

C3

Final Report
on Assessment of Campus Climate
in Support of the Cross-Cultural Component
of the New Curriculum and Cultural Diversity
at Luther Northwestern Theological Seminary

Compiled by David V. Taylor

May 9, 1994

Contents

Final Report

Appendix A: Survey Instruments

Appendix B: Tabulated Survey Results

Appendix C: Summary of Findings

Appendix D: Assessment Documents

#1: Faculty, Administrators/Board Members, and Student Perceptions

#2: Staff Perceptions

#3: Written Comments

Final Report
on Assessment of Campus Climate
in Support of the Cross-Cultural Component
of the New Curriculum and Cultural Diversity
at Luther Northwestern Theological Seminary

Compiled by David V. Taylor

May 9, 1994

Purpose

The intended goal of surveying all constituents of the Seminary was to discern whether the Seminary is prepared, as a community, to embrace the Seminary's revised mission statement, which has as one of its primary goals "to educate leaders for communities called to the mission of Jesus Christ in a world of many cultures." The revised mission statement calls upon the Seminary not only to be an active agent of change relative to the human condition in its worldwide ministry, but also to create on its campus an environment where the teaching of the gospel and biblical scholarship are conducted without bias, prejudice, or insensitivity to anyone invited there to study. More important was to ascertain whether the Seminary has the capacity for developing and sustaining a community that is inclusive with respect to gender and ethnic differences, supportive with regard to understanding and appreciating diversity, and capable of relating to other denominational beliefs in the true spirit of ecumenism. The cross-cultural education component of the new curriculum was designed in part as a first step in the direction of preparing seminarians for the new and changing world in which they will conduct their ministry. This survey was designed to gauge the receptivity of faculty, staff, administrators, Board members, and students to this challenge. It was intended to see how far the Seminary has come, and similarly, how far it has to go.

Development

The consultant met with four constituent groups comprising the Seminary faculty, staff, administrators, Board members, and students to discuss the intent of the survey and to solicit input for areas, items, issues, and concerns that required exploration. That information was used to develop four different survey instruments that, while sharing elements in common, were specifically tailored to the perceived role each constituency plays in the Seminary's community. Each survey instrument was presented to the respective constituent review group for its critique. The consultant met with each of the constituent review

groups and discussed the strengths and weaknesses of the survey instrument. After substantive revision, the final draft of each survey was then prepared for distribution (see Appendix A).

Methodology

Altogether, 784 surveys were prepared for distribution: 613 for students, 40 for faculty, 89 for staff, and 42 for administrators/Board members. A total of 354 surveys were returned: 189 (30.8%) from students, 30 (75%) from faculty, 47 (52.8%) from staff, and 24 (57.14%) from administrators/Board members. Although the response rate was adequate for the purposes of this survey, greater participation had been anticipated.

The surveys were read by a scantron process and then assessed by a computer program that provided value (item number), frequency (of response), percent, valid percent, and cumulative percent. Mean, median, and mode were calculated for each item response. Inferences were then drawn for each item (see Appendix B).

Findings

A report of findings for each survey was developed, consisting of an interpretation of each item in narrative form parallel to the thematic organization of the survey. A summary of the data presented was provided (see Appendix C).

Three assessment documents were then developed. Assessment Document #1 looks at the responses of faculty, students, and administrators/Board members to identical items on each of their survey instruments. The intent was to discover convergence or divergence of opinion on important issues. A separate factor analysis was conducted on the responses of faculty and students in order to identify areas where significant differences of opinion existed. Assessment Document #2 contrasts the responses of staff with those of faculty, students, and administrators/Board members. Because the questions asked of staff members were generally different from those asked of other constituencies, it was necessary to single them out for special attention. Assessment Document #3 consists of a summary of the written responses solicited at the end of each survey. This offered respondents an opportunity to state whatever was on their minds with respect to the issues raised in the survey. The responses have been categorized by subject matter and then by attribution. This effort is a paraphrasing and condensation of the responses received (see Appendix D).

Conclusions

The utility of this survey lies in providing information that may be useful for the administration in determining where next to proceed in developing a more inclusive community. With that in mind, I offer the following observations for consideration.

Campus Climate

On the surface, everyone is reasonably content with the campus climate. All constituencies appear to be engaged with their work, concerned about what happens at the Seminary, and they believe that the administration is acting in the best interests of the collective community. They acknowledge that the community is not as diverse as it could be, but they are optimistic that with effort it could be more reflective of the world around them. This they believe can be accomplished without diminishing the heritage and cultural traditions that have made this Seminary unique. They want the Seminary to be welcoming and affirming to everyone accessing the campus and its programs.

The quality of instruction offered is judged to be excellent. The curriculum does what it is intended to do. It does not appear that there are overt forms of discrimination experienced by persons of color, women, or representatives of other Christian denominations. However, there are indications of more subtle attitudes that are not supportive of ecumenism, or issues raised by the presence in the classroom of women, persons of color, or people of diverse life-styles. The faculty feel that they are capable of addressing the demands of the cross-cultural education component of the new curriculum without more intensive preparation. Nor do they feel that the inclusion of such materials detracts from information needed for students to complete requirements for certification and graduation. The faculty appear to be more supportive and knowledgeable of cross-cultural education and its intended outcomes than the students. This perhaps is an outgrowth of having assisted in the planning and implementation of the curriculum. The students may not have been as close to the process, and therefore are less knowledgeable.

The curriculum and scheduling of courses appears to not always facilitate community building. Full- and part-time students seem to find it difficult to set time apart from their schedules for the type of informal discussions and networking that supports a fully integrated community. Coming to grips with cultural diversity requires time for people to explore relationships and develop acquaintances and friendships. Fragmented academic lives do not permit such growth. The curriculum and co-curricular activities are areas around which stronger community ties could be developed.

The Chapel Experience in Building Community

One of the strengths of this Seminary is the unifying effect that chapel seems to have as a community-building and sustaining experience. It should not be surprising that the articulation of faith and the affirmation of faith through prayer should be a centralizing force in the Seminary experience. All of the constituent groups speak very highly of the role of chapel in the life of the Seminary.

However, there is an undercurrent of dissatisfaction with some aspects of the chapel experience. Many students view the worship service as a purely

religious experience and and feel it should be differentiated from more worldly concerns. Attempts at using inclusive language, attention paid to concerns such as gender perspectives, issues of diversity, and social awareness are perceived to be "politically correct" agendas that play themselves out in chapel. On the other hand, there are indications that not all women, persons of color, or persons from other denominations may feel affirmed by the service.

The only aspect of the chapel experience that was consistently ranked lower than others (music, prayer, and preaching) was chapel speakers. For the most part, the subject matter of chapel speakers did not seem to promote discussion in the community at large. This statement may be a gross generalization. On the other hand, there does seem to be an air of conservatism about what is desired from the chapel experience.

There were several comments by the students concerning the fact that faculty cloistered themselves after chapel service. It was observed that faculty went in one direction for coffee and conversation while students went in another direction. Whether or not this is a correct observation or just a perception, the fact that it was raised several times suggests an area of communication that deserves exploration.

In spite of the lack of success in reaching a sense of balance in chapel services that meets everyone's perceived needs, chapel is by far the most unifying experience on campus. This forum could be used more effectively in promoting diversity through shared experiences.

Diversity by the Numbers

Although there is a general feeling that both women and persons of color are represented at the Seminary in numbers comparable to their representation in the ELCA's worldwide ministry, the consensus is that with respect to people of color, the Seminary is doing a better job of recruiting students than of hiring faculty, administrators, or staff persons. In spite of the fact that the administration is thought to be committed to making the Seminary a more diverse community, little progress seems to have been made in this area. Although the faculty understand the strength that comes from bringing persons of diverse backgrounds into their ranks, they rightfully resist the notion that persons of color should only be hired to bolster the cross-cultural education component of the curriculum. They do not believe that bringing more international students to campus necessarily means meeting the goals of the mission statement or affirming diversity.

The physical presence of numbers of women, students of color, international students, or students from different denominational backgrounds does not insure campus diversity. Representational numbers are a means to an end but should not be confused with the end itself.

Cross-Cultural Education

All of the constituent groups were supportive of cross-cultural education even if they did not understand all of its components. Many of the respondents perceived that cross-cultural education addressed more ethnic/racial differences than issues concerning gender, ecumenism, or diversity in its larger sense. No one seemed confident about being able to assess or evaluate the effectiveness of this program. Yet hardly anyone felt that the program would have a negative effect upon the Seminary or its heritage and traditions. There was a tendency to review the program as being "trendy." However, most respondents felt that the cross-cultural education component of the new curriculum would have an impact upon their lives.

The Seminary has an excellent opportunity to capitalize upon the receptivity of the community to this initiative. Although students have not completely "bought into" the curriculum, bold initiatives and astute administrative leadership could create a program that may serve as a benchmark for efforts in other seminaries. Central to consolidating present and future gains is the necessity of assigning the coordination of these efforts as a line responsibility for an administrative officer.

Support for cross-cultural education should not be mistaken for acceptance of more far-reaching "diversity initiatives." The community must be brought along in a timely fashion consistent with well-articulated goals and intended outcomes for each initiative proposed.

Communication

The solicited comments from students suggest that there is a problem in effectively and forcefully communicating the principles that undergird the academic community and the values that bond this community in faith. Many of the comments received were blatantly intolerant, which seems to support the fact that a significant percentage of the faculty and student respondents claim to have witnessed perceived acts of intolerance on campus.

A greater effort will be required in the future to include all constituents of the Seminary in discussion and planning (where expedient) of the refinement of cross-cultural education and in any other initiatives in support of this basic concept. Faculty support is critical to efforts at providing a quality educational experience that makes real an understanding of what the gospel requires. I was struck by the comment that if we simply taught what the gospel intended, the barriers to understanding human diversity would disappear. Unfortunately, although that concept is not incorrect, it certainly requires more human effort than the author of the statement realizes.

Appendix A:

Survey Instruments

Appendix C:

Summary of Findings

Luther Northwestern Administrators and Board Members Survey Summary

Twenty-four (24) respondents, representing 57.14% of surveys distributed.

Demographic Information

Of the respondents, six (6) were administrators and eighteen (18) were members of the Board of Trustees. One third (33.3%) have been affiliated with the Seminary between two and five years, another third between five and ten years, and 12% more than ten years. They tend to be Caucasian (87.5%) and male (66.7%). As a group they tend to be older, with 54% over 56 years, and 29% between 46 and 55. Twenty-nine percent (29%) are graduates of either Luther or Northwestern Theological Seminary. The majority of respondents (70.8%) were raised in the Midwest, 17% in the Northwest, 8.3% in the Northeast, and 4.2% in the Southwest.

Part I: Luther Northwestern Theological Seminary's Mission

Seminary Education

The respondents felt that the education provided by the Seminary did prepare students with respect to a strong foundation in knowledge of the gospel and biblical scholarship. They also felt that graduates were reasonably prepared for a variety of ministries. They felt that, to a large degree, graduates were prepared to be responsive leaders who understood their relationship to God, creation, and humankind. They also felt that students learned to appreciate the diversity of the human experience, and were provided with opportunities to acquire an understanding of different religious beliefs and lifestyles. They felt that, to some degree, the curriculum provided opportunities for travel to and exchange with nations and cultures outside the United States.

Teaching and Learning

With respect to teaching and learning, the respondents felt that the Seminary provided an environment where original inquiry and scholarship were promoted, effective teaching was evidenced, innovated teaching was encouraged, and the intellect and abilities of students were respected and nurtured.

