

Do Organizational Structures and Strategies Increase Faculty Diversity? A Cultural Analysis

WILLIAM G. TIERNEY & MARGARET W. SALLEE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

We would like to thank Bryan Brayboy, Marybeth Gasman, Roberto Ibarra, Vince Lechuga, Christine Stanley, Caroline Turner and the anonymous reviewers of *American Academic* for helpful feedback on a draft of this article.

Despite efforts at the federal, state, and institutional levels over the past several decades, the number of faculty of color at universities remains unrepresentative of the general population. In 1992, for example, African Americans accounted for 4.9 percent of all faculty. Twelve years later, in 2004, they accounted for 5.9 percent of all faculty.¹ Many institutions have implemented a variety of measures to try to increase the representation of faculty of color on their campuses. However, most actions, such as hiring a chief diversity officer or incorporating a focus on diversity into the institutional mission statement, are mere structural changes and do little to transform the institutional culture. Despite some isolated successes, the data indicate that progress has been slow.

In this article, we examine the recruitment and retention practices of underrepresented faculty of color at 18 postsecondary institutions across the United States. We focus specifically on African American and Latino² faculty, as these two groups comprise the largest populations of people of color in the United States, yet remain severely underrepresented in academe. In general, one of two stances has been taken with regard to this underrepresentation. On the one hand, some will argue that there are simply not enough minority faculty in the labor pool; this argument assumes that the lack of diversity on a campus is essentially a waiting game—at some point, enough people of color will enter the pool and the problem

will be resolved. On the other hand, some suggest that a particular structural change is necessary; they believe, for example, that if an institution hires a chief diversity officer, significant strides will be made toward achieving equity.

Both assumptions have some validity. A review of graduate students in the pipeline, especially in engineering and the sciences, underscores that more students of color are needed to increase the size of the labor pool. Hiring a chief diversity officer may provide the impetus and leadership to increase diversity on campus. However, in this article, we take issue with both assumptions and instead suggest that improving diversity on campus is largely a cultural issue that necessitates a commitment by multiple constituencies over a sustained period of time. We think of culture as the shared assumptions and interpretations of an organization's constituents that are formed over a long period of time.³ Rather than a singular structural act—hiring a diversity officer—a cultural response assumes that organizational effectiveness occurs through a myriad of actions on a daily and long-term basis. In this light, simply waiting until the labor pool increases, or arguing that a structural or strategic change is a magic bullet, is insufficient.

We begin with a review of the literature, exploring the various barriers that institutions face in recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty, and discuss strategies that institutions have adopted to combat this deficit. We provide data from the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF), which indicate that across institutional types and disciplines, White males continue to dominate postsecondary faculties. We then consider the organizational characteristics and practices of 18 institutions that have had varying degrees of success in recruiting and retaining faculty of color. We ask what accounts for different rates of success in these institutions. The majority of the institutions have implemented a series of initiatives to promote diversity on campus; some have seen an increase in faculty of color, whereas others have not. As we will highlight, among the institutions we have analyzed, no strategy has emerged as the best to improve diversity. Accordingly, we suggest that increasing diversity on a campus is based less on a structural response, such as creating a particular office or expecting leadership from a particular individual—often a college president—and is more about organizational culture that promotes diversity over a sustained period of time.

Recruiting and Retaining a Diverse Faculty

Colleges and universities trying to diversify their campuses face two obvious, and related, challenges. First, administrators and faculty must contend with recruiting faculty of color to the campus. The second task is to ensure that faculty stay and prosper. Although individuals acknowledge that recruitment and retention are key activities, more often than not they appear unrelated on many campuses. Accordingly, we first review the challenges that institutions face in recruiting and retaining faculty of color. We then discuss a variety of strategies that institutions have implemented in efforts to overcome these obstacles.

Challenges in Recruitment

As noted, faculty of color represent a small percentage of those employed in universities. As several scholars suggest,⁴ this low percentage is due in part to similarly low numbers of African Americans and Latinos in doctoral programs. Often referred to as a “pipeline problem,” universities are simply not producing enough graduates of color to meet the needs of campuses. However, many Ph.D.s of color choose to avoid the isolation that often accompanies being one of the few faculty of color on campus and opt for careers outside academe, which are frequently better compensated and friendlier to diverse populations.⁵ As we will suggest, such a perception is a cultural interpretation more than a structural problem. The result, however, is that those in universities will argue that they are left with an even smaller pool of candidates from which to choose.

Institutions cannot point to a low number of candidates as the simple causal explanation for a lack of diversity. The recruitment process itself is fraught with difficulties. Recruitment is frequently a highly decentralized process, occurring primarily at the department level.⁶ As a result, while one department may have a goal of increasing faculty diversity, the department down the hall may have no interest in such an undertaking. In addition, many faculty searches are conducted with curricular needs in mind. Departments seek to hire faculty who can teach particular courses. If a department simply hires faculty to replace departing professors, the result is replication, rather than transformation.⁷ Organizational cultures, however, are dynamic—they change constantly and are reinterpreted based on the perceptions of the membership. If a culture simply seeks to replicate itself, then the recruitment of new members is made that much more difficult. In the 21st century, institutions also have to account for more than just the potential faculty candidate. Many individuals are part of dual-career couples

who seek employment for their partners as a stipulation of hire.⁸ Smaller institutions or those in rural areas may not always have the resources to be able to accommodate both partners, thereby losing a potential hire.

Challenges in Retention

Hiring faculty of color is only half of the challenge. Keeping them has proven to be difficult. For example, in their study of 28 colleges and universities in California, Alma Clayton-Pedersen and her colleagues (2007) found that 58 percent of new underrepresented minority faculty hires served to replace departing faculty of color. In other words, only two out of five new faculty of color increased the racial diversity of their campuses. What accounts for the high departure rates of faculty of color? Some⁹ argue that faculty of color may find the university to have a “chilly climate,” or an environment that punishes those who deviate from the norm. Those who do not conform may be punished through social isolation, overt and covert bias, and, for some, denial of tenure.¹⁰ Many faculty also point to the challenges of being among the few faculty of color on their campuses. Not only do some feel isolated as a result of being the sole face of color in an otherwise White department, but many also feel as if they are under a spotlight as representatives of their race.¹¹ Again, such obstacles to retaining faculty of color highlight how individuals perceive the culture of their organization. In addition, many faculty of color often find themselves serving on campus committees and fulfilling service requirements that are devalued in the tenure process. Due to these conditions, many faculty of color leave their campuses in search of friendlier environments.

