adequate institutional funding and engaged and accessible faculty mentors. This comprehensive volume will provide faculty chairs, administrators, and students with information and evidence for assessing their policies, practices, and programs to improve the graduate school experience and the future of the Ph.D.

This article describes selected programmatic efforts undertaken at one large Midwestern public university to expand the minority graduate student population. By identifying larger numbers of well-qualified, high school minority students through early identification programs and/or remediation programs, more of these youth are admitted into undergraduate programs. Graduate student recruiting personnel cooperate and/or facilitate with undergraduate recruiting staff, as appropriate, to implement strategies to retain these students and to interest them in graduate study.


Characteristics of doctorate recipients in library science were compared with those in other disciplines to identify factors that may aid in the recruitment and retention of Ph.D. students in library and information science programs. Factors explored include: (1) trends in the annual production of doctoral degrees; (2) characteristics of LIS doctorate recipients, including gender, race, citizenship, undergraduate major, institutions of higher education attended, median age, median length of time taken to complete the doctorate, and postdoctoral plans; and (3) differences between those library science doctorate recipients planning to teach and those planning other professional careers. Data were derived from a special tabulation of the National Research Council’s annual Survey of Earned Doctorates, 1970-1990. Interviews with deans/directors responsible for administering library and information science doctoral programs were also conducted to ascertain what they consider to be major challenges facing them in regard to recruitment and retention of doctoral students at their own institutions.


Assessing the impact of Wabash Center programs on theological education, this article focuses on the vocation of the theological educator, particularly on the impact of theological teaching on faith and on the institutions, values, and practices that shape living. Five contributions of the Wabash Center are highlighted: (1) guiding seminary faculty in the practices of teaching; (2) enhancing the teaching preparation of doctoral students for theological education; (3) linking effective teaching to the development of seminary curricula; (4) enlarging the literature on teaching in theological education; and (5) nurturing the vocation of seminary educators. [ABSTRACT FROM AUTHOR]


To the colonized, the term ‘research’ is conflated with European colonialism; the ways in which academic research has been implicated in the throes of imperialism remains a painful memory. This essential volume explores intersections of imperialism and research - specifically, the ways in which imperialism is embedded in disciplines of knowledge and tradition as ‘regimes of truth.’ Concepts such as ‘discovery’ and ‘claiming’ are discussed and an argument presented that the decolonization of research methods will help to reclaim control over indigenous ways of knowing and being. Now in its eagerly awaited second edition, this bestselling book has been substantially revised, with new case-studies and examples and important additions on new indigenous literature, the role of research in indigenous struggles for social justice, which brings this essential volume urgently up-to-date.”—publisher’s description. “This book is a counter-story to Western ideas about the benefits of the pursuit of knowledge. Looking through the eyes of the colonized, cautionary tales are told from an indigenous perspective, tales designed not just to voice the voiceless but to prevent the dying - of people, of culture, of ecosystems. The book is particularly strong in situating the development of counter-practices of research within both Western critiques of Western knowledge and global indigenous movements. Informed by critical and feminist evaluations of positivism, Tuhuiwai Smith urges researching back and disrupting the rules of the research game toward practices that are more respectful, ethical, sympathetic and useful vs. racist practices and attitudes, ethnocentric assumptions and exploitative research. Using Kaupapa Maori, a fledgling approach toward culturally appropriate research protocols and methodologies, the book is designed primarily to develop indigenous peoples as researchers. In short, Tuhuiwai Smith begins to articulate research practices that arise out of the specificities of epistemology and methodology rooted in survival struggles, a kind of research that is something other than a dirty word to those on the suffering side of history.” - Patti Lather, Professor Of Educational Policy and Leadership, Ohio State University and author of Getting Smart: Feminist Research and Pedagogy With/In The Postmodern (Routledge, 1991) and Troubling The Angels: Women Living With

This book distills the lessons learned from a five-year action and research project with more than 80 doctoral programs committed to better preparing graduates. Six disciplines were included: chemistry, education, English, history, mathematics and neuroscience. Confronting the disconnect between current approaches and the desired outcomes of doctoral education, the book addresses changes needed to the teaching role as well as to research training. Advocating a view of Ph.D. holders as stewards of their disciplines, it emphasizes the importance of moving away from the traditional apprenticeship model and toward one of intellectual community. The book offers concrete steps for faculty, students, administrators, funding agencies, disciplinary societies, and accrediting bodies to each play a practical role in this change and issues a call to action for each of these audiences.