Outreach

The respondents believed that the Seminary was using its resources to link the campus with the Twin Cities urban communities. They believe (to some degree) that the Seminary is active in extending its programs to the unchurched in the Twin Cities, alleviating hardships while extending care to the elderly, sick and needy.

Community Building

The respondents strongly felt that the Seminary has made an effort to create an environment that is welcoming to students from diverse backgrounds. They were less convinced that the Seminary had succeeded in this regard for faculty and staff. However, they strongly believe that the Seminary has developed "policies and practices" that recognize the contributions of all employees, the worth and contribution of students, and to a large degree promulgate the interdependence of students, faculty and staff. Seventy percent (70%) of the respondents believe that the Seminary allocates its resources in ways that are supportive of community building.

Chapel is viewed very positively as a vehicle for building and sustaining a sense of community. It is perceived to be one of the unifying experiences in the life of the Seminary community. The worship service (music, prayer and preaching) is seen as important in building community. Although deemed important, chapel speakers are not rated as highly in terms of stimulating discussion within and outside of the classroom.

It was felt by the respondents that the present curriculum and the way in which courses were scheduled facilitated community building to some degree. Likewise, the respondents believed that there was some time apart from course work for building a cross-cultural community.

When asked whether they perceived changes in Seminary education, teaching and learning, outreach and community building in recent years, the respondents were "moderately positive." Interestingly, a significant number of "no responses" were recorded, ranging from 25% to 50%. On those items relating to the centrality of chapel to the Seminary's experience in building community, the fewest changes were recorded, possibly indicating a continuous and positive correlation over time.

The respondents felt "to a very large extent" that they were knowledgeable about the Seminary's mission and were contributors to helping the Seminary succeed in meeting its mission. They felt that institutional planning does occur within the framework of the Seminary's mission statement. Although positive they were less certain that cross-cultural education, as an expression of institutional planning, fitted comfortably within the context of the Seminary's mission. Some respondents felt that cross-cultural education could be accomplished without being mandated as part of the mission statement (slight extent 25%, some extent 41.7%).

Part II: Satisfaction with Luther Northwestern Theological Seminary and Campus Climate with Respect to the Cross-Cultural Education Component of the New Curriculum

The respondents feel committed to the Seminary, are involved in their respective responsibilities, and derive a sense of satisfaction from doing their jobs well.

Administrators and Board Members Summary--3

The respondents are very content with the manner in which the administration has provided leadership on issues related to cross-cultural education. Although they feel that a reasonable effort has been made to bring persons of color to the Seminary for educational purposes, they are less certain that a similar effort has been expended to bring persons of diverse backgrounds to the Seminary for educational or employment purposes. Nor are they certain that the Seminary has done all it could to bring persons of color to the Seminary for employment purposes.

The respondents were somewhat ambivalent about whether the campus environment, students and personnel were relatively free of biases that would inhibit communication across cultural groups (25% were neutral, 25% agreed, 20.8% disagreed, and 20.8% did not answer the item). Sixty-two percent (62%) claimed not to have witnessed any acts of intolerance, 12% disagreed, and 20.8% did not answer the item. The respondents strongly felt that providing an inclusive campus environment had direct implications for carrying out their responsibilities. However, they strongly felt that any effort to broaden cultural awareness on campus should respect the cultural heritage and tradition of the Seminary. As a group, they were divided over whether the administration should provide workshop experiences regarding diversity (29.2% were neutral and 33.3% agreed that it was the administration's responsibility to do so). Seventy-nine percent (79%) of the respondents claimed to have worked with or been supervised by a person of color. When asked whether the present campus climate was acceptable and not in need of greater efforts toward inclusivity and cultural sensitivity, 25% of the respondents were neutral, 12.5% agreed that things appear to be fine as they are, and 45.9% disagreed or strongly disagreed, indicating that more effort is required.

The respondents did not feel that efforts to include cross-cultural education in the curriculum would either dilute the quality of instruction or compromise the dissemination of information necessary for graduation or certification. Nor did they feel that the preparation required of the faculty to do so was greater than the value that students would derive from inclusion of such material. Although the respondents generally disagreed that issues of cross-cultural education could be handled by practicum experiences, by hiring faculty of color and from other denominations, and by enriching library resources, a not insignificant number were willing to explore these options. (On each of these items--#93, 95, 96, 97--16.7% did not answer and 20%-25% were neutral.)

The respondents generally felt that the number of students of color at the Seminary was reflective of their representation in the ELCA's worldwide ministry. They felt that the presence of students of color enhanced classroom discussion and generally did not create tensions that distracted from the classroom experience. (On each of these items--#98,99,100,104--between 25% and 41.7% of the respondents did not answer the item.) They felt that women were also represented in numbers comparable to the ELCA's worldwide ministry.

Administrators and Board Members Summary--4

With regard to issues of sexual orientation, ministry and theology, the respondents felt that these issues were--and should be--discussed adequately within the context of instruction. (On each of these items--#102, 103--between 25% and 41% of the respondents did not answer the item.)

The respondents felt that effective recruitment and graduation of students of color would require more attention and that the Seminary had sufficient resources to make cross-cultural education effective.

When asked about the Seminary's positive factors in regard to the recruitment of faculty of color, the respondents did not see any of the items as being deleterious, including the Seminary's European cultural heritage. (Items included theological focus, critical mass of minority students and faculty, reputation of the Seminary, salaries, Twin Cities environment and campus climate.)

When asked which of these same variables might negatively impact upon the retention of faculty of color, all of the items--with the exception of the reputation of the Seminary--garnered at least a 50% negative response. (In each of these items--#114-120--between 25% and 37.5% of the respondents did not answer the item.)

Part III: Administrative Staff and Board Members' Participation in the Development of the Cross-Cultural Education Component of the New Curriculum

The majority of the respondents felt that they had been extended an opportunity to participate in discussions concerning the cross-cultural education program and that the process was a collaborative effort between the faculty and administration. The respondents believe that the cross-cultural education program will be of assistance in the training of seminarians. It was also felt that the Seminary may be in a position of leadership with regard to comparable institutions as a result of the new curriculum and the possibility of a diversity initiative.

Part IV: How Do You Feel About the Cross-Cultural Education Component of the New Curriculum?

A majority of the respondents felt that the mission statement, goals and objectives supporting cross-cultural education were not amorphous or difficult to evaluate (with benchmarks for success and ways to effectively measure outcomes). The cross-cultural education component was not seen as addressing ethnic or racial differences, although it did address issues of gender and ecumenism.

The respondents felt that they were well informed about the cross-cultural education component of the curriculum and did not feel that it was "trendy," would foster divisiveness at the Seminary, or would negatively impact upon the culture and mission of the Seminary. They disagreed that the Seminary could

Administrators and Board Members Summary-5

not be more diverse than it presently is. They disagreed about endorsing practicum experiences and sensitivity-raising workshops as a way of approaching cross-cultural education (50% disagreed or strongly disagreed, 20.8% were neutral, 12.5% agreed, and 16.7% did not answer).

Part V: Board of Directors' Assessment

Some members of the Board (37.5%) felt that the long-term strategic interest of the Seminary required a more expansive view of the mission and the Seminary's capacity for service to the Church. Not all were in accord; 12.5% were neutral, 8.3% disagreed, and 8.3% strongly agreed.

Over forty-one percent (41.6%) believed that adjustments to the curriculum and mission statement should not undermine the financial health of the Seminary (12.5% were neutral and 16.7% disagreed).

The respondents disagreed (54.1%) that in pursuing curricular changes, controversy ought to be avoided so as to not alarm potential donors.

Twenty-five percent (25%) of the respondents were neutral on the subject of expanding the Seminary's enrollment in order to meet the basic premises of the mission statement (20.9% disagreed and 20.8% agreed).

The respondents did not feel that recruiting more international students would suffice to meet its diversity objectives.

Forty-eight percent (48.8%) of the respondents did feel that a concerted effort should be made to identify potential minority candidates for administrative positions in the Seminary (12.5% were neutral, 8.3% disagreed, and 4.2% strongly disagreed).

Part VI: Administrative Staff's Assessment

The administrative staff respondents were divided over the issue of whether a diversity initiative and/or improvements to the cross-cultural education component of the curriculum must be accomplished within the existing resources of the Seminary. They do believe that successful implementation of any initiative may require the identification of an administrator to oversee the effort. The respondents were slightly favorable to the notion of exploring external grants and matching internal resources to support whatever initiative results from the cultural climate survey. They believe that discussion and collaboration with other Lutheran seminaries may be critical to the success of the cross-cultural education component. They strongly agreed that the support of the Board, the President, and faculty leaders is critical to the success of the cross-cultural education effort.

Summation

The administrators and Board members are very committed to the work of the Seminary and share a sense of satisfaction regarding their respective responsibilities. They feel that the Seminary is providing a strong educational foundation in knowledge of the gospel and biblical scholarship and are reasonably convinced that students are being prepared for a variety of ministries. They feel that the faculty provide effective and innovative instruction.

The administrators and Board members feel that women and students of color are well represented on campus, at least comparably to their representation in the ELCA's world-wide ministry. Their presence in the classroom is valued and is not perceived as creating tensions.

The administrators and Board members strongly feel that the Seminary has made an effort to create a welcoming environment for students of diverse backgrounds, although more could be done with respect to faculty and staff. They express satisfaction about bringing persons of color to the Seminary for educational purposes, but are less certain that a reasonable effort has been expended in bringing persons of diverse backgrounds to the campus for educational or employment purposes. They strongly believe that the Seminary has developed policies and practices that recognize the contributions of all employees, affirm the contributions of students, and promulgate the interdependence of students, staff, and faculty.

Chapel was identified as a vehicle for building and sustaining a sense of community at the Seminary. The administrators and Board members perceive it also to be a unifying force in the life of the Seminary community. Apart from chapel, they believe that the curriculum and the way in which courses are scheduled facilitate community building to some degree. They also believe that there is time apart from coursework that students can use to build a cross-cultural community.

The administrators and Board members were somewhat ambivalent about whether the campus environment, students, and personnel were free of biases that inhibited communication across cultural groups. The majority claimed not to have witnessed any perceived acts of intolerance on campus. Even though they were committed to making the Seminary a more diverse and inclusive community, they felt that any efforts to broaden cultural awareness on campus must respect the heritage and cultural background of the Seminary.

The administrators and Board members are content with the manner in which the administration has provided leadership on issues related to cross-cultural education. They feel that each group has been extended the opportunity to participate in discussions concerning the program. They support the goals and do not feel that the goals or objectives are amorphous or lacking in benchmarks for determining effective measures of outcomes. Nor do they feel that the cross-cultural education component will foster divisiveness or negatively impact the culture and mission of the Seminary.

Luther Northwestern Faculty Survey Summary

Thirty (30) respondents, representing 75% of the faculty.

Demographic Information

Of those responding to the survey, 70% are full professors, 20% associate professors, and 6% assistant professors. The majority (70%) have been employed by the Seminary between 5 and 10 years, with 3% for more than 10 years. Eighty percent (80%) hold tenure and 10% are tenure track. Ninety percent (90%) are United States citizens. Eighty-seven percent (87%) are Caucasians, 83% are males, and 77% are older than 45 years. Sixty-three percent (63%) of the respondents have traveled abroad, 83% have lived abroad, 63% speak more than two languages, and 93% read more than two languages. Forty percent (40%) of the respondents are graduates of Luther or Northwestern Seminary. Seventy-three percent (73%) were raised in the Midwest, 13% in the Northeast, and 3% each in the Southeast, West, and Southwest.