One particular challenge for any campus is to recognize that recruitment and retention are linked activities. An individual starts becoming socialized to an institution as soon as he or she sets foot on campus, if not before, via Web sites and other informational materials. As we elaborate below, far too often institutions look at hiring as an instrumental activity and do not have it embedded into the cultural fabric of the institution. An institution that is successful in recruiting and retaining faculty of color is one that puts less emphasis on a cookbook of actions and more emphasis on incorporating a comprehensive approach that seeks to reorient the organization’s culture. In other words, attracting and retaining faculty of color depends less on an instrumental activity and more on the myriad of activities necessary to change the culture of the organization.

Strategies to Increase Recruitment and Retention

In general, campuses have employed four primary strategies to diversify the faculty based on their assumptions on what makes a difference.

Discourse as a strategy. Some argue that institutional documents should reflect a commitment to diversity. In particular, the institutional mission statement should make explicit mention of diversity.¹² From this perspective, the mission statement is not merely a rhetorical device; rather, it serves to direct the actions of an institution at all levels. As Clayton-Pedersen and colleagues (2007) found, including diversity in the mission statement facilitates its implementation:

When an institution's mission [was] explicitly connected to and reinforced a comprehensive approach to diversity, campus constituents were more likely to view diversity as part of the overall educational enterprise and less likely to see it strictly in terms of numbers of students, faculty, and staff or a narrow set of programs. (p. 46)

Integrating diversity into the mission statement may transform diversity efforts from an emphasis on increasing numbers of people of color to a focus on creating an inclusive campus culture.

Leadership as a strategy. Larry Rowley, Sylvia Hurtado, and Luis Ponjuan (2002) found that strong institutional leadership is more important than the presence of diversity in a mission statement. From this perspective, although mission statements are important, what matters is the effectiveness of those charged with putting plans into action. Presidents and provosts, many argue, play a critical role in determining the importance of efforts to diversify the faculty.¹³ As Damon Williams, Joseph Berger, and Shederick McClendon (2005) suggest, senior administrators set the tone for communicating the importance of diversity and attracting the necessary resources to implement diversity action plans. Marjorie Knowles and Bernard Harleston (1997) found in their study of 11 research universities that institutions that were most successful in diversifying the faculty were those whose leaders had stressed a commitment to diversity and had taken specific actions to demonstrate this commitment. In other words, it is not enough for presidents to verbalize their commitment to diversity; they must act upon their commitment. In addition to the support of senior leaders,

diversity efforts also depend on the support of deans and department chairs.¹⁴ Although presidents may promote diversity as a value of the institution, they rely on the support of midlevel administrators to translate rhetoric into action.

Administrative positions as a strategy. An increasing number of institutions have created a senior leadership position to address diversity on campus. Often referred to as chief diversity officers (CDOs), these positions range from executive level appointments at the provost or vice president level to midlevel staff members who direct campus centers on diversity. In general, these administrators address a range of issues, including how to improve search processes, how diversity might be highlighted on campus, and what sorts of activities are needed to aid underrepresented students, staff and faculty. However, as Williams, Berger, and McClendon (2005) caution, to bring about transformational change, the chief diversity officer must be empowered to act upon a range of initiatives to help create a campus that is welcoming for all. Although any chief diversity officer promotes diversity on campus, those in executive level positions usually have access to greater influence for two reasons. First, by creating a senior-level administrative position, the president sends a message that diversity is of high concern to the campus community. Second, the senior-level chief diversity officer presumably has direct access to the president and provost, and can serve to infuse diversity into discussions about a range of topics, from budget allocations to long-range planning.¹⁵ The effectiveness of a CDO often depends on an institution's willingness to change. For example, a CDO might implement training for faculty search committees, but if faculty or other senior-level administrators are resistant to altering current practices, such workshops will do little to change the campus culture.

Incentives as a strategy. Many institutions offer a fund for departments to hire underrepresented faculty, such as women in the sciences or faculty of color.¹⁶ Knowles and Harleston (1997) describe one institution that provides full support for faculty of color during the entire pretenure period. For some departments, these funds provide a means for extending job offers to faculty of color. Although these funds are a critical way to increase diversity on campus, some view "diversity hires" as less qualified than others for faculty positions. While institutions might use these incentives to increase the representation of faculty of color, they need to also take steps to dispel such myths, which ultimately can create a hostile climate for all faculty of color.

Some institutions also use diversity indicators in their job descriptions to attract a more diverse applicant pool.¹⁷ For example, a department might advertise for candidates with experience working with diverse groups of students, which might draw a different type of applicant than other searches. Finally, some institutions also mentor current graduate students of color with the goal of recruiting them to faculty positions.¹⁸ In their study of faculty searches at three Association of American Universities (AAU) institutions over a three-year period, Daryl Smith and colleagues (2004) found that 71 percent of underrepresented faculty of color were hired either due to a special hiring intervention or because of a diversity indicator in the job description. Without these interventions, the authors suggest, the number of faculty of color in higher education would be even lower.

Although each of the strategies identified above are offered as ways to increase the representation of faculty of color on campuses, the evidence does not establish that any one practice has been particularly effective, or has been more effective than another strategy. Our point here is not that a certain strategy is useless, but that too often a campus adopts one strategy with the hope that a singular action will succeed. Instead, we suggest that to improve diversity on campus requires more than a singular strategy. The problem is not that a structural part of the organization is missing or not functioning; instead, the challenge is that the organization's culture is not geared toward comprehensive reform and reinterpretation. Thus, rather than simply implementing piecemeal programs, institutions need to develop a comprehensive approach and engage in constant evaluation to determine the success of their efforts.¹⁹

National Trends: An Overview of the NSOPF Data

We utilize the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF) data from 1999 and 2004 to provide a portrait of the faculty at colleges and universities in the United States. The NSOPF 2004 is based on a sample of 1,080 public and private nonprofit institutions, and includes a sample of 35,000 instructional faculty and staff. We used the NSOPF categories to compare the racial diversity across a variety of institutional types and disciplines. As the data indicate, there has been some progress, albeit limited, in efforts to diversify the faculty.

