Underrepresentation in the Academy and the Institutional Climate for Faculty Diversity

Sharon L. Fries-Britt
University of Maryland, College Park

Heather T. Rowan-Kenyon
Boston College

Laura W. Perna
University of Pennsylvania

Jeffrey F. Milem
University of Arizona

Danette Gerald Howard
Maryland Higher Education Commission

Abstract: *The purpose of this study was to explore the current racial climate for Black and Hispanic faculty at three predominantly White flagship universities with regard to the climate for faculty diversity and diversity discourse. The research paradigm was qualitative using evaluative case study method (Yin, 2009) to study faculty at the University of Georgia, University of Maryland at College Park, and the University of Texas at Austin. The study was situated in Hurtado and colleagues' campus climate framework (Hurtado, Milem, &*

Sharon L. Fries-Britt is an Associate Professor in the College of Education at the University of Maryland, College Park.
Heather T. Rowan-Kenyon is an Assistant Professor in the Lynch School of Education at Boston College.
Laura W. Perna is a Professor in the Graduate School of Education at the University of Pennsylvania.
Jeffrey F. Milem is a Professor in the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Arizona.
Danette Gerald Howard is the Director of Research and Policy Analysis for the Maryland Higher Education Commission.

> *Clayton-Pederson, 1998; Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Peterson, &*
> *Allen, 1999; Milem, Dey, & White, 2004; Milem, Chang, & Antonio,*
> *2005) and Chang's (2002) notion of transformative discourse. The*
> *primary data sources were face-to-face interviews and focus group*
> *discussions with faculty, provosts, chief diversity officers, and senior*
> *academic administrators to understand campus climate and each*
> *campuses effort and commitment to diversity. The data were*
> *analyzed using content analysis. The findings focus on the overall*
> *campus climate, recruitment, retention, and institutional support for*
> *research.*

Although the number of full-time faculty of color increased by 50 percent between 1993 and 2003, people of color still account for less than 20 percent of all full-time faculty (Cook & Cordova, 2006). In fact, faculty of color at predominantly White institutions of higher education represents a substantially disproportionately smaller percentage than students of color at these institutions. In fall 2005, Blacks, Hispanics, Asians, and American Indians together represented 15.5% of all faculty and instructional staff at colleges and universities nationwide (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2007). By comparison, students of color, including Blacks, Hispanics, Asians, and American Indians, represented 31% of total enrollment, and 32% of total undergraduate enrollment in fall 2005 (NCES, 2007).

One common explanation for the slow progress in increasing the representation of people of color among the nation's faculty is that the "supply" of qualified individuals, that is, individuals of color with doctoral degrees, is insufficient (Allen, Epps, Guillory, Suh, & Bonous-Hammarth, 2000; Perna, Fries-Britt, Gerald, Rowan-Kenyon, & Milem, 2008; Smith, Wolf, & Busenberg, 1996). Consistent with this explanation, Perna et al. (2008) found that Blacks and Hispanics experienced greater equity among "entry level" faculty positions (e.g., assistant professors, tenure track faculty) than among doctoral recipients. That is, when using Bensimon, Hao, & Bustillos' (2006) equity indices, the ratio of the representation of faculty to the representation of bachelor's degree recipients, the equity indices for Black assistant professors and tenure track faculty are higher than the equity indices for Black doctoral completions at public four-year institutions in the three states (Perna et al., 2008).

However, an inadequate pipeline is not the only force that restricts the representation of faculty of color among the nation's colleges and universities. Villalpando and Bernal (2002) warn against overemphasizing the "pipeline problem" as the sole explanation of an underrepresentation of faculty of color on college and university campuses and recommended exploring the role of institutional policies and practices beyond doctoral-degree production. Suggesting the merits of this recommendation, Perna et al. (2008) found greater equity for Blacks and Hispanics among assistant than full professors and among tenure-track than tenured faculty. Other scholars have concluded that discrimination on campuses continues to restrict the recruiting, hiring, and retaining of African American faculty members (Allen et al., 2002; Smith et al., 1996; Villalpando & Bernal, 2002).

Research also suggests the importance of attending to an institution's climate for diversity (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, & Allen, 1998) and diversity discourse (Chang, 2002) in order to increase the representation of faculty of color. These perspectives stress the need to move beyond "compositional" diversity, or the numerical representation of faculty of color, to explore the forces that may create a poor climate for faculty of color on campus. Some researchers have concluded that faculty of color perceived an uncomfortable campus climate and that rhetoric regarding campus diversity was not put into action (Smith et al., 1996).