Part I. Luther Northwestern Theological Seminary's Mission

Seminary Education

The respondents strongly felt that the Seminary experience assisted in developing men and women into responsive leaders who expressed understanding of religious beliefs and life-styles that were different from their own. The respondents were equally confident that as a result of the Seminary experience students were knowledgeable of the gospel and biblical scholarship and generally prepared for a variety of ministries. The respondents were less certain that the curriculum provided students with a fuller understanding or appreciation of the diversity of the human experience or understanding of their relationship to God, God's creation, and humankind. They were very strongly supportive (90%) of the curriculum with respect to the opportunities students have for international travel and exchange programs.

Teaching and Learning

Although the respondents were somewhat guarded as to whether the learning environment respected, nurtured or strengthened the intellectual abilities of all students (63.3%), they were fairly positive about the environment's providing innovative teaching (86.6%), effective teaching (76.7%), and the promotion of original inquiry and scholarship among its faculty and students (73.3%).

Outreach

The respondents felt that there were campus programs that linked the Seminary to the Twin Cities urban communities (76.6%), particularly with respect to extending the gospel to the unchurched (80%). They also felt that the Seminary supported efforts through urban ministries to alleviate ignorance, poverty, injustice, and hunger and extended compassionate care to those in need (86.7%)

Community Building

The respondents felt that the Seminary was more responsive with respect to welcoming faculty (80%) and staff (83.3%) from diverse racial, ethnic and religious backgrounds than students (66.7%). They also felt that the Seminary was more effective in giving recognition to the worth and contributions of employees (86.7%) than to students (76.6%). However, the respondents felt that the Seminary did allocate its resources in ways that were supportive of community building (86.6%) and attempted to create a sense of community which promulgates mutual interdependence of students, faculty and staff (80%).

It was generally felt that chapel was a unifying experience in the life of the Seminary (76.7%). However, the worship service (music, prayer and preaching) was viewed by only 70% as "building" a sense of community. The respondents strongly felt that chapel was an essential element in building a sense of community (80%) and sustaining community (83.4%), and that chapel speakers were important to stimulating discussions in the community (80%).

The respondents felt that the curriculum and the way in which classes are scheduled did facilitate community building (76.6%) and that there were opportunities apart from the demands of coursework for building a cross-cultural community (83.3%).

Changes with Respect to Seminary Education

The respondents feel that there have been expanded opportunities for students to travel internationally during recent years (70%). However, the respondents seem equally divided over whether any real changes have occurred in developing responsive leadership, fostering an understanding of different religious beliefs or life-styles, or strengthening students' understanding of their relationship to God and God's creation. No breakthrough was reported in improving knowledge of the gospel or biblical scholarship. Some improvement was reported in preparing students for a variety of ministries (50%).

Changes in Teaching and Learning

The respondents were almost equally divided over the question of whether the learning environment has changed with respect to nurturing and

strengthening intellectual abilities of all students. Slightly more expressed the belief that there have been positive changes in innovative teaching (50% vs. 40%) and effective teaching (46.6% vs. 40%). Seventy-six percent (76.7%) felt that there has been no change in the environment with respect to promoting original inquiry and scholarship among faculty and students.

Changes in Outreach

No significant change in outreach during recent years was noted.

Changes in Community Building

With the exception of improvements in welcoming students from diverse racial, ethnic and denominational backgrounds (66.7% moderate to dramatic improvements), the respondents felt that nothing substantive has occurred during the past few years regarding items 64-76. It may be worth mentioning that item 68 (referring to the Seminary's insisting on policies and practices which recognize the worth, contributions and dignity of all employees) was evenly divided among the respondents.

Items 77-81 (Impressions Concerning Mission)

The respondents report that they are knowledgeable about the Seminary's mission (83.3%), feel that they are contributing to accomplishing that mission (80%), and are comfortable that institutional planning occurs within the framework of the mission (86.7%). Ninety percent (90%) of the respondents feel that the cross-cultural component of the new curriculum fits within the context of the mission. However, 86.7% feel that the goals of the cross-cultural component could have been accomplished without having it mandated as part of the mission statement.

Part II: Satisfaction with Luther Northwestern Theological Seminary and Campus Climate with Respect to the Cross-Cultural Education Component of the New Curriculum

The respondents report that they are very involved with their work (90%), experience personal satisfaction from doing their job well (90%), and are concerned about what happens at the Seminary (83.4%). They believe that the administration is committed to making the Seminary a diverse community (80%) and are content with the way in which the administration has provided leadership on issues relating to cross-cultural education (90%).

The respondents believe that a reasonable effort has been expended to bring persons of color (76.7%) and persons of diverse backgrounds (80%) to the Seminary for educational purposes. However, they express less confidence about efforts at bringing persons of color (66.7%, with 16.6% neutral) and persons of diverse backgrounds (63.3%, with 23.85 neutral) to the Seminary for employment.

Faculty Summary--4

The respondents were somewhat guarded about the perceptions of chapel services. Fifty-six percent (56.6%) felt that the service utilized inclusive language (20% were neutral, while 16.7% disagreed). Sixty percent (60%) felt that chapel services were affirming to all who participate (16.7% were neutral, while 16.7% disagreed).

The respondents were almost equally divided over whether the campus environment was free of biases that inhibited open communications across cultural groups. Over thirty-six percent (36.6%) agreed that there were problems; 33.3% disagreed, while 23.3% remained neutral. Fifty percent (50%) of the respondents reported not having witnessed any acts of intolerance, while 40% said that they had; only 6.7% were neutral on this item. A majority of respondents believed that the physical surroundings of the Seminary did reflect the mission statement of affirming the gospel in a world of many cultures (56.6% agreed, while 26.7% expressed neutrality).

Over seventy-six percent (76.7%) of the respondents stated that they have worked with or have been supervised by a person of color. The respondents were somewhat ambivalent about whether the administration should provide professional workshops/training regarding diversity (33.3% neutral, 20% agree, and 40% disagree).

Generally, the respondents disagree about accepting the present campus climate without some effort toward greater inclusivity and cultural sensitivity (60% disagree, 13.3% neutral, and 20% in agreement). However, 90% felt that any attempt to broaden cultural awareness on campus should respect the traditions and cultural heritage of the campus.

Items 100-106 (Perceptions about Curriculum)

The respondents disagreed that additional emphasis upon cross-cultural education and ecumenism would dilute the quality of instruction (66.3%), compromise the dissemination of information needed for graduation and certification (63.4%, with 23.3% responding neutrally), or require more time to research and present (80%). They also disagreed with the statement that cross-cultural education could be handled by practicum experiences (63.3%, with 20% responding neutrally), or by hiring more faculty of color and from other denominations to shoulder the responsibility (90%).

The respondents were divided over whether cross-cultural perspectives could be handled by enriching library resources and by assigning individual readings (36.7% disagreed, 40% agreed, while 16.7% responded neutrally) or by creating a speakers' forum to raise the level of consciousness through dialogue (26.7% disagreed, 30% agreed, with 36.7% responding neutrally).

Items 107-121 (Perceptions about Classroom Experiences and Issues of Diversity)

The respondents felt that women are represented on campus in numbers comparable to the ELCA's world-wide ministry (83.3%). Eighty percent (80%) felt that students of color are represented comparably to ELCA's world-wide ministry.

The respondents generally felt that the classroom environment was supportive of students of color, women and persons from differing denominational backgrounds (77.3%). The respondents expressed satisfaction with the preparation of students of color and their ability to challenge the curriculum (70%, with 20% holding some reservation). Seventy percent (70%) thought that students of color enhanced classroom discussion. Interestingly, 63.3% of the respondents did not perceive the presence of students of color as creating tensions which detracted from learning, yet 30% held some reservations. Over eighty-nine percent (89.9%) of the respondents felt that effective recruitment and graduation of students of color will require more attention than in the past.

When asked similar questions concerning the presence of women in the classroom, 90% of the respondents felt that the presence of women in the classroom enhanced classroom discussion, while 80% did not feel the presence of women created tension that distracted from learning (19.9% were not convinced).

With respect to ecumenism, the respondents felt that ecumenism is valued (73.3%) and placed (discussed) positively in the course of classroom instruction (66.7%).

With respect to issues of sexual orientation, ministry and theology being discussed within the context of classroom instruction, 79.9% of the respondents felt that these issues were discussed and 83.3% felt that they should be discussed.

The respondents felt that there is time for seminarians to meet informally and discuss issues of diversity and theology outside of the classroom (83.3%). They also strongly believe that the Seminary possesses the resources to make cross-cultural education effective (86.7%).

Items 122-128 (Positive Factors in Recruitment)

The respondents felt somewhat confident about the Seminary's ability to recruit faculty of color. They felt that the theological focus of the Seminary (66.6%), its reputation (86.6%), its location (86.7%), and campus climate/receptivity to persons of color were strong assets. However, they perceive that the Seminary's historical and ethnic heritage may be an impediment to recruitment (40% not at all, 46.7% to some degree). The

respondents also express some concern about a critical mass of minority students (63.4%) and salaries (60%).

Items 129-135 (Negative Factors in Retention)

The respondents were generally uncertain about what would affect the retention of faculty of color. Between 20% and 26.7% of the respondents did not answer the items, indicating that they did not know. Of those responding, 56.6% felt that to some degree the historical/ethnic heritage was an impediment, 60% the theological focus, 56.7% critical mass of students of color, 24.3% the reputation of the Seminary, 53.3% salaries, 50% the location in the Twin Cities, and 53.3% campus climate and receptivity to persons of color.

Part III: Faculty Participation in the Development of the Cross-Cultural Education Component of the New Curriculum

Items 136-140 (Faculty Involvement)

The respondents felt that they were extended an opportunity to participate in discussions leading to the development of the cross-cultural education component of the new curriculum (73.3%) and that it represented a collaborative effort with the administration (66.7%). They also felt that they had opportunities to influence the policies of the Seminary (83.3%). However, they were not convinced that a diversity initiative resulting from this cultural climate assessment might be a well reasoned approach to the myriad issues confronting the Seminary and the training of its seminarians (40% yes, 26.7% no; 30% did not answer this item). However, the respondents were somewhat supportive of the perception that as a result of the cross-cultural education component and a possible diversity initiative, the Seminary might find itself in a leadership role among seminaries addressing this issue (60%).

Part IV: How Do You Feel About the Cross-Cultural Education Component of the New Curriculum?

Most of the respondents feel that they have been well informed concerning cross-cultural education, its scope and implications for the Seminary (60%, with 26.7% expressing neutrality). Overwhelmingly, the respondents feel that cross-cultural education does have a direct bearing upon what they do (93.3%).

The respondents are divided over whether the goals and objectives supporting cross-cultural education are too amorphous, lacking vision and difficult to evaluate (40% disagreed, feeling that the goals are not amorphous, lacking vision or difficult to evaluate; 30% were neutral, and 30% agreed). With respect to the cross-cultural education component's lacking benchmarks for success and ways to measure outcomes, 46.7% of the respondents were neutral, 20% disagreed, and 20% agreed. However, 33% of the respondents thought that present concerns about cross-cultural education appear to be "trendy," while 50% did not.