Racial Diversity by Institutional Type

There are approximately 630,000 full-time faculty members across all institutions in the United States. Of these, approximately 506,000 (or 80.3 percent)

are White; 36,000 (5.8 percent) are African American; 21,000 (3.4 percent) are Latino; 58,000 (9.2 percent) are Asian American, and 8,000 (1.2 percent) are American Indian. As indicated in Table 1, Whites are the majority across all institutions, accounting for 78.7 percent of the faculty at doctoral-granting institutions, 80.5 percent at master's-granting institutions, 85.7 percent at baccalaureate-granting institutions, and 80.7 percent at two-year institutions. Though Asian Americans are the next highest-represented racial group, they tend to be concentrated in doctoral-granting institutions. Asian Americans account for 12.9 percent of all faculty at doctoral-granting institutions, but only 4.4 percent of faculty at two-year colleges. Asian Americans made robust gains between 1999 and 2004, increasing their representation in the professoriate by 50 percent.²⁰

Together, American Indians, African Americans and Latinos account for just 10.4 percent of full-time faculty across all institutional types. Unlike Asian Americans, members of all three groups are more likely to teach at less prestigious institutions. For example, 4.4 percent of the faculty at doctoral-granting institutions are African American, but 6.9 percent and 7.4 percent of faculty at baccalaureate-granting institutions and community colleges, respectively, are African American. Similarly, 3 percent of faculty at doctoral-granting institutions, but 5.7 percent of faculty at community colleges, are Latino. Finally, the percentage of full-time African American and Latino faculty increased little between 1999 and 2004. African American representation went from 5.2 percent to 5.8 percent, while Latino representation increased by one-tenth of one percentage point, from 3.3 percent to 3.4 percent. Although one might argue that five years is not enough time to see appreciable change, the significant gains made by Asian Americans during the same period refute that argument. Is such a microscopic increase for Latinos and African Americans sufficient? Our response is that—although we do not make claims that specific percentages need to be achieved each year, or even that proportional representation needs to be achieved—such a small increase shortchanges the academy if diversity is important. Indeed, if the rate of change were to stay the same for Latino faculty and the Asian/Pacific Islander faculty were to hold constant, in 50 years Latinos would still make up fewer than half that of their Asian/Pacific Islander faculty counterparts.

Table 1: Racial and Ethnic Diversity of Full-Time Faculty by Institutional Type

	American Indian (%)	Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	African American (%)	Latino (%)	White (%)
2004					
All Institutions	1.2	9.2	5.8	3.4	80.3
Doctoral-Granting	1.0	12.9	4.4	3.0	78.7
Masters-Granting	1.5	7.0	7.8	3.2	80.5
Baccalaureate-Granting	1.2	4.1	6.9	2.2	85.7
Associates-Granting	1.7	4.4	7.4	5.7	80.7
1999					
All Institutions	0.7	6.4	5.2	3.3	84.5
Doctoral-Granting	0.7	8.8	3.8	3.4	83.4
Masters-Granting	0.5	5.0	5.9	2.8	85.8
Baccalaureate-Granting	1.5	3.1	8.3	2.0	85.1
Associates-Granting	0.8	3.6	6.6	4.8	84.3

Racial Diversity by Select Disciplines

Without exception, Whites compose the majority of faculty in all disciplines, from a low of 70.9 percent of faculty in engineering, to a high of 87.8 percent of faculty in agriculture and home economics. Although Asian Americans compose 9.2 percent of faculty across disciplines, they account for 20.1 percent of faculty within engineering and 14.6 percent of faculty in the natural sciences. African Americans are most highly represented in the social sciences and education, comprising 8 percent of the faculty in each discipline. Latinos comprise 3.4 percent of faculty in all disciplines, but have a significantly greater presence in education (4.7 percent) and the humanities (5.1 percent). American Indians' representation across disciplines ranges from a low of 0.7 percent in the natural sciences to a high of 2 percent in education.

Although African Americans and Latinos continue to be underrepresented across disciplines, both groups made gains in a few areas between 1999 and 2004. For example, African American representation in engineering increased from 2.2 per-

cent of all faculty in 1999 to 5.6 percent of all faculty in 2004. Similarly, Latinos' numbers grew in the social sciences, going from 2.9 percent in 1999 to 4.2 percent in 2004. However, these few successes mask shortages in other disciplines in which the percentage of African American and Latino faculty actually decreased, such as education for African Americans and engineering for Latinos.

Table 2: Racial and Ethnic Diversity of Full-Time Faculty by Discipline

	American Indian (%)	Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	African American (%)	Latino (%)	White (%)
2004					
All programs	1.2	9.2	5.8	3.4	80.3
Agriculture/home econ	1.0	6.4	2.3	2.5	87.8
Business	1.4	12.2	4.7	2.3	79.5
Education	2.0	4.9	8.0	4.7	80.5
Engineering	0.8	20.1	5.6	2.6	70.9
Fine arts	1.0	3.2	6.5	3.1	86.4
Health sciences	1.5	10.7	5.2	2.9	79.7
Humanities	1.3	5.8	5.5	5.1	82.3
Natural sciences	0.7	14.6	4.3	2.9	77.6
Social sciences	1.3	5.4	8.0	4.2	81.1
All other fields	1.4	4.1	8.0	3.2	83.3
1999					
All programs	0.7	6.4	5.2	3.3	84.5
Agriculture/home econ	0.9	3.8	4.3	1.5	89.6
Business	1.2	5.3	5.3	1.7	86.5
Education	0.8	3.6	8.9	3.4	83.4
Engineering	0.9	16.3	2.2	4.0	76.6
Fine arts	0.6	2.3	6.6	1.1	89.3
Health sciences	0.6	7.1	4.5	3.3	84.5
Humanities	0.4	4.6	4.7	6.5	83.8
Natural sciences	0.3	9.1	3.2	2.9	84.5
Social sciences	1.2	4.9	6.7	2.9	84.3
All other fields	0.9	3.7	6.5	2.5	86.4

Racial Diversity by Faculty Rank

Although Whites are overrepresented in the rank of full professor, Table 3 illustrates that changes are possible. In 2004, African Americans accounted for just 5.8 percent of all faculty, but 7.1 percent of assistant professors. Similarly, though Latinos accounted for only 3.4 percent of the total faculty, they accounted for 4.1 percent of assistant professors. Clearly, percentages are increasing in part due to the hiring of junior faculty. However, comparing the 2004 percentages with the 1999 percentages offers a slightly different story. In 1999, African Americans accounted for 5.2 percent of all faculty, 7.4 percent of all assistant professors, and 5.4 percent of all associate professors. One would expect, then, that five years later the percentage of associate professors would have increased considerably, as the junior faculty earned tenure. Yet, African Americans only accounted for 5.7 percent of all associate professors in 2004, an increase of just 0.3 percent. Translating these percentages into numbers, there were 8,431 African American assistant professors in 1999 and 7,204 African American associate professors in 2004. So, while the percentage of faculty who are African American faculty increased, their actual representation in the labor pool decreased. The trends are similar for Latinos. In contrast, the percentage of Asian American associate professors increased by 66 percent in five years.