This paper is one product of a larger project whose goal was to expand the discourse on affirmative action, diversity, and civil rights in public higher education, civil rights communities, and public policy arenas in 19 southern and southern-border states that, prior to the 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education* Supreme Court decision, operated on a racially segregated basis. The original study included four larger research and policy analysis projects: (a) an analysis of trends in race and ethnic equity in higher education enrollment and employment, (b) an examination of state-sponsored race and ethnic equity and diversity programs, (c) an analysis of Title VI enforcement by the U.S. Office of Civil Rights (OCR), and (d) an analysis of campus-based race and ethnic equity and diversity programs at three public flagship universities. While the other projects provide contextual information, the latter project is the focus of this paper. The current researchers examined data gathered from case studies of three public flagship universities to explore the

institutional climate for faculty diversity. Our analyses focus on public flagship universities in three (i.e., Georgia, Maryland, and Texas) of the nineteen southern and southern-border states that, prior to the 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education* Supreme Court decision, operated on a racially segregated basis.

Literature Review

Students benefit from attending institutions with a diverse faculty. Research shows that a diverse faculty is more likely to utilize the range of pedagogical techniques that help ensure an engaging learning environment for all students and provide additional support and mentoring for students of color at the institution (Cole & Barber, 2003; Hurtado, 2001; Smith, 1989). For example, Umbach (2006), in his examination of faculty at 134 colleges and universities, found that the number of faculty of color on these campuses was positively related to student learning, as faculty of color were more likely than other faculty to employ active learning, increase diverse interactions, and emphasize higher order thinking. More faculty frequently engage in effective educational practices at institutions with more rather than less diverse faculty (Umbach, 2006).

While students benefit from a diverse faculty, various challenges limit the presence of faculty of color, especially at predominately White institutions (PWIs). Stanley (2006a, 2006b) identified aspects of teaching, mentoring, service, and racism that contribute to a "chilly" climate for faculty of color. Other research also illustrates the challenges that faculty of color experience with regard to teaching (Harlow, 2003). Harlow (2003) found that classroom work was more complex for Black than for White faculty at a PWI because Black faculty were required to negotiate their devalued racial status in the classroom. She found that this emotional management often increased the amount of work required to be effective in the classroom, as Black faculty often felt the need to be overly prepared or perfect so that students, especially White students, would see them as credible and not just an affirmative action hire. Stanley (2006a, 2006b) found that students more frequently questioned the authority of Black than White faculty, especially with regard to integrating diversity issues into courses. Although, most faculty of color reported that teaching was enjoyable and satisfying, and a key reason why many decided to follow the faculty route (Stanley, 2006a; Turner &

Myers, 2000), faculty of color also struggled with constantly feeling under a microscope and needing to be able to succeed beyond their White peers in order to be equal (Turner, Myers, & Creswell, 1999).

Discrimination and racism also contribute to a chilly climate for faculty of color and their retention (Johnsrud & Sadao, 1998; Reyes & Halcón, 1988). Reyes and Halcón (1988) reported that, when faculty of color experience racism, their options are to give in and assimilate to White academic culture so that they can be successful at an institution, give up after they pour all their energy into struggling against racism until they experience burnout, move on by picking battles and biding their time until better opportunities open up, or fight back by persevering and learning how to work the system or trying to prove the oppressor wrong at every opportunity. In short, most of these options include either leaving the institution or putting aside their own identity at some point.

Many junior faculty of color at PWIs experience a pull between working to meet the requirements of tenure and providing a support system for students of color, a focus that is rarely recognized in the tenure process (Blackwell, 1996; Stanley, 2006b). Stanley (2006b) found that, while faculty of color are encouraged to participate in service activities to be good citizens and alleviate isolation, it is a challenge to balance these requests with advancing one's scholarly agenda. Butler-Purry (2006) shared her experience of serving on many committees due to the fact that a "diverse" committee was needed, and she was one of only a few faculty of color in her school. These "extra" responsibilities can lead faculty of color to experience higher levels of stress, especially related to research and service, than White faculty members (Smith & Witt, 1993). Because time is finite, assuming extra advising and service responsibilities also limits the time that faculty of color have available for research, the most important criterion for tenure at most flagship PWIs.

Strong mentors, even cross-race mentorship experiences have been found to be a great benefit to faculty of color in learning the ways of the institution (Butler-Perry, 2006; Stanley & Lincoln, 2005). Nonetheless, Turner et al. (1999) found in their mixed-methods study that faculty of color in the Midwest typically perceived isolation, unsupportive work environments, and lack of information and mentoring, with some faculty reporting that others have told, at various points in their career, that they did not fit the *profile* of tenured faculty. Research also found that faculty

were given mixed messages from mentors, and often felt *invisible* on campus (Stanley, 2006a).