In this volume a group of eminent African American scholars of religious and theological studies examine the problems and prospects of Black scholarship in the theological academy. They assess the role that prominent Black scholars have played in transforming the study and teaching of religion and theology, the need for a more thorough-going incorporation of the fruits of Black scholarship into the mainstream of the academic study of religion, and the challenges and opportunities of bringing Black art, Black intellectual thought, and Black culture into predominantly White classrooms and institutions. [Excerpt retrieved from online review]


During the mid-1990’s, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky began the research and development of a nontraditional Ed.D. degree program built around the use of the Internet as a significant part of the instructional delivery system. The resulting Ed.D. in Leadership degree was highly successful in its cohort approach to doctoral studies utilizing principles and best practices of online learning in tandem with elements of traditional classroom education. Although the degree is no longer offered by Southern Seminary, the parameters of the original Ed.D. in Leadership program design are presented as one possible model of doctoral level education utilizing elements of online learning. [ABSTRACT FROM AUTHOR]


The book has become the standard measure of research in performance-based evaluations of faculty in the modern university. Emphasis on book publication as the sole evidence of faculty productivity has led to a variety of unhappy consequences for those pressured to write books and for scholarly presses expected to issue them, principally panic and pandemonium.

Mentoring


Many teacher education programs have adopted a cohort structure, which offers attractive administrative and organizational benefits while promoting classroom community. This study examines one urban teacher preparation program that employed a cohort model. Using focus groups and survey data, this mixed methods study compared results on the basis of race and gender. Findings suggest that while the cohort structure created a strong classroom community among the majority of students, specific minority populations in the program (men and students of color) were excluded from the social benefits associated with the cohort model. This study identified active social systems of silencing and exclusion and outlines implications for hiring practices, curriculum, and faculty development.

One of the major benefits of the present book is its thrust toward integration. The book brings together knowledge from three domains of mentoring that have been largely kept separate – mentoring of youth; faculty mentoring of students; and mentoring in the workplace. It also sets the stage for increased collaboration between those in the academy and practitioners. The first part of the chapter concentrates on how social scientists have approached issues of mentoring and how they might approach these issues in the future. The second part of the chapter turns to the work of practitioners, noting why so many organizations and educational institutions today are interested in developing formal mentoring programs and are also calling into question assumptions that underlie some of the programs.


The purpose of this study was to contribute to the construct validity of the scores from Rose’s (2003) 34-item Ideal Mentor Scale (IMS) and to examine whether male and female doctoral students value different attributes in their ideal mentor. Two hundred and twenty-four doctoral students from colleges (Education, Public Health, Nursing, Arts and Sciences, Engineering, and Business) throughout a large state research university participated in the study. Confirmatory factor analysis of the IMS revealed that the fit of the three-factor model (Integrity, Guidance, and Relationship) was not satisfactory. A major source of misfit involved covariances between errors of similarly worded items. Gender comparisons of the three subscales and individual items on the IMS indicated that male and female doctoral students were more alike than different regarding qualities they desire in their ideal mentor. The largest difference was observed on the item “believe in me” (Integrity subscale), with female doctoral students rating this as more important than male students. The potential of the Ideal Mentor Scale for stimulating conversations about mentoring and clarifying expectations of students and faculty is discussed.


This article examines the experiences of first-year Latina/o undergraduates at a predominantly White institution. Through a borderlands analysis, the authors explore how these students describe their experiences participating in an ethnic studies course and mentoring Latina/o elementary schoolchildren. The authors find that these experiences served as sitios y lenguas (decolonizing spaces and discourses; Pérez, 1998) in which the undergraduate students were able to reflect on the ongoing transformation of their social and political identities, revealing the complex and fluid latinidades (Latina/o identities; Latina Feminist Group, 2001) that exist among the Latina/o university students. This article explores the physical and metaphorical borders (Anzaldúa, 1987) the undergraduates occupy, navigate, and challenge while they work simultaneously as mentors in a mostly Latina/o setting and as college students on a mostly White campus.


Consistently, the academic and anecdotal research on mentoring has demonstrated that it is important in enhancing opportunities for success and achievement. Whereas many would agree that mentoring is important for females and scholars of color, there is very little research to confirm this conventional wisdom. In an effort to fill the gap of knowledge about how mentoring affects the success of African American junior faculty, this article explores the mentoring experiences of recently graduated, African American doctorates (Ph.D.s) in the field of sociology. This research demonstrates how mentoring can enhance the opportunities of faculty of color and facilitate advancement through the ranks.


This article seeks to provide a subjective definition of mentoring, beyond the objective, analytic definitions usually provided. The author argues that mentoring is a matter of the heart, and offers the metaphor of gift exchange as a way of understanding the mentor-protégé relationship. Further, she suggests that research in the tradition of objective mentoring will generally be disappointing. The market model for understanding mentoring relationships is critiqued. Gehrke states, “The use of market metaphors obfuscates the nature of the mentor-protégé phenomenon. It can lead to confusion between the real gift exchange
relationship and such marketplace phenomena as patronage and sponsorship.” She concludes that research in “the spirit of giving” leads to compassionate research of giving and receiving as well as labors of gratitude.


Mentoring can be an effective strategy in improving retention of college students and faculty from fields where historical underrepresentation has occurred. This article reviews the benefits of mentoring in higher education, and identifies components of effective mentoring strategies that promote educational and career advancement. It illustrates how effective programs can be institutionalized and scaled through consortia and national collaborations. Traditional and alternative mentoring models are described through four successful programs designed to increase the academic and professional success of undergraduates, graduate students, and junior faculty. The article concludes with a set of general recommendations and caveats gleaned from the literature and programs reviewed.