The data suggest two possibilities. First, institutions are failing to create climates that are hospitable to African American and Latino faculty. Alternately, successful faculty from both groups may be recruited into other administrative positions on campus. National datasets cannot account for this shift, making it appear that institutions are losing faculty of color. Whether or not universities are managing to keep African Americans and Latinos on campus, the data make one thing clear: The representation of both racial and ethnic groups in the faculty is not growing to the degree it should. Although some may argue that a precise relationship of racial representation in the general population to academe ought not to be a goal, few will argue that too many faculty of color exist in the academy. While the goal of a color-blind society and academy may be admirable, such a goal would be absurd, obviously, if the academy were only populated by White citizens. Sufficient progress toward a goal can be difficult to determine. However, if, for example, a school of engineering had one African American faculty member ten years ago and today claims it has “doubled” the number of faculty of color, few would argue that such progress is sufficient.

From this perspective, the challenge is to see how change has occurred over time and how that change has increased the actual number and percentage of faculty of color in all ranks of the institution.

Table 3: Racial and Ethnic Diversity of Full-Time Faculty, by Rank

	American Indian (%)	Asian/Pacific Islander (%)	African American (%)	Latino (%)	White (%)
2004					
All faculty	1.2	9.2	5.8	3.4	80.3
Full professor	1.0	6.9	3.9	2.5	85.8
Associate professor	1.3	10.0	5.7	2.9	80.1
Assistant professor	1.2	13.0	7.1	4.1	74.6
Instructor/lecturer	1.5	6.3	7.9	4.7	79.7
Other	1.3	9.8	6.4	3.9	78.5
1999					
All faculty	0.7	6.4	5.2	3.3	84.5
Full professor	0.4	4.8	2.9	2.7	89.2
Associate professor	0.6	6.6	5.4	2.7	84.7
Assistant professor	0.8	9.3	7.4	3.5	79.1
Instructor/lecturer	1.1	4.6	5.6	4.9	83.8
Other	0.9	8.3	6.3	4.4	80.1

Examining Institutional Structures and Practices

Though the national data suggest that African American and Latino faculty are underrepresented across institutional types, some universities are doing better than others in recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty. In this section, we compare the policies and practices of 18 institutions with varying success in maintaining a diverse faculty. We begin by providing an overview of the institutions, including the manner in which we selected and analyzed them. We then compare the institutions with regard to the four strategies discussed above; we utilize these strategies as indicators because the institutions have called on them as ways to increase the representation of faculty of color on their campus.

Selecting the Institutions

The United States has over 4,000 postsecondary institutions. Although significant differences exist with regard to issues such as endowment income, disciplinary focus, public control, and the like, the institutions are more similar than different with regard to the underrepresentation of faculty of color. If the challenge of hiring more faculty of color were simply an issue of institutional wealth or public/private control, one might expect one type of institution to have an ample supply of minority faculty and their counterparts to be lacking. However, that is not the case. We focus here on 18 research universities. We have divided the institutions into two categories. Institutions in the first category are members of the Association of American Universities (AAU), an elite, invitation-only organization of 62 research universities. The second group of universities is composed of non-AAU members. All 18 universities fit the Carnegie classification of research-extensive universities. We focus on AAU and non-AAU institutions insofar as institutions in each category have successes and challenges in recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty.

We utilized the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) to analyze the percentage of Latino and African American faculty at all of the research-extensive institutions. We eliminated institutions with a special academic focus (e.g., Teachers College at Columbia University) and those geared toward a special population (e.g., Howard University).²¹ We then matched institutions by institutional control (public versus private); location (large city, small city and town); and approximate ranking of various graduate programs, such as engineering, law, and business. All full-time faculty (tenure-line and nontenure-line) are included in the statistics for each campus. Following Tables 4 and 5, we discuss these findings in greater detail.

With a high of 21 percent, Florida International University is significantly more diverse than any of the other institutions. The University of New Mexico is the second most diverse institution with 11 percent of its faculty African American or Latino. Neither institution belongs to the AAU. Indeed, AAU institutions tend to be less diverse than their non-AAU counterparts. Although Columbia, Emory, and Syracuse have faculties in which 10 percent are Latino or African American, the University of Florida and Texas A&M round off the top five with only 9 percent and 7 percent, respectively. Yet, these are the five AAU institutions with the greatest institutional diversity. While the “highs” of the non-AAU institutions are

higher, the “lows” of the AAU institutions are lower. Lows in the AAU category range from 2 percent to 4 percent.

Table 4: Percentage of African American and Latino Faculty at AAU Institutions

Institution	Control	% African American and Latino	Location
Institutions with High Diversity			
Columbia University	Private	10%	New York City
Emory University	Private	10%	Atlanta
Syracuse University	Private	10%	Syracuse, N.Y.
University of Florida	Public	9%	Gainesville, Fla.
Texas A & M	Public	7%	College Station, Texas
Institutions with Low Diversity			
University of Pennsylvania	Private	4%	Philadelphia
Washington University in St. Louis	Private	4%	St. Louis
University of Rochester	Private	2%	Rochester, N.Y.
University of Minnesota-Twin Cities	Public	4%	Minneapolis/St. Paul
University of Virginia	Public	4%	Charlottesville, Va.