Faculty Summary--7

The respondents seem somewhat divided over the following items:

- cross-cultural education not connected to or associated with efforts toward ecumenism (33% disagree, 23.3% neutral, and 26.7% in agreement)
- cross-cultural education not connected to issues of gender (30% disagreed, 26.7% neutral, and 33.4% in agreement)
- cross-cultural education seems only to address ethnic/racial differences and not diversity in the larger context (36.7% disagree, 13.3% neutral, 43.3% in agreement)

Although 70% of the respondents did not feel that the cross-cultural education component would negatively impact upon the culture and mission of the Seminary, some concern was expressed about whether the effort could indirectly foster divisiveness at the Seminary. Forty-three percent (43%) disagreed that it would, 36.7% agreed that it might, while 16.7% remained neutral on the issue. The respondents did not feel, however, that a way of addressing cross-cultural education would be to send students out on practicums or sensitivity-raising workshops.

The respondents strongly felt that in spite of its heritage and historical development, it is possible for the Seminary to be more diverse than it is.

Summation

The faculty expressed confidence that the Seminary experience was producing men and women who would be responsive leaders and would manifest an understanding of religious beliefs and life-styles that were different from their own. They were equally confident that these students, as a result of the Seminary experience, were knowledgeable of the gospel, had a secure foundation in biblical scholarship, and were prepared for a variety of ministries. The faculty were not as confident that students left the Seminary with a fuller understanding or appreciation of the diversity of the human experience.

The faculty were fairly positive about the quality of instruction provided. They felt that the Seminary provided innovative and effective teaching and promoted original inquiry and scholarship among faculty and students. However, they were guarded as to whether the learning environment respected, nurtured, or strengthened the intellectual abilities of all students. The faculty seemed to feel that there has been a slight, albeit positive, change in the learning environment during the past few years.

It was generally felt that the Seminary, through campus programs, was linked with the Twin Cities urban community. Although specific programs and institutional efforts were not identified, the faculty felt that the Seminary was

Faculty Summary--8

involved in extending the gospel to the "unchurched" and compassionate care to those in need. No significant change in outreach during recent years was noted.

Although the faculty felt that the Seminary did allocate its resources in ways that were supportive of community building, they perceived that the environment was more welcoming to faculty and staff from diverse racial, ethnic, and religious backgrounds than to students of diverse backgrounds. However, the faculty observed that some improvement with respect to welcoming students has occurred during recent years. It was also perceived that the Seminary gave more recognition to the worth and contributions of employees than to those of students.

The faculty rated very highly the unifying force that chapel services provide at the Seminary. They felt that chapel was important in building a sense of community and essential in sustaining a sense of community. Chapel speakers were perceived as important in stimulating discussion on campus. Not all were convinced that chapel services were affirming to all who participated.

The faculty did not perceive the curriculum or the scheduling of classes as being detrimental to community building or inhibiting efforts at building a cross-cultural community. They felt that there was time for seminarians to meet informally to discuss issues of diversity and theology outside of the classroom.

The faculty were overwhelmingly positive about their work, satisfaction derived from doing their job well, the importance of the Seminary in their lives, and the way in which the administration has provided leadership on issues related to cross-cultural education. They were divided over the issue of whether the campus environment was free of biases that inhibited open communication across cultural groups. Forty percent reported having witnessed acts of intolerance. Although the faculty believe that a reasonable effort has been expended in bringing to the campus persons of color and from diverse backgrounds for educational purposes, they perceive less of an effort in the area of employment opportunities. Most of the faculty feel that a greater effort could be made toward inclusivity and cultural sensitivity at the Seminary, but such efforts should respect the traditions and cultural heritage of the campus.

The faculty did not seem to feel that additional emphasis upon cross-cultural education or ecumenism would impact negatively upon the quality of instruction or time spent covering things essential for certification. They did not feel that issues concerning cross-cultural education ought to be handled by assigning reading, more library projects, or hiring faculty of color (or from other denominations) to deliver instruction.

The faculty perceived that women and students of color are represented in numbers comparable to the ELCA's world-wide ministry. They felt that the classroom environment was supportive of these students. Women were perceived as enhancing the classroom environment and were not perceived as

Faculty Summary--9

creating tension that distracted from learning. However, students of color were not perceived as enhancing the classroom environment as much as women, and more faculty perceived tension in the classroom as a result of students of color.

According to the faculty, ecumenism was valued and discussed positively in the course of classroom instruction. They also felt that issues of sexuality and the ministry were discussed in the classroom, and should be discussed in the classroom.

The faculty expressed more confidence in the Seminary's ability to recruit faculty of color than to retain them. Many of the faculty did not answer these items.

Generally, the faculty feel well informed about and are supportive of the cross-cultural education component of the new curriculum. They perceive it to be a collaborative effort with the administration and feel that the Seminary has the resources to make the program successful. They are not convinced that a "Diversity Initiative" is necessary to make the program succeed. They would probably welcome a discussion concerning ways in which to evaluate the success of cross-cultural education.

Luther Northwestern Staff Survey Summary

Forty-seven (47) respondents, representing 52.8% of the staff.

Demographic Information

The majority of the respondents were salaried full-time staff persons, 45% of whom have been employed with the Seminary for more than five years. They tend to be Caucasian (85%) and predominately female (75%). The largest percentage of staff (66%) are between 36 and 55 years of age. They are predominately from the Midwest (83%) and are not graduates of Luther or Northwestern Theological Seminary.

Part I: Luther Northwestern Theological Seminary's Mission

From the perspective of the staff, there has been a reasonable attempt by staff to provide an environment that is welcoming and respectful to visitors as well as to students and faculty of diverse backgrounds. They believe that there has been an attempt to promote a sense of community that is interdependent and that the contributions of all who are employed and who are studying at the Seminary are recognized. However, 66% felt a greater sense of cohesion at the departmental level than within the larger Seminary community.

Involvement in chapel is perceived to be important in building and sustaining a sense of community. The service (music, prayer and preaching) is important in that respect. Chapel speakers were seen as important in stimulating discussion on campus.

Although being part of the campus community is important to the staff with respect to carrying out their responsibilities, approximately 60% derive a greater sense of belonging to communities apart from the Seminary. Sixty-two percent (62%) feel that there is a need to build a greater sense of community between staff and faculty.

Part II: Satisfaction with the Seminary's Campus Climate

It is generally felt that the respondents are satisfied with their employment and are allowed to apply their talents. Gender and/or race is not perceived to be an obstacle to employment satisfaction. Staff feel generally informed of changes at the Seminary and that there are opportunities for information sharing.

Fifty-four percent (54%) are content with the manner in which the administration is providing leadership on campus issues. Seventy-five percent (75%) believe that the administration is committed to making the Seminary a diverse community. The majority feel that the Seminary's facilities, grounds, art

Staff Summary--2

displays, etc., are affirming of the gospel's respect for cultures. However, 70% express neutrality to strong disagreement on whether the campus environment or its personnel is free of biases that inhibit communication across cultural groups. Sixty-four percent (64%) profess to not having personally witnessed acts of intolerance on campus.

Sixty-four percent (64%) believe that a reasonable attempt has been made to bring persons of color and people from diverse backgrounds to campus for educational purposes and programs. However, only 38% believe that a similar effort has been expended for persons of color, and 30% for people of diverse backgrounds, with respect to employment opportunities.

Sixty-three percent (63%) of the staff claim never to have worked with or been supervised by a person of color. The majority of respondents thought that it would be helpful for the administration to provide professional workshops/training regarding cross-cultural education. Overwhelmingly, 89% of the respondents felt that efforts to improve cultural sensitivity and inclusivity were not misdirected efforts, in spite of their general high regard for the campus environment.

The centrality of chapel in the life of the campus was again reaffirmed. Fifty-two percent (52%) felt that the worship services, chapel services and other prayerful occasions were affirming to everyone who participated, and 67% felt that inclusive language was utilized.

When asked about their perception of their supervisors' support for enhancing cross-cultural education, the response was very affirming (68%). However, when asked to respond to specific behaviors, the answers were decidedly neutral or moderately supportive, suggesting that staff may not always know what their supervisor's position may be. However, those persons strongly disagreeing on any of the items seldom exceeded 19% of the responses.

Part III: How Do You Feel About Cross-Cultural Education?

The staff feel concerned about not being kept well informed about cross-cultural education or its implications for the Seminary (25% were neutral, but 32% expressed concern about not being well informed). Some of the respondents felt that the mission statement, goals and objectives supportive of cross-cultural education were becoming amorphous, therefore potentially difficult to evaluate. The respondents were virtually evenly split between those who felt that the the current emphasis on diversity is "trendy" (40%) and those who considered it substantive (46%).

Data suggest that staff are neutral with respect to the relationship of cross-cultural education to issues of gender or ecumenism. They are also neutral on whether cross-cultural education, as defined in this context, addresses diversity in the larger sense or just issues of ethnicity and race.

Staff Summary--3

The staff expressed concern that they are very interested in the issue of developing an inclusive climate on campus and that cross-cultural education is important to what they do. They do not feel that cross-cultural education will have a negative impact upon the culture and mission of the Seminary.

They are not convinced that the Seminary cannot be more diverse than it currently is, and they do not believe that sending students to sensitivity-raising workshops or practicums is a way to address this issue.

They are neutral with respect to whether there are appropriate ways to measure outcomes.

Summation

The staff are satisfied with their employment and do not perceive racial or gender barriers preventing them from being successful. Even though they feel that they are part of the Seminary community, they have expressed concern about strengthening the relationship between staff and faculty. They perceive daily chapel services being important in building and sustaining that sense of community.

They believe that the administration is committed to making the Seminary a diverse community. They believe that as staff they have attempted to provide an environment at the Seminary that is welcoming and respectful. However, the campus environment and personnel are not free of biases that inhibit communication across cultural groups. The majority of staff respondents professed to not having seen or witnessed any acts of intolerance on campus.

Although the Seminary has done a reasonable job of insuring diversity in the student body and faculty (persons brought to campus for educational purposes and programs), the staff felt that less effort had been expended with respect to hiring employees. Many employees claimed never to have been supervised by or to have worked with a person of color.

The staff are not well informed with respect to cross-cultural education. On most items regarding cross-cultural education, they were neutral, with many respondents declining to answer those items. They perceive their supervisors as being supportive of cross-cultural education but are not aware of any specific action or behavior taken in support of the initiative. They perceive cross-cultural education as important to what they do. Cross-cultural education was not perceived as negatively impacting the Seminary's culture or mission. They believe that the Seminary can be more diverse than it currently is.

Luther Northwestern Student Survey Summary

One hundred and eighty-nine (189) respondents, representing 30.8% of the student body.

Demographic Information

The majority of the respondents (90.5%) were full-time students; 8.5% considered themselves as part-time. Seventy-five percent (75%) were in the Master of Divinity Program, 11.6% MA, 0.5% DMin, 1.6 MTh, 4.2% ThD, and 5.9% Graduate Special.

Thirty-six percent (36%) were first year, 33% second year, 6% third year, 20% fourth year, and 1% participating in internships.

About ten percent (10.6%) of the respondents were international students. The majority of them were from North America (15.9%), followed by Africa (9%), South America (2.6%), and Asia (1.6%).

The respondents were predominantly Lutheran (88.4%) and Caucasian (75.7%). African Americans represented 1.1% of the respondents, American Indians 2.1%, Asian Americans 1.1%, and Chicano/Latinos 0.5%.

Fifty percent (50%) of the respondents were female, 47.6% were male.

The following age distribution was recorded: under 25 (18%), 26-35 (37.6%), 36-45 (28.6%), 46-55 (11.6%), and 56 or older (3.2%).