In this essay, Leigh Hall and Leslie Burns use theories of identity to understand mentoring relationships between faculty members and doctoral students who are being prepared as educational researchers. They suggest that becoming a professional researcher requires students to negotiate new identities and reconceptualize themselves both as people and professionals in addition to learning specific skills; however, the success or marginalization that students experience may depend on the extent to which they attempt to enact identities that are valued by their mentors. For this reason, Hall and Burns argue that faculty mentors must learn about and consider identity formation in order to successfully socialize more diverse groups of researchers, and they believe that formal curriculum designs can be used more intentionally to help students and faculty understand the roles identity plays in professional development and to make doctoral education more equitable.


How can faculty in professional psychology programs become more intentional and effective mentors? Many psychology graduate students are never mentored, and very few psychologists have ever received training in the practice of mentoring. This article briefly summarizes the nature of mentoring, the prevalence of mentoring in psychology, primary obstacles to mentoring, and some ethical concerns unique to mentoring. The article provides several strategies to enhance mentoring and guidelines for the profession, departments of psychology, and individual psychologists who serve as mentors. This article is designed to help readers take a more deliberate approach to the practice of mentoring.


Cross-cultural mentoring relationships can be sites of struggle around the issues of race, class and gender. In addition, the mentor/protégé relationship offers microcosmic insight into power relations within western society. The authors of this paper, a Black woman associate professor and a White male professor, use the example of their mentoring relationship to illustrate six common issues facing academicians involved in these relationships: (1) trust between mentor and protégé; (2) acknowledged and unacknowledged racism; (3) visibility and risks pertinent to minority faculty; (4) power and paternalism; (5) benefits to mentor and protégé; and (6) the double-edged sword of ‘otherness’ in the academy. Literature is used for review and critique of mentoring in the academy while offering personal examples to illustrate the complexity and success of a 13-year mentoring relationship between two people who began their association as a teacher and student.


In this paper, we critique the traditional model of mentoring in academia and offer an alternative model, co-mentoring, grounded in feminist principles. Our conception of co-mentoring challenges masculinist values of hierarchy, competition, and objectivity by emphasizing the importance of cooperative, non-hierarchical relationships for learning and development. Feminist co-mentoring seeks to dispel the view of the disembodied intellectual by attending to academics’ familial, personal,
and emotional needs. While co-mentoring is valuable for all academics, we argue that underrepresented groups can especially benefit from this type of relationship.


College women are positioned at the juncture of adolescence and adulthood, as well as school and work. This study sought to identify whether the structural model underlying the mentoring of college women is dyadic in nature, as it is in adolescence and school settings, or networking in nature, as it is in adulthood and workplace settings. Traditional-aged college women in their first year (n = 146) and fourth year (n = 115) participated in a mentoring survey. First-year college students were more likely to seek and experience mentoring in the form of a dyadic relationship with one mentor, often with a family member or a recent high-school teacher, while fourth-year college students were more likely to seek and experience mentoring in the form of a network of multiple mentors, which included college faculty, family and peers. Both groups of students experienced psychosocial mentoring functions and sponsorship from mentors, but fourth-year students reported more challenge from their mentors than first-year students did. Implications for designing developmentally appropriate mentoring initiatives that simultaneously challenge female stereotypes are discussed.


This chapter focuses on graduate-level mentoring relationships with an emphasis on diversity. The last two sections use research and variables of consideration for mentoring African Americans and Asian/Asian Americans. The authors claim “it appears critical for all academics to know how mentoring relationships for nontraditional students differ from those relationships with a traditional student, as well as knowing how to mentor nontraditional and traditional students with equal effectiveness. This latter issue is especially important because the existing research (e.g., Atkinson et al., 1994; Pope-Davis et al., 1997; Schlosser et al., 2005) suggests that mentoring experiences are different for those in socially-privileged groups (e.g., Whites, men, Christians, heterosexuals) than those in socially oppressed groups (e.g., people of color, women, LGBT persons, religious minorities). With regard to race, research reveals several obstacles for students of color to obtain mentoring. Some examples include (a) a lack of faculty role models of color (Pope-Davis et al., 1997), (b) differences in cultural values between mentor and protégé (Goto, 1999), (c) not understanding the importance of good mentoring to success in one’s career (Grant-Thompson & Atkinson, 1997), and (d) reluctance entering a cross-race advising or mentoring relationship (Brinson & Kottler, 1993). In addition, faculty members may believe one or more myths about mentoring students of color (see Brown, Davis, and McClendon, 1999), and faculty of color may be overwhelmed with requests for mentorship from students of color. Benjamin (1995) found that African American students at predominantly White institutions (PWIs) construct bipartite identities that consist of a personal/cultural self and an academic/institutional self. However, one key area both selves shared in common is how racism influences their identities on both a personal and institutional level. This appears consistent with the non-cognitive variable of learning how to navigate the explicit and implicit values and practices of academic institutions, and by realizing that all institutions of higher education are firmly embedded in larger cultural systems. The authors feel that by employing the noncognitive variable approach discussed above and shown in Exhibits 1 and 2, mentors of any race or gender and protégés from any nontraditional group can come together for mutual development. Race may not be an overt feature of the relationship, but racial issues should not be ignored in order to explore career development for African American college students. Failure to address the role of race in the relationship can limit what the experience of supervision/mentoring has to offer.