Table 5: Percentage of African American and Latino Faculty at Non-AAU Institutions

Institution	Control	% African American and Latino	Location
Institutions with High Diversity			
Florida International University	Public	21%	Miami
University of New Mexico	Public	11%	Albuquerque, N.M.
UC Santa Cruz	Public	10%	Santa Cruz, Calif.
Fordham University	Private	10%	New York City
Institutions with Low Diversity			
Louisiana State University	Public	5%	Baton Rouge, La.
University of Southern Mississippi	Public	5%	Hattiesburg, Miss.
Oregon State University	Public	3%	Corvallis, Ore.
Boston University	Private	4%	Boston
University of Virginia	Public	4%	Charlottesville, Va.

Although these tables show disparities among comparable institutions, we offer them with four caveats. First, there are only a few percentage points separating the majority of the high and low institutions. For example, though we classify Texas A&M as one of the most diverse AAU institutions, it is only three percentage points higher than four of the five less diverse AAU institutions. Clearly, all institutions have much work to do to increase diversity on their campuses. Second, the statistics are not disaggregated by rank. However, if they mirror national data, African Americans and Latinos are primarily concentrated at the assistant professor level with decreasing representation through associate and full professorship. Such a drainage suggests that while institutions may excel at recruiting faculty, they have yet to find a way to retain them.

Third, although some of the institutions have high percentages, one racial or ethnic group may dominate over all others. While the University of New Mexico is the second most diverse institution across both tables at 11 percent, for example, only 2 percent are African American faculty. Similarly, at Florida International University, 14 percent of faculty are Latino while 7 percent are African American. Presumably, this institution draws from Miami's large Latino population to increase its representation of people of color.

However, even those institutions with a high percentage of faculty of color are not always representative of the surrounding area. For example, in Albuquerque, 11 percent of the University of New Mexico's faculty are Latino or African American. Yet, according to the 2000 U.S. Census, 40 percent of the city's residents were Latino. In contrast, although African Americans and Latinos only compose 3 percent of the Oregon State faculty, 7 percent of the residents of Corvallis, Ore., come from these two groups. While we acknowledge that local demographics matter, and can either aid or limit an institution's ability to recruit, the majority of these 18 institutions have implemented a variety of programs in an effort to bolster the numbers of underrepresented faculty on their campuses.

An Overview of Institutional Structures and Practices

After selecting these 18 institutions for comparison, we used a combination of document analysis and interviews with key informants to understand how they try to recruit and retain faculty of color. Interviews focused on policies and practices at each institution, along with perceptions of strengths and weaknesses in recruitment and retention efforts. As we now discuss, we found that the manner

in which the various institutions function parallels the strategies we outlined in the previous section.

Discourse makes a difference (at some institutions). Though less than half of the institutions have an executive-level chief diversity officer, many more incorporate diversity as an institutional goal in their mission statements. Eleven universities (seven AAU institutions and four non-AAU institutions) outline diversity as an explicit goal in their mission statements. Of these eleven, we categorized six as representative of high levels of diversity and five as representative of low levels of diversity. For example, Syracuse University states that the institution's vision is "to be a university whose five core values of quality, caring, diversity, innovation and service are pervasive and evident among all its members"²²

Four institutions have not stopped at incorporating diversity into their mission statements. Rather, they have created explicit diversity statements, which outline their commitment to and plans to incorporate diversity into their communities. Texas A&M offers a plan with six core areas for action, including improving the campus climate, expanding mentoring and retention programs, and developing more partnerships with the community. While mission statements serve as a guide for institutional action, these diversity plans suggest a deeper level of commitment. It should be noted that of the four institutions, three belong to the AAU. In addition, only two of the four institutions are categorized as having high levels of diversity.

The thirteen institutions above are those that incorporated diversity into their mission statements or other explicit action plans. Two institutions' mission statements made no explicit mention of diversity. In addition, we could not find either a mission or a diversity statement for three institutions on their Web sites. Accordingly, we cannot comment on whether these mission statements reflect a commitment to diversity. If a mission statement is to signal an institution's commitment to incorporating people of color into the campus community, one assumes that such information would be readily accessible to the public.

People make a difference (at some institutions). Across institutions, individuals repeatedly spoke of decentralization as a challenge to increasing the diversity of faculty. Many suggested that the fact that their campuses are highly decentralized

slows down efforts to diversify. The colleges and professional schools have a history of shaping their unit's direction without significant interference from central administration. At one institution with a low percentage of faculty of color, there is no central directive from the president's office about the importance of diversity. However, several of the professional schools have been successful in promoting diversity as a core value. Insofar as the efforts are personality-driven and not institutionalized, they may cease to be important once leadership changes. Nevertheless, although some suggested that a decentralized campus might pose greater challenges for institutions, we found that other decentralized campuses are among those with high percentages of faculty of color.

Similarly, some institutions have had a history of vigorous leadership with regard to diversity by their president and others have not. Some institutions, for example, have had presidents who speak of diversity a great deal in their communications to the campus community and others do not. The same point can be made with provosts and deans. Individuals at eight institutions praised their presidents for their support of diversity efforts. Five of these institutions belonged to the AAU. Three institutions had high levels of faculty of color while five did not. However, at some institutions, the president appeared to be working alone; other members of the campus community were described as disinterested in diversity efforts. Although the commitment of leaders is important, successful campuses also have buy-in from faculty. At one of the institutions with high percentages of faculty of color, the push for diversity came not from the administration, but from faculty members who organized efforts to establish an executive-level diversity position. Such a history has paved the way for an array of programs and policies aimed at creating a diverse campus. Though a president may actively promote diversity as a core institutional value, faculty and staff play a critical role in putting that value into action.

Administrative positions make a difference (at some institutions). Seven of the 18 institutions (Columbia, Emory, Texas A&M, University of Rochester, University of Minnesota, University of Virginia, and Louisiana State University) have vice provosts or vice presidents for diversity. Of these seven institutions, six of them belong to the AAU. Only three of these seven institutions have high percentages of faculty of color on campus. While many of the campuses have offices dedicated to affirmative action, two other institutions have special positions dedicated to promoting faculty diversity. Washington University in St. Louis has a special assistant to the chancellor for diversity initiatives, while

Oregon State University has a Director of Community and Diversity, who is a part of the president's cabinet. Out of these nine institutions, only three have more than 7 percent of faculty of color on campus. Although the literature suggests that the presence of a chief diversity officer reflects an institution's commitment to diversity, the findings suggest such an office is not sufficient.