The majority of the respondents were from the Midwest (65.6%), followed by Northeast 7.4%, South 5.3%, West 4.2%, Northeast 3.2%, Southwest 3.2%, and Southeast 2.1%.

Part I: Luther Northwestern Theological Seminary's Mission

Seminary Education

The respondents felt "to a large degree" that the Seminary does prepare students to be knowledgeable of the gospel, and knowledgeable with respect to biblical scholarship. They were less sure of their preparation for a variety of ministries.

The respondents believed that they were being prepared as responsive leaders. They felt that "to some degree" they were challenged to understand different religious beliefs, values and life-styles, and to appreciate the diversity of the human experience. "To a large degree" they were challenged to understand their relationship to God, God's creation and humankind. As part of

Student Summary--2

the Seminary training, they acknowledge opportunities for travel through exchange programs with nations and cultures external to the United States.

Teaching and Learning

The respondents were generally pleased with instruction received. Seventy-seven percent (77%) felt that the learning environment respected the intellect and abilities of students, 85% felt that effective teaching was demonstrated, and 69% believed that innovative teaching was encouraged. The students strongly felt (85.7%) that the environment encouraged original inquiry and scholarship among faculty and students.

Outreach

The respondents were less supportive of the Seminary's outreach to the Twin Cities urban community. Sixty-seven percent (67%) felt that the Seminary encouraged campus programs which linked the Seminary's resources to the Twin Cities urban community. Fifty-seven percent (57%) felt that the Seminary sponsored activities to extend the gospel to the unchurched in the urban communities, and 47.6% felt that the Seminary (only to a slight degree) encouraged efforts through urban ministry to alleviate hardships while extending care to the elderly, sick and needy. (Only 41.3% felt more positive, and 11.1% did not answer.)

Community Building

The respondents perceive that the Seminary respects and is more welcoming to students and staff of diverse racial, ethnic and denominational backgrounds than it is to faculty of diverse backgrounds. However, the respondents felt that the Seminary develops and insists on policies/practices that recognize the contributions and dignity of all. "To some degree" the Seminary promotes the mutual interdependence of students, staff and faculty, and allocates resources in ways that are supportive of community building.

The daily chapel experience is viewed as being very important to building and sustaining a sense of community. Over seventy-nine percent (79.9%) perceive worship as a unifying experience, 84.1% perceive chapel as an essential element in community building, and 87.3% perceive chapel as important in sustaining community. Although important, chapel speakers are not perceived as highly in terms of stimulating discussion (78.9%), but the worship service (music, prayer and preaching) is valued more highly (80.4%).

The respondents feel that the way in which courses are scheduled presents difficulties to building community and that there is not enough informal time for building a cross-cultural community.

Items 44-73 ask the respondents whether there has been a change over the past five years with respect to items 14-43. Between 42% and 59% of the respondents did not answer some of

these items. This phenomenon may be related to the fact that their course of study does not span five years, and therefore very few (if any) have the ability to contrast and compare. Those choosing to answer responded "moderately positive" to "little or none" with reference to change. One could conclude from the responses that, given the more positive assessment in the section preceding, no real or perceptible changes have occurred in the environment.

Part II: Satisfaction with Luther Northwestern Theological Seminary and Campus Climate with Respect to the Cross-Cultural Education Component of the New Curriculum

The respondents are committed to their studies, derive a personal sense of satisfaction from being a student at the Seminary, and aver that what occurs at the Seminary is important to them. Although they believe that the administration is committed to making the Seminary a diverse community, they are not content with the way in which the administration has provided leadership on issues related to cross-cultural education (23.3% in disagreement, 28% neutral, and 40.7% supportive).

The respondents are somewhat divided over the issue of representation of diversity on campus and efforts to bring people of diverse backgrounds to the Seminary. With respect to bring persons of color for educational purposes, 14.3% disagree, 25.9% neutral, 48.6% agree; with respect to bring people of diverse backgrounds to campus for educational purposes 15.9% disagree, 25.9% are neutral, and 46% agree; with respect to efforts for hiring people of color, 21.1% disagree, 29.6% are neutral, and 36.4% agree; with respect to hiring people of diverse backgrounds, 20.1% disagree, 30.2% are neutral, and 25.4% agree.

The respondents did not feel that the campus environment was free of biases that inhibited open communication across cultural groups (45.9% disagreed, 14.3% were neutral, and 36% agreed). With regard to not having witnessed perceived acts of intolerance on campus, 37% disagreed, 4.2% were neutral, and 51.8% agreed.

The majority of respondents found that the physical environment of the campus (facilities, grounds, and display art) were reflective of affirming the mission statement with respect to spreading the gospel in a world of many cultures. They also felt that the worship services did utilize inclusive language. However, the respondents were not in accord with respect to whether the worship services were affirming to everyone who participated (24.3% disagreed, 19.6% were neutral, and 49.2% agreed). The respondents were stronger in their affirmation that any attempt to broaden cultural awareness on campus should respect the traditions and cultural heritage of the Seminary (7.9% disagreed, 10.6% were neutral, and 75.2% agreed).

In general they strongly disagreed with the statement suggesting that the present campus climate did not indicate a need for greater inclusivity and

Student Summary--4

sensitivity (70.9% disagreed, 12.7% were neutral, and 26.5% agreed). They were somewhat supportive of the administration's providing professional workshops/training regarding diversity (21.7% disagreed, 17.5% were neutral, and 52.9% agreed).

The respondents strongly disagreed (70.9%) with the statement that developing an inclusive campus or enhancing diversity on campus did not have any direct implications for their training or professional goals.

Fifty-seven percent (57.7%) claimed never to have been taught, mentored or advised by a faculty member of color (35.3% disagreed and 2.6% were neutral).

Questions about existing curriculum, pedagogies and cross-cultural education

The respondents felt that bringing in issues of cross-cultural education and ecumenism would not dilute the quality of instruction or present an additional burden upon the faculty over and beyond its value to the students. Nor did they feel that studying such issues would compromise the information needed for graduation and certification.

The respondents felt that issues surrounding cross-cultural education might possibly be handled in creative ways. Although they disagreed that cross-cultural education could be handled through practicum experiences rather than incorporating them into existing course materials, they were divided over whether enriching library resources and assigning a greater cross-section of reading would be helpful. They agreed that some issues of cross-cultural education could be handled by inviting prominent theologians and lay persons to raise the level of consciousness through dialogue. They disagreed that the hiring of more faculty of color or faculty from other denominations would be sufficient to address issues of cross-cultural perspectives.

Questions about student academic life and Issues of diversity

The respondents felt that women were represented on the campus in numbers proportional to their representation in the ELCA's worldwide ministry. However, they were less confident that students of color were proportionately represented.

They perceived the classroom environment to be generally supportive and nurturing to women, students of color, and persons from differing denominational backgrounds. They agreed that the presence of students of color and women enhanced classroom discussion and did not feel that their presence created tension which distracted from learning. The respondents felt that effective recruitment and graduation of students of color will require more attention than it has been given in the past. They felt that the Seminary possesses the resources to make cross-cultural education effective.

With reference to issues of sexual orientation, ministry and theology being discussed in the context of instruction, the respondents felt that they were

Student Summary--5

being discussed "to some extent." The respondents also felt that these issues should be discussed "to some extent."

With regard to whether ecumenism is valued and placed in a positive perspective in the context of instruction, the respondents felt that "to some extent," it was.

The respondents felt that "to a slight extent," there was time for seminarians to meet informally and discuss issues of diversity and theology outside of the classroom.

Part III: How Do You Feel About Cross-Cultural Education?

The respondents were somewhat divided in their responses as to whether they had been well informed regarding cross-cultural education, its scope and implications for the Seminary. About forty percent (40.8%) of the students felt that they had been informed, while 36% felt that they had not, and 16.4% were neutral in their response. The respondents were similarly divided over whether the mission statement, goals and objectives supporting cross-cultural education were amorphous, lacking vision, and difficult to evaluate (25.1% disagreed, while 26.9% agreed, and 27.5% remained neutral). When asked whether the cross-cultural education portion of the new curriculum was lacking in both benchmarks for success and ways to measure outcomes, 23.3% agreed, 14.8% disagreed, and 23.8% remained neutral. The respondents were virtually split between those who thought that the present concerns about cross-cultural education appeared to be "trendy" (22.3% disagreed, 32.8% agreed, and 18% remained neutral).

The respondents were almost evenly split over the issue of whether cross-cultural education seemed connected or associated with efforts toward ecumenism (23.8% felt that it was, 19.6% felt that it was not, and 27.5% remained neutral on the issue). Many respondents perceived cross-cultural education to address ethnic/racial differences, but not diversity in the larger context (19% were neutral). Many also felt that cross-cultural education seemed not to be connected to issues of gender (16.9% were neutral).

The respondents strongly disagreed that the cross-cultural education component of the curriculum would negatively impact upon the culture and mission of the Seminary.

Seventy-five percent (75%) felt that cross-cultural education would have an effect upon their lives. About eighty-one percent (81.5%) expressed the belief that the Seminary could be more diverse than it currently is. Over fifty-four percent (54.5%) disagreed that it is improbable that Seminary would ever be more diverse than it currently is.

Respondents disagreed that, rather than attempting to make the Seminary more diverse and the curriculum more inclusive, it should send students out on practicum experiences or sensitivity-raising workshops.

Summation

The students are committed to their studies, derive satisfaction from being students at the Seminary, and are concerned about what occurs at the Seminary. They feel that they are being prepared as responsive leaders who are knowledgeable of the gospel and biblical scholarship. They feel to some extent that they are challenged to understand other religious beliefs, values, and life-styles and to appreciate the diversity of the human experience. In spite of their scholarly training, they are not as confident about being prepared for a variety of ministries.

The students are somewhat divided or ambivalent over the issue of diversity on campus and the effort that the Seminary is extending in bringing people of diverse backgrounds to the Seminary. They perceive that the Seminary respects and is more welcoming to students and staff than to faculty from diverse backgrounds.

The students did not perceive that the campus environment was free of biases that inhibited open communication across cultural groups. A significant minority claimed to have witnessed perceived acts of intolerance on campus.

The students perceived that daily chapel service was important to building and sustaining a sense of community on campus. Although they felt that the worship service did make use of inclusive language, they perceived that the service may not be affirming to everyone. The chapel speakers were not rated as highly as other aspects of the service (music, prayer, and preaching).

Although they were keenly aware of the deficiencies in the Seminary with reference to diversity and acknowledged that there is a need for greater inclusivity and sensitivity, they did feel that any attempt to broaden cultural awareness should respect the heritage and traditions of the Seminary.

The students felt that the classroom environment was supportive and nurturing to women, students of color, and persons from different denominational backgrounds. They did not feel that the addition of materials and discussions concerning cross-cultural education and ecumenism diluted the quality of instruction or presented an additional burden to the faculty. They felt that women and persons of color enhanced classroom discussion rather than detracted from it.

Although somewhat divided over the methods, goals, and their ability to evaluate the success of the cross-cultural education portion of the new curriculum, the students seem supportive of the effort and confident that the administration had the resources to make it successful.

Appendix D:

Assessment Documents

Assessment Document #1: Faculty, Administrators/ Board Members, and Student Perceptions

The survey instruments given to the faculty, administrators/Board members, and students shared common elements, themes, and questions. This document is an assessment of responses to the questions shared in common. A separate assessment was required for staff responses and is contained in Assessment Document #2.