In the last ten years, over 500 articles have been published on mentoring, examining the need for it, antecedents of it, impact, types, and obstacles to it (Allen & Johnston, 1997). Much of this research has shown that mentoring—an intense interpersonal exchange between a senior experienced colleague (mentor) and a less experienced junior colleague (protégé) (Noe, 1988b; Russell & Adams, 1997)—is a beneficial relationship for all parties: protégé, mentor, and the organization. For example, protégés typically experience greater job success (Hunt & Michael, 1983; Fagenson, 1989); higher salaries (Roche, 1979), and enhanced career mobility (Scandura, 1992). On the other hand, benefits to mentors include career enhancement, information exchange, recognition, and personal satisfaction (Kram, 1985). Ultimately, organizations benefit in that protégés, when compared to non
protégés, experience higher job satisfaction (Baugh, Lankau, & Scandura, 1996); higher organizational commitment (Burke et al., 1991; Baugh et al., 1996); and lower turnover (Scandura & Viator, 1994). Amid predictions that people of color will constitute 62% of the workforce by year 2005 (U.S. Department of Labor, 1995), many organizations have recognized the value of mentoring relationships and have tried to formalize them to assist diverse groups in their efforts to overcome barriers to career success. Theories have emerged attempting to address gender (Noe, 1988a) and race issues in mentoring relationships (Thomas, 1993). Yet, little is known about the type of mentoring experienced in cross-race and cross-gender relationships or their impact on organizational outcomes. The present study explores the nature and impact of diversified (cross-gender and cross-racial) mentoring relationships. A power perspective and several cultural concepts (social identity and similarity attraction) will be used to address the three general research questions. [Excerpt from Author]


In the literature of faculty development, mentoring is usually mentioned as a vital contribution to a successful academic career, particularly for women and faculty of color. Mentoring has traditionally been defined as a top-down, one-to-one relationship in which an experienced faculty member guides and supports the career development of a new or early-career faculty member, and research on faculty development and mentoring programs largely has been designed to fit this traditional definition. Recently, a model has been emerging that encourages a broader, more flexible network of support, in which no single person is expected to possess the expertise required to help someone navigate the shoals of a faculty career. In this model, early-career faculty build robust networks by engaging multiple “mentoring partners” in non-hierarchical, collaborative, cross-cultural partnerships to address specific areas of faculty activity, such as research, teaching, working towards tenure, and striking a balance between work and life. This review highlights recent faculty-development resources, all published since 2000, that offer fresh models, concepts, and thinking on mentoring in higher education, particularly the mentoring of new and underrepresented faculty. The resources are organized into four areas: (1) new conceptualizations of mentoring; (2) recent studies on mentoring; (3) faculty-development programs and practices that promote mentoring; and (4) gender, race, and other diversity issues related to mentoring. (Contains 35 resources.)

Race/Racism


On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life provides an ethnographic account of the experiences of diversity practitioners in higher education. Ahmed conducted interviews with 21 diversity professionals at universities in Australia and the United Kingdom to understand what diversity actually means and how diversity is framed. In addition, Ahmed supplements interview data with her own recollections of racialized and gendered experiences while performing diversity work. [Description retrieved online at http://muse.jhu.edu/login?auth=0&type=summary&url=/journals/review_of_higher_education/v036/36.3.truong.html]


This report explores a broad array of obstacles that impede hiring and retaining an ethnically and racially diverse faculty. The report highlights a number of activities already under way to break down these obstacles and presents a long list of ideas that unions may be able to undertake on their own campuses. In 2005-2006, approximately 5.4 percent of all tenure-eligible and contingent faculty members were African American, 4.5 percent were Hispanic, and 0.04 percent were Native American, even though these groups represented, respectively, 12 percent, 14 percent and 0.8 percent of the total U.S. population. Despite administrators and faculty members around the country expressing strong support for improving faculty diversity, there has not been significant movement on the diversity front. This report addresses three major barriers to racial and ethnic diversity: (1) barriers in the educational pathways that lead to becoming a faculty member, (2) barriers in the faculty hiring process, and (3) barriers to retention of faculty members. A list of recommendations is provided at the end of the report.
In this article, Stephen Brookfield explores the “unproblematic Eurocentrism” that characterizes contemporary adult education in light of Herbert Marcuse’s perspectives on repressive tolerance. Brookfield, a White English male, explores the implications of his own social location for his work in adult education by drawing on the works of Cornel West and Lucius T. Outlaw Jr., two prominent African American scholars who racialize the discourse of adult education. Brookfield further considers the broader implications for adult education practice and scholarship that emerge from West’s and Outlaw’s perspectives on critical thinking, which are paradigmatically different from the Euro-American traditions that tend to ignore issues of race and dominate the field. Finally, Brookfield offers recommendations to practitioners and scholars for actively exploring adult education’s role in challenging the “myth of neutral, non-impositional, adult educators.”