Incentives make a difference (at some institutions). A handful of institutions have created specific incentives aimed at increasing the representation of faculty of color. Eight institutions have mechanisms for orienting faculty search committees. Six of the institutions belong to the AAU and two do not. Five are institutions with high percentages of faculty of color. Given the difficulty that many institutions have in recruiting faculty of color, these institutions have established programs to educate members of search committees on ways to emphasize diversity in the recruitment process. One campus makes two presentations a year to all departments that are scheduled to conduct a faculty search. Another holds a dinner for the search committees of various departments and professional schools. Led by faculty in each unit, topics for discussion include demographics of the campus, nationwide challenges in diversifying higher education, and best practices for a successful search. Although two of the eight institutions do not have individuals on staff charged with educating faculty search committees, they offer periodic trainings run by outside contractors. Such workshops aim to "train the trainers," with the expectation that they will continue the work in the future. (On a related note, these two institutions are two of the three universities that have low levels of diversity.) Another campus recently completed a faculty recruitment toolkit, available online for all members of search committees, which provides similar information on how to emphasize diversity during the recruitment process. As one individual observed, many members of the search committees seem eager to recruit faculty of color on campus, but simply do not know how to go about doing so.

Several institutions have special hiring funds earmarked for increasing faculty diversity. The magnitude of scope for such funding can be significant. For example, one institution recently started a \$15 million campaign over three years to increase the diversity of their faculty. In contrast, another institution with a smaller, though still sizable, endowment is aiming to increase its faculty hiring fund to \$500,000 by 2008.

In addition to the use of special hiring funds, several institutions also offer re- search funds for faculty of color. The practices of one institution are particularly instructive in the ways of creating buy-in from all in the campus community. This institution offers \$25,000 research fellowships to junior faculty. Applications for the award must come from the department chair, who outlines how the indi- vidual is being supported through the tenure process. The institution also holds an awards dinner for all award recipients and invites deans and other leaders on campus. This campus has recognized that creating diversity is a community undertaking and not a series of isolated efforts.

However fruitful these incentives may seem, they are found in institutions with high and low diversity. Some institutions with high diversity have not adopted such policies and other institutions with low diversity have some of these poli- cies. As with the other strategies, then, a plausible conclusion is that no particu- lar strategy is successful. Table 6 offers a summary of the findings.

Table 6: What Makes a Difference

	Diversity in Mission Statement	Diversity Statement	Supportive President	Chief Diversity Officer	Training for Faculty Search Committees
AAU Institutions	7	3	5	6	6
Non-AAU Institutions	4	1	3	1	2
Institutions with High Diversity	6	2	3	3	5
Institutions with Low Diversity	5	2	5	4	3

Discussion

We conclude that no discernable pattern exists to indicate which strategies are most effective in increasing faculty diversity. While AAU institutions were slightly more likely to have an executive-level chief diversity officer, for example, only three of those institutions have a high percentage of faculty of color on campus. Similarly, we found no patterns connecting the inclusion of diversity in an institutional statement with successful recruiting and retaining of a diverse faculty. Offering training to faculty search committees was slightly more likely to

occur at campuses with higher levels of diversity. However, despite this isolated success, the overall findings suggest that structures and strategies do not determine the success of an institution's efforts at diversifying the faculty.

Such an observation is important, since other institutional priorities seem to be effectively implemented through patterns of similar actions. For example, if an institution wants to raise funds or increase its endowment, it is sure to have a development office. Obviously, simply hiring a development officer or creating an office does not ensure success, but the absence of an officer or office surely guarantees failure. Similarly, a college or university that is committed to a particular curriculum—the liberal arts, for example—or to serving a specific constituency—for example, women or African Americans—is sure to mention this distinctiveness in its mission statement. An institution that wants to be especially engaged with the local community will have a president who acts as its public face in the community, whereas a disengaged campus is likely to have a president who does not seek active community outreach. Institutions with sports teams generally have clear policies aimed at regulating athletic conduct; the rigorous enforcement of such policies is likely to be more successful at these institutions than at institutions where such policies are absent or ill-defined.

And yet, this is not the case with regard to increasing faculty diversity. No one strategy will work for all campuses. Even though an institution's participants may assume that a particular effort—the creation of an office, the public pronouncement of its president and the like—is what leads to success, what we have outlined here brings such a conclusion into question. Our assumption is that increasing diversity is more a cultural act that requires interpretative strategies in an institution, rather than an instrumental activity based on linear models of decision-making.

Andrew Masland has noted that “the difficulty in studying culture arises because culture is implicit and we are all embedded in our own cultures.”²³ Those who subscribe to a cultural view see the organizational world as a social construction where participants constantly interpret and re-create organizational reality. From such a vantage point, a single act or policy is likely to fail at reorienting a campus toward increasing diversity. We have previously pointed out that the culture of an organization pertains to an institution's mission, environment, communication, leadership, socialization and strategy.²⁴ Identifying such com-

ponents may be useful for someone who has no sense of what an organization's culture is, but the components should not be used in an instrumental manner. A cultural approach seeks to reorient the entire organization toward a particular goal rather than emphasize one or another singular action in order to reach that goal. An understanding of culture obviously will not magically resolve a problem such as the lack of diversity amongst faculty. However, an interpretative cultural framework for an organization enables individuals to articulate and address ways to improve performance, such as seeking to increase diversity with the understanding that such an outcome will likely take a long time and will necessitate a reorientation of the culture.

Our concern with previous efforts to increase diversity is that, however well-intentioned they are, such efforts are based on the assumption that the organization will undergo a minor shift. From this perspective, those who are new to the organization need to learn about the organization. The organization changes slightly because new personnel arrive, but the underlying ethos, ideology and culture remain the same. A cultural framework works from a different perspective. New individuals change the culture. As a result, an institution's new recruits and its current participants need to change. An effective culture is one where the various components are in sync with one another. Thus, a diversity officer's ideas for change are not the actions of a singular office, but instead are part of a long-term, cohesive strategy that reaches into areas such as the organization's mission statement, how the organization interacts with and interprets its environment, what kinds of statements are communicated about the value of diversity and the like.

Conclusion

Leadership in higher education has been characterized by some as "organized anarchy,"²⁵ based on the assumption that individuals do not really make a difference. They liken the college presidency to a person who must change a light bulb. To be sure, someone needs to change the light bulb, but who changes it is relatively unimportant.