Demographic Information

In assessing the characteristics of faculty, staff, administrators and Board members of Luther Northwestern Theological Seminary, the following items were noted. The faculty and administrators/Board members tend to be Caucasian males over the age of 45 who were raised in the Midwest. The majority have been employed at or affiliated with the Seminary for more than five years. Of the faculty responding, 40% were graduates of Luther or Northwestern; 29% of the administrators/Board members were. The majority of the faculty have traveled and/or have lived abroad.

In contrast, 45% of the staff respondents have been employed at the Seminary for more than five years, are female and Caucasian, were raised in the Midwest, and are between the ages of 36 and 55. They are not graduates of Luther or Northwestern Seminaries.

The student respondents share similar characteristics. They are predominantly Caucasian and Lutheran, were raised in the Midwest, and are under the age of 45. There were more female than male respondents; the majority identified themselves as full-time students, in the Master of Divinity Program, and distributed between the first and second year of study. About 10% of the respondents identified themselves as international students.

Significance

The only consistent characteristics shared are that the respondents were predominantly Caucasian, from the Midwest, and male. Those persons holding positions of authority in the Seminary more than likely are older males who are Caucasian.

Part I: Luther Northwestern Theological Seminary's Mission

Seminary Education

The faculty, administrators, Board members, and students responded favorably to the preparation that students receive at the Seminary. They strongly felt that the experience prepares students to be responsive leaders who are knowledgeable of the gospel and biblical scholarship. All felt that

students are challenged to clarify their understanding of their relationship to God, God's creation and humankind. The faculty were less certain that the curriculum provides students with a fuller appreciation of the diversity of the human experience; the students were less certain that they were being prepared for a variety of ministries. All were very positive about the opportunities for participation in foreign travel and exchange programs.

Teaching and Learning

The faculty, administrators, Board members, and students were fairly positive about the instruction received. They felt that the faculty provide effective and innovative teaching and promote original inquiry and scholarship among faculty and students. The faculty were somewhat guarded about whether the learning environment actually nurtures or strengthens the intellectual abilities of all students.

Outreach

The faculty and administrators/Board members were more inclined to highly rate the Seminary's involvement in outreach activities specifically linked to urban ministry. The students perceived the Seminary to be much less involved in urban ministry and outreach programs. The difference between the two perspectives is statistically significant.

Community Building

Faculty, administrators, Board members, and students differ in their perception of community-building efforts. The faculty feel that the Seminary is more responsive in welcoming faculty and staff from diverse racial, ethnic, and religious backgrounds than in welcoming such students. Board members and administrators feel that the Seminary is more welcoming of students than of faculty and staff members from diverse backgrounds. The students perceive that the Seminary respects and is more welcoming to students and staff than to faculty from diverse backgrounds.

All constituencies of the Seminary (faculty, staff, administrators, Board members, and students) feel that chapel is a vehicle for building and sustaining a sense of community. Whereas they gave very high ratings to music, prayer, and preaching as essential elements in providing a unifying experience, students, administrators, and Board members did not rate chapel speakers highly with respect to providing stimulus for discussion outside of chapel. Faculty thought differently.

The faculty and administrators/Board members uniformly felt that the curriculum and the way in which courses were scheduled did facilitate efforts toward building a cross-cultural community. Students felt that there was not enough informal time in their schedules for building a truly cross-cultural community.

The difference noted between the perception of the faculty/administrators/Board members and the students with respect to community building is statistically significant and indicates an area to be explored.

Significance

The items in this section were submitted to gauge the perception of the respondents relative to the Seminary's affirming its mission of promulgating the Gospel of Jesus Christ through the vehicle of the Christian faith encompassing all nations, peoples, and cultures, and of educating leaders for this apostolic calling.

This community perceives that education (the teaching and learning environment) and leadership training received are excellent.

Not everyone is convinced that the Seminary as an institution is as engaged as it could be in urban ministries consistent with promulgating the gospel. This could be a matter of perspective, depending on familiarity with outreach activities.

The respondents feel that the Seminary allocates its resources in ways that promote and are supportive of community building. Everyone seems to be aware of an effort on the part of the Seminary to welcome visitors; to appear supportive of faculty, staff, and students; and to recruit for educational programs or for employment purposes persons from diverse backgrounds. Not everyone feels that a consistent effort has been expended to bring underrepresented minority faculty, students, or potential staff persons to campus for educational or employment purposes.

Chapel is perceived as being a unifying force on campus and possibly an activity around which a closer sense of community could be built. Chapel is seen as affirming to participants, and inclusive. A greater degree of sensitivity could be brought to bear on the selection of chapel speakers (or the topics that they choose to address).

Students and faculty hold divergent views on the amount of time available for dialogue or discussion concerning cross-cultural issues (informal sharing of experiences) apart from the rigorous demands of the classroom. The way in which degree programs are structured, the sequencing and availability of courses, and the amount of preparation time for classroom assignments may be detrimental to developing a greater sense of community among full-time, and particularly part-time, students.

Only the faculty, administrators, Board members, and students were asked to respond to perceived changes in the Seminary observed over a period of years concerning teaching and learning, the general Seminary education, outreach, and community building.

Part II: Satisfaction with Luther Northwestern Campus Climate with Respect to the Cross-cultural Education Component of the New Curriculum

The respondents (faculty, administrators, Board members, and students) all reported a great sense of satisfaction derived from their work or engagement in studies, and expressed concern about what happens at the Seminary. The faculty, administrators, and Board members feel that the administration is committed to making the Seminary a diverse community and are content with the leadership that the administration has provided on issues related to cross-cultural education. Although the students concur with respect to efforts at making the Seminary a diverse community, they are less content with the administration's leadership on issues related to cross-cultural education.

The faculty, administrators, and Board members felt that a reasonable effort had been expended to bring persons of color and of diverse backgrounds to the Seminary for educational purposes but were less confident about efforts in the area of employment opportunities. The students were not convinced of sustained commitment in either category generally, with a large number of respondents expressing neutrality.

All respondents (faculty, administrators, Board members, and students) were somewhat divided over the issue of whether the campus environment was relatively free of biases that would inhibit communication across cultural groups. Almost as many disagreed as agreed, with a smaller but significant number expressing neutrality. However, 40% of the faculty responding said that they had personally witnessed perceived acts of intolerance, as had 51% of the students, but only 12% of the administrators and Board members. (In contrast, 50% of the faculty said that they had not, nor had 62% of the administrators/ Board members or 37% of the students.)

Generally, the respondents were not inclined to accept the campus climate with respect to diversity, and they expressed the belief that the Seminary could do more to be inclusive and culturally sensitive as long as the traditions and cultural heritage of the Seminary were respected.

All three groups felt that efforts to include cross-cultural education in the curriculum would not dilute the quality of instruction or compromise the dissemination of information necessary for graduation or certification. Nor did they feel that it placed an additional burden of preparation upon the faculty. They were not inclined to believe that enriched practicum experiences would meet the intended outcomes of cross-cultural education, nor would the hiring of faculty of color (or from other denominations). However, all groups expressed a willingness to explore other options in support of the cross-cultural education component of the curriculum, such as enriched library resources, speaker forums, etc.

The faculty, administrators/Board members, and students felt that women were represented at the Seminary in numbers comparable to their

representation in the ELCA's worldwide ministry. They differed with respect to students of color. Students were less confident that students of color were proportionately represented. Generally, faculty, administrators, Board members, and students felt that the presence of women and students of color enhanced classroom discussion and did not present tensions that distracted from the learning environment. (A significant minority of faculty--30%--did feel that some tension existed with respect to students of color.) All concur that more effective recruitment and graduation of students of color will require more attention than in the past.

The students and faculty felt that issues concerning ecumenism were treated positively in the classroom (faculty more strongly than students). With regard to issues of sexual orientation, ministry, and theology students, faculty, and administrators/Board members felt that these issues were being addressed and should be addressed.

The faculty and administrators/Board members were generally positive about the Seminary's ability to recruit faculty of color. The faculty were more concerned than the administrators/Board members about the Seminary's ethnic heritage being an impediment to effective recruitment. However, both groups expressed reservations about being able to retain faculty of color. Many of them were uncertain about what would affect retention. Students were not asked these questions; therefore, no response was recorded.

Part III: How Do You Feel About the Cross-Cultural Education Component of the New Curriculum?

The faculty, administrators, and Board members felt that they had been well informed concerning cross-cultural education, its scope and implications for the Seminary. The administrators/Board members felt that the objectives of cross-cultural education were not amorphous, lacking vision, or difficult to evaluate. The faculty were a little skeptical, but were not in basic disagreement. The students were evenly divided on the issue. With respect to whether the subject of cross-cultural education was "trendy," the Board members did not think that the issue was, while both the faculty and students expressed division within ranks but were more inclined to look at this issue positively. None of the respondents felt that the cross-cultural education component of the curriculum would impact negatively upon the culture and mission of the Seminary. The faculty expressed some concern about this issue potentially fostering divisiveness, but that perspective was not shared by the students, administrators, or Board members.

The faculty and students were divided (very similarly) over whether cross-cultural education was associated with efforts toward ecumenism, connected to issues of gender, or only appeared to address ethnic/racial differences and not diversity in its broadest sense. The administrators/Board members did not have a similar set of questions to address.

All of the respondents agreed that sending students out on practicums and sensitivity-raising workshops/seminars was not the way in which to achieve cross-cultural education.

Additional Information

1. The faculty were asked to assess their participation in the development of the cross-cultural component of the new curriculum. They felt that they had been extended an invitation to participate, and that it was a collaborative effort with the administration. More important, they strongly felt that they have the opportunity to influence policy development at the Seminary. They were not of one accord with respect to whether a "diversity initiative" resulting from this survey might be the proper vehicle for approaching issues confronting the Seminary and the training of seminarians.

2. The Board members were asked a series of questions relating to the Seminary's capacity to respond to the cross-cultural education component of the curriculum and the larger issue of diversity. When asked whether the long-term strategic interests of the Seminary required a more "expansive" view of the mission and capacity for service to the Church, there was no unanimity of thought or concurrence. Nor did they agree that the objectives of the mission statement could be met by expanding enrollment. Most did agree that adjustments required by the curriculum would not undermine the financial health of the institution.

The Board members did not feel that, in pursuing curriculum changes, controversy should be avoided for fear of jeopardizing funding solicitation. They did feel that an effort should be made to identify potential minority candidates for administrative positions.

3. The administrative staff strongly felt that the success of the cross-cultural education effort was dependent upon the support of the faculty, Board, and president. They were divided over whether a "diversity initiative" or enhancements to the cross-cultural education component of the curriculum must be accomplished within the resource base of the Seminary. They slightly favored the seeking out of external support. They were in accord concerning the importance of having an administrator to oversee this effort.

Table 1. Number of Faculty and Students.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
FACULTY	1.00	29	13.3	13.3	13.3
STUDENT	2.00	189	86.7	86.7	100.0
	Total	218	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	218	Missing cases	0		

Table 2. Comparison of Faculty and Students on the Community Building Scale.

	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	t Value	two-tail Probability
FACULTY	27	3.6253	.750	3.01	.003
STUDENTS	176	3.1667	.735		

Table 3. Comparison of Faculty and Students on the Diversity Education Scale.

	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	t Value	two-tail Probability
FACULTY	28	3.5097	.489	1.88	.062
STUDENTS	170	3.2933	.577		

Table 4. Comparison of Faculty and Students on the Chapel & Community Building Scale.

	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	t Value	two-tail Probability
FACULTY	29	4.2483	.692	2.43	.016
STUDENTS	186	3.8050	.943		

Table 5. Comparison of Faculty and Students on the Ministry Preparation Scale.