The focus of this article acknowledges past and present experiences of racism in predominantly White theological institutions (PWTIs) by faculty from racial/ethnic minority groups. The author calls for an approach to racial/ethnic diversity in theological education that goes beyond the concern for improving racial/ethnic demographics, or the concern for improving institutional capacity for “managing” faculty and student diversity, which seem to be the present and preferred approach by the power holders in theological institutions and organizations. [Excerpt taken from article]

This chapter explores how racial and ethnic identity develops and how sensitivity to this process can improve adult education. Racial and ethnic identities are critical parts of the overall framework of individual and collective identity. For some especially visible and legally defined minority populations in the United States, racial and ethnic identities are manifested in very conscious ways. This manifestation is triggered most often by two conflicting social and cultural influences. First, deep conscious immersion into cultural traditions and values through religious, familial, neighborhood, and educational communities instills a positive sense of ethnic identity and confidence. Second, and in contrast, individuals often must filter ethnic identity through negative treatment and media messages received from others because of their race and ethnicity. These messages make it clear that people with minority status have a different ethnic make-up and one that is less than desirable within mainstream society. Others, especially White Americans, manifest ethnic and racial identity in mostly unconscious ways through their behaviors, values, beliefs, and assumptions. For them, ethnicity is usually invisible and unconscious because societal norms have been constructed around their racial, ethnic, and cultural frameworks, values, and priorities and then referred to as “standard American culture” rather than as “ethnic identity.” This unconscious ethnic identity manifests itself in daily behaviors, attitudes, and ways of doing things. Unlike many minority cultures, there is little conscious instilling of specific ethnic identity through White communities, nor is differential ethnic treatment often identified in the media of White cultures. Discussed throughout this chapter, everyone benefits from the development of a conscious ethnic identity and benefits as well when multicultural frameworks are used in their learning environments. The purpose of this chapter is to review pertinent racial and ethnic identity literature to better understand how it informs adult learning. First, authors define racial and ethnic identity and stress the importance of examining these concepts from a multidimensional frame. Next, they discuss racial and ethnic identity through developmental and descriptive lenses and highlight the strengths and limitations of the models presented. Finally, they discuss implications and share strategies for working with adult learners.

The author contends that marginalization is a major issue for graduate students of color in their doctoral studies. She explains three forms of marginalization, and suggests some strategies for how each can be counteracted. These are physical, cultural and intellectual isolation, benign neglect and problematic popularity. Her analyses are informed by insights gleaned from her personal experiences as a student and professor of color in predominantly White institutions (PWIs), her observations and interactions with graduate students of color as an instructor and doctoral studies advisor, and from the research and scholarship
of other scholars. The author makes an appeal for professors of color and their European American colleagues to make their curriculum, instruction advising, and mentoring relationships more culturally responsive to ethnically, racially and linguistically diverse students. By doing so they can teach these students more effectively how to navigate the marginality they encounter en route to the professoriate, and how to be more successful in executing their roles and responsibilities as professors of color.


This volume, one in a series of three monographs, is a guidebook to evaluating campus diversity initiatives. Chapter 1 introduces campus diversity initiatives. Chapter 2, "Evaluation and Diversity," explores the need for assessment of such initiatives. Chapter 3, "Designing a Campus Diversity Evaluation," presents general concepts and guidelines and identifies various foci of diversity assessment. It also raises questions evaluators should consider as they plan assessments and discusses data collection and analysis. Chapter 4, "Frameworks for Evaluation," offers some larger frameworks for evaluation and discusses performance indicators linked to campus diversity work. Seven appendixes contain instruments for use in evaluating campus diversity programs and student experiences. (Contains 24 references.) (SLD)


The graduate school experience for students of color has been theorized as oppressive and dehumanizing (Gay, 2004). Scholars have struggled to document how students of color navigate and negotiate oppressive and dehumanizing conditions in their daily experiences of doctoral education. The authors provide a critical race analysis of the everyday experiences of Latina/o and Black doctoral students. They draw from critical inquiry and critical race theory to establish and describe an overarching and powerful social narrative that informs, influences, and illustrates the endemic racism through which Black and Latina/o students struggle to persist in pursuit of the doctorate. They call this social narrative, "Am I going crazy?!" Deconstructing the narrative into its core elements, they provide an extended definition that illustrates a dehumanizing cultural experience in the everyday lives of doctoral students. Gildersleeve et al problematize these cultural norms to promote a more humanizing experience of doctoral education for Black and Latina/o students.


This article examines the experiences of academic socialization for Latina doctoral students. Thirteen 1- to 2-hour semistructured interviews were conducted with Latina doctoral students attending U.S. research institutions who had been in their programs for three or more years. Through production theory, a phenomenological analytic approach of Latina doctoral experiences was conducted. Findings include support systems, challenges, resistance methods, and issues with claiming their academic voice. The article concludes with policy implications and a discussion.