One way to interpret our findings here is to think of increasing faculty diversity as increasing diversity in an organized anarchy. Incentives work in some institutions and not others. College presidents might be important—but then again, they might not. From this perspective, a singular organizational action or

strategy aimed at increasing diversity is not likely to produce assured outcomes in the same way that hiring an effective vice president for development will improve the chances for a successful capital campaign.

This is not how we have interpreted the data, however. Rather than saying that no one person is important, we suggest that, as a cultural issue, all people are important at a campus where diversity is an institutional goal. The key is not to obsess over whether the institution needs to be more or less decentralized, for example, but instead to consider how to foment a concern for diversity within the organization's culture. In this view, a successful campus is one that utilizes each of the elements we highlighted earlier—discourse, people, administrative positions and incentives—to change the culture of the organization over a sustained period of time. No two institutions will experience the same results from an identical set of strategies. Rather, an institution's history, culture, and community will shape the success of diversity efforts. Unlike a capital campaign that has a start and conclusion, increasing diversity is a generational undertaking that will outlast several presidents. A sustained effort at diversifying the faculty cannot be the work of a handful of individuals or campus offices.

An organization's culture is about the symbols, communicative acts, and interpretive events that actors employ to understand and function at the institution. No "silver bullet" exists such that a single speech by a campus official transforms the culture. Diversifying the faculty needs to be thought of for what it is—transforming the culture of the organization. Accordingly, a comprehensive approach needs to be developed with clear benchmarks and goals that enable the campus community to move forward on a value that is incorporated into the fabric of the institution. Thus, rather than a cookbook approach with a set list of "ingredients," we are suggesting that ultimately individuals are better served by thinking of their organizations as cultures in need of reframing core beliefs and values.

ENDNOTES

¹ Lance A. Selfa et al., *1992-93 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty* (Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, 1997); Emily Forrest Cataldi, Mansour Fahimi, and Ellen M. Bradburn, *2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:04) Report on Faculty and Instructional Staff in Fall 2003* (Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, 2005).

² Although federal data sets refer to these two groups as Black and Hispanic, respectively, we use African American and Latino because these are the terms preferred by most members of each group.

³ Ellen E. Chaffee and William G. Tierney, *Collegiate Culture and Leadership Strategies* (New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan Publishing Company, 1988).

⁴ Marjorie F. Knowles and Bernard W. Harleston, *Achieving Diversity in the Professoriate: Challenges and Opportunities* (Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 1997); Rhonda Phillips, "Recruiting and Retaining a Diverse Faculty," *Planning for Higher Education* 30, no. 4 (2002): 32-39; Caroline S. V. Turner, Samuel L. Myers, Jr., and John W. Creswell, "Exploring Underrepresentation: The Case of Faculty of Color in the Midwest," *Journal of Higher Education* 70, no. 1 (1999): 27-59.

⁵ Cathy A. Trower and Richard P. Chait, "Faculty Diversity: Too Little for Too Long," *Harvard Magazine* 104, no. 4 (2002): 33-37 & 98; Turner, Myers, and Creswell, "Exploring Underrepresentation."

⁶ Knowles and Harleston, *Achieving Diversity*.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Phillips, "Recruiting and Retaining."

⁹ Trower and Chait, "Faculty Diversity"; Turner, Myers, and Creswell, "Exploring Underrepresentation."

¹⁰ Christine A. Stanley, ed., *Faculty of Color: Teaching in Predominantly White Colleges and Universities* (Boston: Anker Publishing Company, 2006); Caroline S. Turner, "Incorporation and Marginalization in the Academy: From Border Toward Center for Faculty of Color?" *Journal of Black Studies* 34, no. 1 (2003): 112-125.

¹¹ Turner, Myers, and Creswell, "Exploring Underrepresentation."

¹² Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis, *The Road Ahead: Improving Diversity in Graduate Education* (Los Angeles: CHEPA, 2004); Alma R. Clayton-Pedersen et al., *Making a Real Difference with Diversity: A Guide to Institutional Change* (Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2007).

¹³ Clayton-Pedersen et al., *Making a Real Difference*; Laurel R. Davis, "Racial Diversity in Higher Education: Ingredients for Success and Failure," *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 38, no. 2 (2002): 137-155; Patricia B. Hyer, "Affirmative Action for Women Faculty: Case Studies of Three Successful Institutions," *Journal of Higher Education* 56, no. 3 (1985): 282-299; Trower and Chait, "Faculty Diversity"; Damon A. Williams, Joseph B. Berger, and Shederick A. McClendon, *Toward a Model of Inclusive Excellence and Change in Postsecondary Institutions*, (Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2005).

¹⁴ Berta Vigil Laden and Linda Serra Hagedorn, "Job Satisfaction Among Faculty of Color in Academe: Individual Survivors or Institutional Transformers?" *New Directions for Institutional Research* 105 (2000): 57-66; Turner, "Incorporation and Marginalization."

¹⁵ Nancy Barceló, "Transforming Our Institutions for the Twenty-First Century: The Role of the Chief Diversity Officer," *Diversity Digest* 10, no. 2 (2007); Damon A. Williams and Katrina C. Wade-Golden, "What Is a Chief Diversity Officer?" *Inside Higher Ed*, April 18, 2006.

¹⁶ Knowles and Harleston, *Achieving Diversity*; Phillips, "Recruiting and Retaining"; Turner, Myers, and Creswell, "Exploring Underrepresentation."

¹⁷ Daryl G. Smith et al., "Interrupting the Usual: Successful Strategies for Hiring Diverse Faculty." *The Journal of Higher Education* 75 no. 2 (2004): 133-160.

¹⁸ Phillips, "Recruiting and Retaining."

¹⁹ Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis, *The Road Ahead*; Jose F. Moreno et al., *The Revolving Door for Underrepresented Minority Faculty in Higher Education: An Analysis from the Campus Diversity Initiative*. A research brief from The James Irvine Foundation. (San Francisco: Claremont Graduate University; Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2006).

²⁰ In this discussion, we do not distinguish between citizens and noncitizens. African Americans include international faculty from Africa and the Caribbean, and Latinos include those from Central and South America. While each of the above groups is slightly affected by the inclusion of international faculty, the category of Asian American is affected the most. International faculty from Asia compose a large percentage of those included within the Asian American category. For example, although 9.2 percent of all faculty are of Asian descent, only 6.5 percent of all faculty are of Asian descent and U.S. citizens. While Asian Americans are not the focus of our paper, we want to highlight the fact that this racial group may not be as making as great gains as the data would suggest. Although institutions may be increasing the number of faculty of color on their campus, they may be drawing from outside the United States to do so.