	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	t Value	two-tail Probability
FACULTY	28	4.0077	.575	3.07	.002
STUDENTS	184	3.6024	.661		

Table 6. Comparison of Faculty and Students on the Institutional Commitment to Diversity Scale.

	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	t Value	two-tail Probability
FACULTY	25	3.5095	.513	2.49	.014
STUDENTS	132	3.2227	.530		

Table 7. Comparison of Faculty and Students on the Change in Community Building Scale.

	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	t Value	two-tail Probability
FACULTY	26	2.8366	.657	.38	.704
STUDENTS	95	2.8962	.720		

Table 8. Comparison of Faculty and Students on the Change in Diversity Education Scale.

	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	t Value	two-tail Probability
FACULTY	28	2.4851	.633	1.80	.075
STUDENTS	102	2.7190	.604		

Table 9. Comparison of Faculty and Students on the Change in Outreach Scale.

	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	t Value	two-tail Probability
FACULTY	26	2.7051	.649	.85	.396
STUDENTS	99	2.8451	.769		

Assessment Document #2: Staff Perceptions

What is attempted here is a contrast between the staff perception on issues raised in their survey and the perception of faculty, administrators/Board members, and students on related issues found in their survey instruments.

Demographic Information

In direct contrast to the faculty, students, administrators and Board members, 75% of the staff respondents were female, the majority of whom were full-time employees between the ages of 36 and 55. They were not graduates of either Luther or Northwestern Seminaries.

Part I: Luther Northwestern Theological Seminary's Mission

The staff were not asked questions directly related to preparation of students for ministry, quality of instruction, or biblical scholarship of the faculty. The staff focus group with whom I consulted at the outset suggested that these were areas in which staff were not directly involved. For the most part, staff were not perceived as being directly involved with efforts at outreach and urban ministry. However, the staff seemed to concur with others about the importance of the chapel experience in building and sustaining a sense of community. Unlike the other respondents, staff saw chapel speakers as an important source for stimulating discussion on campus. They expressed concern about building a greater sense of community between staff and faculty.

Although the faculty, administrators, Board members, and students differed in their perception of community-building efforts (whether the campus environment is perceived to be more supportive of students or of faculty of diverse backgrounds), the staff felt that there has been a reasonable attempt to provide an environment that is welcoming to everyone and respectful to visitors.

Part II: Satisfaction with the Seminary's Climate

Consistent with other respondents, the staff felt a sense of satisfaction with their employment. They feel informed of changes occurring at the Seminary and that there are opportunities for information sharing. They also believe that the administration is committed to making the Seminary a diverse community and are content with the leadership provided on campus issues.

Like the other respondents, the staff believes that a reasonable effort has been expended in bringing persons of diverse backgrounds to campus for educational programs. However, they are not convinced that a reasonable effort has been extended for employment purposes. Unlike the faculty, of whom 76% stated that they had worked with or been supervised by a person of color, 63% of the staff acknowledged never having worked with or been supervised by a person of color. The majority of the staff felt that efforts to improve cultural sensitivity and inclusivity on campus were not misdirected activities, and that

perhaps professional workshops or training sessions regarding cross-cultural education might be helpful. Although 64% of the staff claimed not to have witnessed acts of intolerance on campus, 70% were not convinced that the campus environment, however affirming in general, was free of biases that inhibited communication across cultural groups. The staff perceived that their supervisors supported enhancing cross-cultural education.

Part III: How Do You Feel About Cross-Cultural Education?

Although well informed about issues on campus, the staff felt less well informed about cross-cultural education or its implications for the Seminary. This stands in contrast to the faculty and administrators/Board members, but is somewhat reflective of concerns expressed by the students. The staff also expressed some difficulty in being able to evaluate the goals and objectives of cross-cultural education and their relationship to the mission statement. Much like the students but unlike the faculty and administrators/Board members, the staff were divided over whether the current interest in diversity was "trendy."

The staff feel very much interested in the issue of cross-cultural education and it is viewed as important to what they do. They are convinced that the Seminary can be more diverse than it presently is. Like the faculty and administrators/Board members, they do not feel that practicum experiences or sensitivity-raising workshops/seminars are appropriate ways to address this issue.

Assessment Document #3: Written Comments

All respondents were offered the opportunity to comment on any item of concern raised by the survey or to address issues of diversity, campus climate supportive of diversity initiatives, and/or the potential for the cross-cultural education component of the new curriculum. Because a survey of this nature cannot address all issues of concern, this device is a mechanism by which minority as well as majority voices can be heard and acknowledged.

The responses received are summarized below. I have attempted to organize them by categories and by constituencies. The responses are interesting because in spite of the unanimity of responses received on several items in the survey (centrality of chapel to community building, teaching and learning, curriculum, diversity, inclusivity, etc.), there are apparent underlying tensions in this community. It could be argued that the concerns expressed are the views of a vocal minority (not everyone participated in the survey); it could equally be argued that this is just the tip of the iceberg. Between the responses to the items addressed in the survey and the solicited comments tendered by those wishing to be heard lies the challenge to developing community and community support for cross-cultural education at Luther Northwestern.

The responses from faculty, staff, administrators, and Board members are measured and restrained. They are direct, constructive, and generally formative in their approach to a very complex subject. The comments reflect a certain maturity of judgment tempered by the knowledge that there are no absolute truths and a lot of experimentation is necessary in developing a community and a curriculum necessary for insuring the successful training of seminarians for ministry.

The student responses are much more energized and reflective of the urgency that they feel about issues related to their training and the community of which they are active participants. They reflect the same generalized fears, concerns, attitudes, dispositions, frustrations, and intolerant beliefs that are operative in society at large. These concerns are real! They may not constitute obstacles to building the desired community. However, if ignored, these concerns could become an impediment to progress. One senses that these issues are not new to the Seminary. How best to approach each of them is the challenge.

Special criticism has been focused on the survey instrument. Students were particularly critical. Many viewed the survey as biased and representative of an agenda dictated by the administration. Others felt that it was awkwardly worded, too broad to be effective, not scientifically constructed with little perceived validity, another example of "political correctness," and the list goes on. This survey was complex because of the complexity of gleaning the information needed to assess the receptivity of the Seminary community to implementation of the cross-cultural component of the new curriculum and enhancing diversity on campus. To that end, the survey achieved its purpose. Useful information has been provided for the development of strategies. The effectiveness of the strategies employed might be a better measure of the ultimate utility of the survey instrument.

**Luther Northwestern Theological Seminary Questionnaire:
Summary of Written Responses to Campus Climate Survey**

Overview of Categorized Responses

- Problems with questionnaire: flawed questions, inconsistent response choices, too much in some items; obvious agenda dictates answers; waste of time, effort, money, and paper
- Chapel: too political, not theological enough; needs more diversity, expansion, experimentation, participation from students
- Faculty: too aloof from students; too critical of non-Lutherans
- Teaching: should expand methods (too much lecture), allow for discussion and alternate viewpoints
- Curriculum: frantic pace and schedule leaves no time for additional activities; particularly difficult for older, 2nd-career, off-campus students
- Training: need practical preparation for work in ministry (e.g., logic and rhetoric for dealing with diverse populations and current problems)
- Current prejudices: non-Lutherans not welcomed; GLBs not tolerated, or even considered sinners, by some
- Status quo: keep Lutheran Seminary as is (not non-denominational, secular, or university); people know of theological focus when they come (should go elsewhere if they don't like it rather than expect it to change)
- Caution: move slowly; don't force diversity; don't succumb to "political correctness" or "trends"; don't make all WASPs feel guilty (especially white males)
- Religion: Gospel itself, if followed, should provide enough diversity; focus on one-ness in Christ and commonality rather than on diversity
- Recommendations for continuing and increasing good diversity initiative: integrate and include in core (not as peripheral add-on); include more women and persons of color—particularly on faculty—and in class readings and library portraits; include other kinds of diversity (e.g., deaf, handicapped, class); include more American students of color; treat all students equally (e.g., providing loans and scholarships)

Administrators and Board Members

- Questionnaire flawed because slanted, some repetition, inconsistency; caused impatience in completing; waste of time and resources
- Divisive to focus so much on "diversity"; should create positive atmosphere that welcomes all; academic requirements should be the same for all; financial aid and scholarships should be equally available to all; "quota system" mentality an offense to the Gospel ("Holy Spirit should do our recruitment")

- Can accomplish much with diversity sensitivity-raising workshops and training directed at achieving fairness; students must be given enough diversity experience to understand the subject and be effective leaders in congregations (these diversity issues and problems are present in all our congregations)
- Should move very slowly in this area; recognize what our focus is--better to be excellent in an academic and Gospel field than to try to be all things to all people, which will only weaken us in the long run
- Whites will soon be "minority"; genuine Christian teachings shouldn't be threatening to anyone; seminary must be a leader in abolishing tradition of strong racism in Lutheran church
- After organizational actions, let matter "ferment" a bit; religion itself, properly taught and followed, should take care of diversity/humanity issue; cross-cultural familiarity should convince people of good will and common sense that "different" approaches have great values
- Participatory experience not the only, or even the best, means of developing cross-cultural understandings/sensitivities/skills; "experiential" and "intellectual" dimensions need to have closer balance; faculty need "retooling"--difficult, but probably supported by faculty; need cross-cultural education director; students must realize that diversity is mandated by Gospel (not just politically correct in these times)
- Diversity and cross-cultural education initiatives of ELCA as a whole, not just of the seminary; seminary's efforts so far both responsible and creative, but always room to grow; can expand outreach to international students, but not because they are easy to recruit to fill quotas

Faculty

- Much diversity effort is already good; questionnaire implied criticism; responding "no change" shouldn't be interpreted as complacency
- Change can't be legislated; it's not good just for the sake of change
- Some "thought police" are against change--they won't prevent it totally, but will keep the institution from being as good as it could be
- Recruit diverse faculty and students; incorporate diversity in core, not on fringes
- Connect cross-cultural and ecumenics
- Don't force change by outsiders (resistant to control and manipulation, but wants to seem receptive)
- Questionnaire may be an exercise in futility; hopes results will be worthwhile, but skeptical
- New academic calendar follows frantic pace of American society (not good)
- Shouldn't be so egotistical
- Cultural diversity is good initiative; sensitivity training will help until Seminary becomes more diverse
- Integrate diversity training rather than on margin (especially in Midwest)

Staff

- Not well enough informed to answer some questions
- Other institutions may have good ideas for how to do this; ask them
- Language barriers create suspicion
- Staff/administrators better than faculty at promoting mutual interdependence
- Chapel is still quite insular (not even acknowledging other Protestant traditions)
- Need more disability accommodations in buildings (e.g., library)
- Need more inclusive language (e.g., females) and more female professors; this is a good time for a necessary initiative
- Don't dilute Northern European culture as diversity initiative is developed
- People as people are even more important than for their ethnic diversity
- Objects to "white" instead of "European American" or "Caucasian" in racial categories; also doesn't allow for mixed races

- A non-Lutheran has improved ecumenical diversity, but can Lutheran ministers effect cultural diversity? Theological diversity not welcomed at Seminary
- Acceptance a problem especially for women