Presumed Incompetent is a path-breaking account of the intersecting roles of race, gender, and class in the working lives of women faculty of color. Through personal narratives and qualitative empirical studies, more than 40 authors expose the daunting challenges faced by academic women of color as they navigate the often hostile terrain of higher education, including hiring, promotion, tenure, and relations with students, colleagues, and administrators. One of the topics addressed is the importance of forging supportive networks to transform the workplace and create a more hospitable environment for traditionally subordinated groups. The narratives are filled with wit, wisdom, and concrete recommendations, and provide a window into the struggles of professional women in a racially stratified but increasingly multicultural America. (Abstract retrieved online at http://works.bepress.com/carmen_gonzalez/21)

This article is a classic resource that attempts to unpack the challenges of Black intellectuals in the University setting. Harding articulates specific challenges that Black scholars must address in their vocation. [Excerpt from Article] Because the walls of the academy are, on the whole, merely more tastefully, delicately wrought extensions of the walls of the government, industry, and the military (somewhere along the way the White church got lost in the shuffle), it is not surprising that they too should now encompass part of the national army of cynical, despairing, increasingly frightened men and women. In few places is the Black temptation to make White America's style become our own more prevalent than in the world of the American university. So often cut off from the churnings of our own mainstream. So regularly filled with misleading calls to the mystic, universal fellowship of objective, unpigmented scholarship (or with more crassly formulated invitations to respectability and a certain safety, in exchange for the abandonment of our real questions). Yet in no "profession" is it more crucial that a man or woman ask the old fashioned, out-of-style question: what is the vocation of the Black scholar; what is MY vocation as a Black scholar? We avoid the question, American-style, only at the risk of our Soul—which is at once the same as and more than our soul.


This study provides a comprehensive profile of all types of “minority-serving institutions” (MSIs), in the United States and examines the characteristics of minority students who attend these institutions. The report adds to earlier research focusing on single types of MSIs—primarily Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), Hispanic-serving institutions (HSIs), or Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCUs). In contrast to earlier research, this study examines all types of MSIs side by side and includes private, for-profit institutions, which are typically excluded from studies on MSIs. This report consists of three sections, beginning with an overview of MSIs, discussing the major trends between 1984 and 2004 in the participation of minority students in U.S. higher education and the extent to which MSIs enroll minority students. This overview is followed by a description of how MSIs differed from other institutions in terms of their major institutional characteristics (e.g., sector, admissions selectivity, and population size of low-income students) in 2004. The report ends with an analysis of the demographic and enrollment characteristics of minority students attending MSIs and how they differ from those attending non-MSIs and various types of MSIs. Findings from this report are descriptive in nature; they do not imply causality or identify reasons for the trends or differences observed. (44 tables and 12 figures. Appended are: (1) Glossary; (2) Technical Notes and Methodology; and (3) List of Degree-Granting Title IV Institutions Included in This Study That were Minority-Serving: Fall 2004.)


Interest in increasing the number of engineering graduates in the United States and promoting gender equality and diversification of the profession has encouraged considerable research on women and minorities in engineering programs. Drawing on a framework of intersectionality theory, this study recognizes that women of different ethnic backgrounds warrant disaggregated analysis because they do not necessarily share a common experience in engineering education. Using a longitudinal, comprehensive dataset of more than 79,000 students who matriculated in engineering at nine universities, this research examines the question: How does the persistence of engineering students (measured as enrollment to the eighth semester) vary by disaggregated combinations of gender and race/ethnicity? Findings reveal that for Asian, Black, Hispanic, Native American, and White students, women who matriculate in engineering are most likely to persist in engineering compared to other eighth-semester destinations and, except for Native Americans, do so at rates comparable to those of men. Thus, contrary to considerable popular opinion that there is a gender gap in persistence, the low representation of women in the later years of engineering programs is primarily a reflection of their low representation at matriculation.


The current study examines the outcomes, processes, and individual predictors of the pursuit of a STEM Ph.D. among
African American students in the Meyerhoff Scholarship Program. Meyerhoff students were nearly five times more likely than comparison students to pursue a STEM Ph.D. Program components consistently rated as important were financial scholarship, being part of the Meyerhoff Program community, the summer bridge program, study groups, staff academic advising, and summer research opportunities. Furthermore, focus group findings revealed student internalization of key Meyerhoff Program values, including a commitment to excellence, accountability, group success, and giving back. In terms of individual predictors, multinomial logic regression analyses revealed that Meyerhoff students with higher levels of research excitement at college entry were more likely to pursue a STEM Ph.D.


Individuals who have earned doctoral degrees are in a position to use that advanced knowledge to teach, perform leadership functions, and to conduct research. We know very little about the ethnic group differences among doctoral degree recipients and doctoral students beyond the fact that minorities are underrepresented. This paper examines the differences among Black, Hispanic, and White doctoral students at four major universities. The results indicate that Black and Hispanic doctoral students perceive more feelings of racial discrimination than do White doctoral students, and that Blacks who come from the poorest socioeconomic backgrounds also receive the fewest teaching or research assistantships. Suggestions for action and for future research are also presented.