²¹ We elected not to focus on either discipline-specific institutions or historically black institutions as they draw a particular type of student and faculty member. Howard's historical mission has focused on African American students only. Other institutions included in our study, such as the University of New Mexico and Florida International University, are now classified as Hispanic Serving Institutions. However, such a designation was earned because of the demographics of the students who are enrolled.

²² Syracuse University, "Syracuse University Mission and Vision," Syracuse University, <http://www.syr.edu/aboutsu/mission.html> (accessed July 20, 2007).

²³ Andrew Masland, "Organizational Culture in the Study of Higher Education," *Review of Higher Education* 8 (1985): 160.

²⁴ William G. Tierney, "Organizational Culture in Higher Education: Defining the Essentials," *The Journal of Higher Education* 59, no. 1 (1988): 2-21.

²⁵ Michael D. Cohen and James G. March, *Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1974).

REFERENCES

- Barceló, Nancy. "Transforming Our Institutions for the Twenty-First Century: The Role of the Chief Diversity Officer." *Diversity Digest* 10, no. 2 (2007). Available online at <http://www.diversityweb.org/digest/vol10no2/barcelo.cfm>.
- Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis. *The Road Ahead: Improving Diversity in Graduate Education*. Los Angeles: CHEPA, 2004.
- Chaffee, Ellen E., and William G. Tierney. *Collegiate Culture and Leadership Strategies*. New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan Publishing Company, 1988.
- Clayton-Pedersen, Alma R., Sharon Parker, Daryl G. Smith, Jose F. Moreno, and Daniel H. Teraguchi. *Making a Real Difference with Diversity: A Guide to Institutional Change*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2007.
- Cohen, Michael D., and James G. March. *Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1974.
- Davis, Laurel R. "Racial Diversity in Higher Education: Ingredients for Success and Failure." *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 38, no. 2 (2002): 137-155.
- Forrest Cataldi, Emily, Mansour Fahimi, and Ellen M. Bradburn. See U.S. Department of Education.
- Hyer, Patricia B. "Affirmative Action for Women Faculty: Case Studies of Three Successful Institutions." *Journal of Higher Education* 56, no. 3 (1985): 282-299.
- Knowles, Marjorie F., and Bernard W. Harleston. *Achieving Diversity in the Professoriate: Challenges and Opportunities*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 1997.
- Laden, Berta Vigil and Linda Serra Hagedorn. "Job Satisfaction Among Faculty of Color in Academe: Individual Survivors or Institutional Transformers?" *New Directions for Institutional Research* 105 (2000): 57-66.
- Masland, Andrew. "Organizational Culture in the Study of Higher Education." *Review of Higher Education* 8 (1985): 157-168.
- Moreno, Jose F., Daryl G. Smith, Alma R. Clayton-Pedersen, Sharon Parker, and Daniel H. Teraguchi. *The Revolving Door for Underrepresented Minority Faculty in Higher Education. An Analysis from the Campus Diversity Initiative*. Report issued by The James Irvine Foundation. San Francisco: Claremont Graduate University; Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2006.
- Phillips, Rhonda. "Recruiting and Retaining a Diverse Faculty." *Planning for Higher Education* 30, no. 4 (2002): 32-39.
- Rowley, Larry L., Sylvia Hurtado, and Luis Ponjuan. "Organizational Rhetoric or Reality? The Disparities between Avowed Commitment to Diversity and Formal Programs and Initiatives in Higher Education Institutions." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA, April 2002.
- Selfa, Lance A., Natalie Suter, Shaun Koch, Daniel A. Zahs, Brian D. Kuhr, Sharon Myers, Robert A. Johnson, Sameer Y. Abraham, Linda J. Zimpler. See U.S. Department of Education.

- Smith, Daryl G. "Organizational Implications of Diversity in Higher Education." In *Diversity in Organizations: New Perspectives for a Changing Workplace*, edited by Martin M. Chemers, Stuart Oskamp, and Mark A. Costanzo, 220-244. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1995.
- Smith, Daryl G., Caroline S. Turner, Nana Osei-Kofi, and Sandra Richards. "Interrupting the Usual: Successful Strategies for Hiring Diverse Faculty." *The Journal of Higher Education* 75, no. 2 (2004): 133-160.
- Stanley, Christine A., ed. *Faculty of Color: Teaching in Predominantly White Colleges and Universities*. Boston: Anker Publishing Company, 2006.
- Syracuse University. "Syracuse University Mission and Vision." Syracuse University. <http://www.syr.edu/aboutsu/mission.html>.
- Tierney, William G. "Organizational Culture in Higher Education: Defining the Essentials." *The Journal of Higher Education* 59, no. 1 (1988): 2-21.
- Trower, Cathy A., and Richard P. Chait. "Faculty Diversity: Too Little for Too Long." *Harvard Magazine* 104, no. 4 (2002): 33-37, 98.
- Turner, Caroline S. "Incorporation and Marginalization in the Academy: From Border Toward Center for Faculty of Color?" *Journal of Black Studies* 34, no. 1 (2003): 112-125.
- Turner, Caroline S. V., Samuel L. Myers, Jr., and John W. Creswell. "Exploring Underrepresentation: The Case of Faculty of Color in the Midwest." *Journal of Higher Education* 70, no. 1 (1999): 27-59.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2000). "Your Gateway to Census 2000." U.S. Census Bureau. <http://www.census.gov/main/www/cen2000.html>. Accessed August 16, 2007.
- U.S. Department of Education. *1992-93 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93)*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, 1997.
- U.S. Department of Education. *1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:99)*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, 2002.
- U.S. Department of Education. *2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:04) Report on Faculty and Instructional Staff in Fall 2003*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, 2005.
- U.S. Department of Education. *Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, 2005.
- Williams, Damon A., Joseph B. Berger, and Shederick A. McClendon. *Toward a Model of Inclusive Excellence and Change in Postsecondary Institutions*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2005.
- Williams, Damon A., and Katrina C. Wade-Golden. "What is a Chief Diversity Officer?" *Inside Higher Ed*, April 18, 2006, <http://www.insidehighered.com/workplace/2006/04/18/williams>. (Accessed May 29, 2007).