Students

- Wasted too much paper on this already [on reminder to return survey]
- Important effort--continue
- Do more with Native Americans
- Good to include women (more will come), but also need to include older, 2nd-career students, and gays and lesbians
- Important initiative NOW--implement by actions, not just words; international students provide only ethnic diversity; all whites are responsible for problems, not just those actively against diversity
- Bad survey, geared to previous agenda by questionnaire developers; trust to Gospel to take care of diversity
- Include international students more fully and learn from them; need more two-way communication; faculty need to learn about different learning styles of international students
- Already doing well (history won't change); don't change traditions while embracing diversity
- Flawed survey
- "Us" vs. "them" is bad presumption; what about mixed races? Individuals/people more important than groups/classes
- Change is overdue; past practices were bad (faculty humiliating students)
- Important initiative--continue and increase in future
- Follow Gospel, which mandates diversity; if someone objects, then they should rethink their "call"
- Important survey, but many questions hard to answer; need better treatment of GLBs
- Students too busy to participate in some diversity activities (or even to return survey!)
- Survey targets white males and assumes them to be racists; focus on Gospel and people as people rather than on particulate (racial) groups; hasn't seen any problems
- Vital difference between racist and anti-racist multiculturalism; address racism
- Important to embrace all individuals (don't shame Scandinavians)
- Don't force diversity, let it happen; focusing on diversity emphasizes differences and divides rather than uniting
- Pursue diversity but maintain "primary heritage"; provide more cross-cultural experiences outside classroom
- Important--continue effort
- Diverse people bring many gifts and strengths
- Hectic academic schedule; concentrate on Gospel first (that should take care of the rest); survey flawed (what's its purpose?)
- Important issues, but can't be forced; life will provide cross-cultural experiences
- Important task; in contest of Gospel, difficult
- Need more diversity; should do more with diversity assignments, not just lip service
- Seminary is place to "wallow in the faith"; secular institutions are place for diversity
- Need to focus more on 2nd-career students, who have less time for campus (diversity) activities
- Faculty and students are split, president is aloof; need more women and international faculty
- Good beginning, need more; diversity must be integrated, not separate; need more varied readings (not all German)
- Need more diverse content in classes, more diversity in library portraits
- Questionnaire slanted; seminary is already too diverse with non-Lutherans
- Scheduling problems--class schedule should state that fifth hour is needed for small groups
- Doing good job (can't cram down throats), but longer period of study abroad needed (best way to learn about diversity)
- Need more women faculty, more training to work with non-white congregations
- Useless, biased survey to support administration's agenda; wasteful

- Shouldn't apologize for being white, but work from it; this is a Lutheran seminary (not a Protestant university); more diversity needed, but must maintain historical context
- Flawed, biased, presumptive survey; white males attacked, accused; Gospel should be enough (but don't miniaturize it; it's broader than multiculturalism)
- Flawed, biased survey; helpless to try to answer
- More professor/student contact has been good
- Respond more to international students' questions and experiences
- Discuss theology as related to cross-cultures [2 said this]
- Biased questionnaire; this is a conservative Lutheran seminary, so if one comes here, one should accept that; don't accommodate to others so they can feel comfortable (refers to Gospel and Paul's epistles: focus on pleasing God, not men)
- Railing against homosexuals: they are sinners, so should be forgiven (and urged to sin no more); we should concentrate on preaching Gospel
- We should pursue diversity initiative because it's right, not because it's "politically correct"
- We should learn from other Christians as well as cross-culturally, and learn how to work together in Christian ministry; we should include more women and persons of color
- Interesting conflict between non-acceptance of gays and lesbians as pastors but acceptance of those who don't believe in resurrection of Christ! Good to have diverse faculty
- Faculty should not belittle other denominations; the only way to really understand another culture is to live there (and that's too expensive for many)
- Good effort so far, but should pay more attention to physically handicapped
- Need more diverse faculty (color, women, GLB); too much homophobia; chapel needs more student input; faculty/student split following chapel not good; catalog photos give falsely represent numbers of students of color on campus; too much ignoring or slamming of other Protestant denominations
- Some questions difficult to respond "agree/disagree"; don't hire faculty from other denominations (though ok as guest speakers)--keep Lutheran focus; global forums are good
- Some questions difficult; have "buddy" program with "natives" and others; some differences are good, but don't accuse/assume all whites are racist
- Need more professors of color
- Chapel should focus on religion, not on "false gods"; survey biased and flawed, ignores oppression of white males; don't concentrate on social causes at expense of religion
- Seminary is biased against gays; too insular
- Diversity training is important, but difficult to force on people
- Need more faculty and staff of color, most students too insular; don't confuse "indigenous" with "integrated"; must build relationships across cultural (and denominational) barriers, must do this work intentionally and with sincerity and sacrifice ("Being comfortable and homogenous is one of Satan's weapons against reconciliation."); diversity education must become active (global forums aren't enough)
- Woman student appreciates being accepted, but it's hard to participate in activities because she's a commuter, 2nd-career, working student
- Curriculum too hectic, not enough time for socializing or prayer
- New student is unaware of problems; be careful in forcing diversity
- Questionnaire unclear, no idea what was being asked
- Railing against homosexuality as a sin!
- General Lutheran bias against all who are different (often unconscious or at least unmalicious)
- Need more input from diverse groups and individuals as resources
- Can't isolate cross-cultural work to projects; all chapels should reflect diversity (not just special sessions); diversity is more than just culture (include varieties of opinion and views)
- Chapel not inclusive enough; can't legislate diversity; bring in more diverse faculty, then students, then administrators--then discuss; live faith communally rather than discussing individually
- Railing against PC "trends"; consider people as people rather than as representatives of groups (reverse discrimination)
- Don't go too fast; progress as have done so far (which is good)

- Questionnaire difficult; diversity valued, but lacking--awareness needs to be increased
- This is a seminary, not a divinity school; some questions hard to answer; chapel should be religious, not political; survey biased, doesn't reflect all opinions (not all worship the "new god of diversity")
- Purpose of survey? Is seminary considering cutting funds for cross-cultural studies, or expanding that area? Focus on seminary community or curriculum?
- Likes seminary, but wants more acceptance of questioning views
- Should focus on training Lutherans; don't dilute or diverge from purpose with ethnicity/diversity
- Too homophobic; need more diversity in library portraits; accept alternate viewpoints; professors shouldn't squelch other viewpoints
- Likes cross-cultural activities and contacts with international students (but be careful about tuition policies that favor them unduly)
- Hypocritical to include others where Lutheran environment and doctrine are so overpowering
- Involve students more in international mission activities and local outreach; expand core curriculum studies; expand cultural and ecumenical diversity for better understanding
- Good new emphasis, but be sure diversity is at the core, and genuine; focus on individuals as persons rather than as representatives of groups
- Provide training in logic and rhetoric to deal with current issues
- Lutheran seminary first; don't adopt diversity for the sake of diversity; be careful not to end up doing nothing well if can't do everything
- Amount of diversity sharing in classrooms varies; no strong ecumenical movement on campus
- Begin with mission, let diversity come from there; recognize importance of class differences too
- Don't force-feed diversity
- Hectic schedule doesn't leave enough time for cross-cultural activities
- Don't deny Lutheran heritage; don't coddle internationals and non-Lutherans financially
- Be aware of problems, but careful about how much is too much; don't include non-Christians at seminary
- Encourage diversity internships for seniors; broaden worship--experiment!
- Cross-cultural experiences are too expensive; help prepare students to deal with diverse people when they enter the ministry
- Involve faculty as well as students in cross-cultural experiences
- Inclusivity is crucial; diversity is to be celebrated!
- Hectic schedule allows no time for non-credit workshops; use other teaching methods besides lectures; purposes of instruction?--should do job and skill task analysis for a pastor
- Troubled by lack of financial support from congregations; hire more diverse faculty (to show commitment); solicit money from small communities in neighboring states for internship programs
- Fruitless effort--too little time now, and too expensive [very cynical]
- Good courses; tune pianos and organs more often; too little time to talk with friends; non-Lutherans feel like outsiders
- Concern that diversity efforts may dilute/conflict with Lutheranism
- Too hectic schedule for older students; should concentrate on God's work
- Good efforts: more American students of color, more visible (financial) support for women's programs--to be encouraged
- Not enough time for off-campus students to participate in diversity activities; negative attitude on campus concerning GLBs
- Need more women and persons of color on faculty; use other than lecture methods (to provide opportunities for student discussion; use more inclusive liturgy; include wider group for community building (e.g., rape survivors, those with AIDS, etc.); cross-cultural initiative must become integrated part of all syllabi; women were treated differently in different questions on survey
- Include community people in chapel; add Africal-American (Muslim) scholarship students
- Too little time to add anything to curriculum; don't sacrifice Lutheran identity for diversity
- Survey was waste of money to answer obvious question (that diversity is important)
- Diversity important, but avoid labels; beware of losing focus on one-ness in Christ

- "Politically correct" focus should stem from focus on Christ; homosexuals don't deserve same kind of equality recognition as other groups (e.g., Blacks, women)
- Chapel needs more diversity--both people and liturgy
- Schedule makes it difficult for commuters to fit in core classes; fear and "paranoia talk" on campus are troubling
- Going too far with racial and gender "thing"; don't be like the "cultural wasteland of the U of M"
- Was discriminated against, had bad experience at seminary; must instill need for diversity in both faculty and staff (more diverse ministers can reach more people)
- Chapels need improvement (those involving different cultures have been the best); staff chaplain not in touch with people
- #97 flawed--set up to encourage failure, limits usefulness of survey
- Poorly developed questionnaire, several questions flawed; don't recruit non-Lutherans; some people of color on campus are still "midwest WASPs"; don't accept homosexuals; don't encourage non-Lutheran values; send students out for internships instead of indoctrinating them with "political correctness"
- Flawed responses; forced community doesn't work; need more community between faculty and students (staff are fine)
- Need cross-cultural encounters, but too little time in schedule; diverse people are not really welcomed; slow, difficult process, but some progress being made
- Some progress--keep it up
- Would welcome discussion of diversity-necessity; came to LNTS for Lutheran theological training--"not because of diversity issues"
- Diversity is inherent in Gospel; don't force change; leave old curriculum alone!
- Survey questions steered responses to pre-determined end; new directions are negative; must know selves as Lutherans first
- Wants diversity training with respect to worship and handling inner-city problems; need to increase diversity
- Gaps between faculty and students; too little time to learn everything and also increase diversity; should include other groups (e.g., deaf)
- Don't include sexual orientation with racial/ethnic/gender diversity
- Define diversity goals clearly, be sure they're not artificial
- Awkward survey, cumbersome wording; "seminary has great potential for becoming more diverse and should continue to strive for it in faculty, students, and experience"
- "Will concentrating on diversity rather than what we have in common continue to keep us seperated[sic]?"
- Gospel is enough; trust in genuineness of others
- Invalid survey (too much in too many questions); gender and race are different kinds of diversity
- Not enough attention paid to white males [two women said this]
- Take care in effecting change; maintain seminary's traditional grace
- Must require diversity if committed to it; most attention has been paid to cultural and other kinds of diversity rather than ecumenical/theological diversity
- Individuals should work with the poor to get diversity experience
- Some badly worded questions; fear of losing identity if exposure to diversity is bad--obligated to become aware because we are diverse; faculty shouldn't belittle non-Lutherans
- Bad teaching (all lecture); diversity initiative probably futile exercise at Lutheran seminary [very sarcastic tone]
- Cross-cultural development good, but include more kinds of diversity (values), and emphasize commonality; don't attack white males or make them feel guilty; stress one-ness in Christ
- Need more faculty of color and women; need more recognition of women (and other diversities) instead of emphasizing (or gearing to) Lutheran white males in today's world