This is a journal published by the North American Institute for Indigenous Theological Studies. First published in 2003, it consists of articles devoted to Native (intended to be inclusive of all Aboriginal peoples on the North American continent) people of faith in the context of theology, missiology, and church practice.


This article is based on the 1995 Presidential Address given at the American Academy of Religion Annual Meeting. The purpose of this address is threefold: (1) to reflect on the arduous African American struggle for access to Euro-American education, (2) to clarify the moral values implicit in African American religious scholarship; and (3) to celebrate the production of new knowledge by African American scholars during the second half of the twentieth century.


In this article, the authors modify and use the metaphor of “a wolf in sheep’s clothing” as the theme in uncovering racism aimed at Hispanics in higher education. The authors, who are new to the academic profession, as are many Hispanics in the field, discover that the old wolf, racism, is as active in academia as in their previous educational settings. In elementary and secondary schools, the wolf’s disguises include educational tracking, low expectations, and negative stereotypes. Hispanics who have overcome these obstacles and who are attempting to break into the faculties and administrations of U.S. higher education institutions are finding the wolf in a new wardrobe. The authors identify the various disguises used to hide racism by higher education faculties and administrations.


The importance of college degree completion for U.S. society and economic competitiveness makes it imperative to improve educational outcomes for Latino students. Institutional leaders, educators, and policymakers who recognize this imperative are challenged to determine what they can do to improve educational outcomes for Latino students. Excelencia in Education responds to this challenge by linking research, policy, and practice that supports higher educational achievement for Latino students. Premier in this effort is Examples of Excelencia, a national initiative to systematically identify and honor programs boosting Latino enrollment, performance and graduation with evidence of effectiveness. While there are a growing number...
of programs worthy of recognition for their efforts to increase Latino student success. Examples of Excelencia focuses on institution-based programs and departments. These programs do not serve Latino students exclusively, but each program disaggregates their data and can demonstrate success with Latino students. [Excerpt from Author]

The inclusion of race-related content in college courses often generates emotional responses in students that range from guilt and shame to anger and despair. The discomfort associated with these emotions can lead students to resist the learning process. Based on her experience teaching a course on the psychology of racism and an application of racial identity development theory, Beverly Daniel Tatum identifies three major sources of student resistance to talking about race and learning about racism, as well as some strategies for overcoming this resistance.

Faculty women of color experience multiple marginality, characterized by lived contradiction and ambiguous empowerment. Their lives are often invisible, hidden within studies that either examine experiences of women faculty or faculty of color. Recommendations to affirm, validate, and value contributions by faculty women of color emerge from an analysis of interviews and recent literature.

To better prepare students for an increasingly diverse society, campuses across the country remain engaged in efforts to diversify the racial and ethnic makeup of their faculties. However, faculty of color remain seriously underrepresented, making up 17% of total full-time faculty. In the past 20 years, more than 300 authors have addressed the status and experience of faculty of color in academe. From 1988 to 2007, there was a continued rise in publications addressing the issue of the low representation of faculty of color. This article presents a literature review and synthesis of 252 publications, with the goal of informing scholars and practitioners of the current state of the field. Themes emerging from these publications and an interpretive model through which findings can be viewed are presented. The analysis, with a focus on the departmental, institutional, and national contexts, documents supports, challenges, and recommendations to address barriers and to build on successes within these three contexts. The authors hope that this article informs researchers and practitioners as they continue their work to understand and promote the increased representation of faculty of color.

This report focuses on educational attainment among African Americans and Hispanics because they are the largest underrepresented groups in higher education relative to their presence in the nation’s population. Similar patterns hold for the very small number of American Indians in doctoral education—just 133 out of nearly 26,000 citizen Ph.D.s in 2003, comprising 0.5% of all U.S. doctoral recipients but 0.9% of the overall population. Asians, on the other hand, received 5.2% of all Ph.D.s granted to U.S. citizens in 2003, when they represented 4.1% of the population, and are therefore not considered underrepresented. Data on these and other populations come from Doctorate Recipients from “United States Universities: Summary Report 2003,” based on the Survey of Earned Doctorates (Chicago: University of Chicago [National Opinion Research Center], December 2004.) For that matter, while inequities of income and gender (in some fields, particularly the physical sciences) are also of concern, this particular report gives itself over to matters of race and ethnicity, on the grounds that these issues in doctoral education remain not only vexing, but also—as will become clear—politically and culturally difficult to address.

In this article, Tara Yosso, William Smith, Miguel Ceja, and Daniel Solórzano expand on their previous work by employing
critical race theory to explore and understand incidents of racial microaggression as experienced by Latina/o students at three selective universities. The authors explore three types of racial microaggression—interpersonal microaggression, racial jokes, and institutional microaggression—and consider the effects of these racist affronts on Latina/o students. Challenging the applicability of Vincent Tinto’s three stages of passage for college students, the authors explore the processes by which Latinas/os respond to racial microaggression and confront hostile campus racial climates. The authors find that, through building community and developing critical navigation skills, Latina/o students claim empowerment from the margins.
TABLE 2.12-BASED ON ATS TABLE 2.12: HEAD COUNT ENROLLMENT BY RACE OR ETHNIC GROUP, DEGREE, AND GENDER, ALL MEMBER SCHOOLS, 2007-2011

Source: Association of Theological Schools (ATS), 2011-2012 Annual Data Tables, Table 2.12, retrieved online at http://www.ats.edu/resources/institutional-data/annual-data-tables

APPENDIX A: TABLES & GRAPHS

The Cultivation of Scholars of Color within Theological Education

42
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Category</th>
<th>Degree Program</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Visa</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Not Reported</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Ministerial Leadership MDiv</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2,872</td>
<td>1,204</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>4,501</td>
<td>1,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Ministerial Leadership Non-MDiv</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Ministerial Leadership</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoMin</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoD/Min/EdD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate (Ministerial)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Theological Research</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThM/ThSTM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThD/PhD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1,025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Fund for Theological Education

TABLE 2.18A - BASED ON ATS TABLE: NUMBER OF FACULTY BY RACE/ETHNICITY, RANK, AND GENDER, ALL SCHOOLS, 2007-2011
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaskan Native or Inuit</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visa or Nonresident Alien</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>1,141</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>1,126</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>1,105</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,385</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>2,334</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>2,290</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>2,232</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>2,187</td>
<td>657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>1,325</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>1,274</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>1,302</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>1,298</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,872</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>2,774</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>2,736</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>2,706</td>
<td>849</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Association of Theological Schools (ATS), 2011-2012 Annual Data Tables, Table 3.1, retrieved online at http://www.ats.edu/resources/institutional-data/annual-data-tables
Source: Association of Theological Schools (ATS), 2011-2012 Annual Data Tables, Graph 3B, retrieved online at http://www.ats.edu/resources/institutional-data/annual-data-tables
TABLE 3.01: NCES-NUMBER OF DOCTOR'S DEGREES AND CERTIFICATES ABOVE THE BACCALAUREATE CONFERRED IN PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGIOUS STUDIES (CIP CODE 38) AND THEOLOGY AND RELIGIOUS VOCATIONS (CIP CODE 39) BY 4-YEAR DEGREE-GRANTING TITLE IV POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS, BY MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY (CIP CODE), LEVEL OF AWARD, GENDER, RACE/ETHNICITY, AND INSTITUTION: UNITED STATES, 2010-11

| Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), Fall 2011, Completions component. Tables 307 and 309. (Original table was prepared April 2012) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Two or More Races</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>V EA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,833</td>
<td>1,199</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,391</td>
<td>8,868</td>
<td>6,523</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>1,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>799</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>832</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,099</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>906</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Population by Race and Hispanic Origin: 2012 and 2060

(Percent of total population)

- White alone: 78% in 2012, 69% in 2060
- Black alone: 13% in 2012, 15% in 2060
- AIAN alone: 1.2% in 2012, 1.5% in 2060
- Asian alone: 5.1% in 2012, 8.2% in 2060
- NHPI alone: 0.2% in 2012, 0.3% in 2060
- Two or More Races: 2.4% in 2012, 6.4% in 2060
- Non-Hispanic White Alone: 63% in 2012, 43% in 2060
- Hispanic (of any race): 17% in 2012, 31% in 2060

AIAN = American Indian and Alaska Native; NHPI = Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander

DEFINITION OF DEGREE PROGRAMS

I. ATS Degree Programs

ATS Approved Degree Programs consists of more than 250 distinct degree programs. Those listed in the five categories below are the most common ones. Highly specialized degrees may not be included in this list. To view all degree programs offered by member schools, please consult the following page on the ATS website: http://www.ats.edu/member-schools/approved-degrees.

II. National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Data

Disaggregated data derived from Table 307 and 309 of the National Center for Education Statistics, 2012 report was used to calculate degree data provided in this report. It includes data from the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), Fall 2010, and Fall 2011 Completions component. Degrees awarded in philosophy and religious studies include degree categories 38.xxxx and degrees awarded in theology and religious vocation include degree categories 39.xxx described in the Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) codes—http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cipcode/.

TERMINOLOGY

Black rather than African American is used throughout this report to refer to persons that may be categorized within the U.S. Census as Black/African American, but are domestic citizens and not viewed as non-resident aliens or visa students.

Persons of Color refers to Asian Americans, Blacks, Hispanics, and Native American/Pacific Islanders.

Representation is based on the percentage of a group’s population within a particular context in relation to the percentage of the same group within the United States’ overall population/college age population. Underrepresentation and overrepresentation are percentage characterizations, which reflect disparities between contextual and overall population densities. Representation is not a measure of raw numbers.

Theology and Religious Vocations refers to instructional programs that focus on the intramural study of theology and that prepare individuals for the professional practice of religious vocations. Definition is from the National Center for Education Statistics (http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cipcode/cipdetail.aspx?y=55&cipid=88461).

Theological Education is used throughout this report to reflect degree programs and faculty positions in theology and church ministry. Some data and literary sources aggregate theological studies, religious studies, or philosophy in common categories of religion or religious studies. When aware of variances between terminologies, distinctions were noted.