Conceptual Framework

The campus racial climate framework was originally developed by Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen (1998); Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen and Allen (1999); and modified in work by Milem, Dey, and White (2004) and Milem, Chang, and Antonio (2005). The campus climate framework asserts that the climate for diversity on individual campuses is shaped by the interaction of a series of external and internal (or institutional) forces (Hurtado et al., 1998; Hurtado et al., 1999; Milem et al., 2004; Milem et al., 2005). The external forces affecting the campus climate include governmental policy, programs, and initiatives as well as socio-historical forces. While these forces occur "outside" of college campuses, they stimulate discussions or other activities that occur on campus.

The framework specifies five internal dimensions that result from the educational programs and practices at an institution: (a) compositional diversity, (b) historical legacy of inclusion or exclusion, (c) psychological climate, (d) behavioral climate, and (e) organizational/structural aspect. Compositional diversity refers to the numerical and proportional representation of various racial and ethnic groups on a campus. In earlier versions of the framework (e.g., Hurtado et al., 1998; Hurtado et al., 1999) this dimension was termed structural diversity; however, Milem, Dey, and White (2004) argued that the term compositional diversity is a more accurate descriptor of the numerical and proportional composition of the campus. The historical legacy of inclusion or exclusion points to the historical vestiges of segregated schools and colleges which continue to affect the climate for racial and ethnic diversity on college campuses. The psychological dimension of campus climate includes views about inter-group relations as well as institutional responses to diversity, perceptions of discrimination or racial conflict, and attitudes toward individuals from different racial and ethnic backgrounds. The behavioral dimension of campus climate consists of the status of social interaction on the campus, the nature of interactions between and among individuals from different racial and ethnic backgrounds, and the quality of intergroup relations (Hurtado et al., 1998; Hurtado et al., 1999). The organizational/structural dimension

of climate is reflected in the curriculum; in campus decision-making practices related to budget allocations, reward structures, hiring practices, admissions practices, and tenure decisions; and in other important structures and processes that guide the day-to-day business of our campuses.

Chang (2002) asserted that two main types of discourse dominate approaches to diversity in higher education: a discourse of preservation and a discourse of transformation. A discourse of preservation has as its key (if not exclusive) focus, increasing the compositional diversity of campuses. Somewhat paradoxically, Chang (2002) argued that a discourse of preservation is limiting because it overlooks the full historical development of diversity-related efforts on college campuses, focuses on admissions as the primary goal, and ignores the transformative aims of diversity, thereby underestimating the impact that diversity can have on student learning.

Chang (2002) argues that, with regard to campus diversity, institutions should engage in a discourse of transformation, which not only includes attention to compositional changes, but also recognizes that deeper forms of institutional change are critically important. This form of discourse can be very challenging because the transformative aims of diversity often clash with deep-seated institutional assumptions and values. The educational benefits of diversity emanate from institutional changes that challenge prevailing educational sensibilities and that enhance educational participation for all groups. Chang asserts that, when the discourse about campus diversity is transformative, the following questions shape discussions about campus diversity: Who deserves an opportunity to learn? How is the potential for learning evaluated? What is learned? Who decides what is important to learn? Who oversees learning? What conditions advance learning for all students? When diversity discussions focus on these broader fundamental issues they are more likely to change the values of a campus to support diversity. These changes can benefit faculty of color who are more likely to be supported in their teaching and research on campuses that ask deeper questions. Even more important they are likely to be valued as members of the community and feel like their contributions matter.

While instances of a chilly climate for faculty of color have been well documented in prior research, this issue has not been explored through

the framework of campus racial climate. The campus racial climate framework provides a broad context from which to explore the racial experiences of faculty of color by drawing on institutional as well as personal factors that impact the climate of a campus. Hurtado et al. (1999) submit that the framework, "...provides a conceptual handle for understanding an element of the environment that was once thought too complex to comprehend" (p. 3). Understanding the campus racial climate was central to this work however we also wanted to evaluate the language used by the informants as they talked about diversity as a way of determining if the efforts of the campus were status quo or transformative. Because we were interviewing senior administrators (e.g., provosts, vice presidents and directors) and key faculty engaged in diversity programs we felt their language would likely reflect the values and beliefs of the institution. At the very least we felt that their use of terminology and the examples they provided would offer insight into the institutions' progress on diversity. Chang's (2002) framework of transformative discourse provided an important lens for evaluating faculty and administrator discourse about diversity in the interviews with informants we were able to examine what they said about their campuses initiatives and the examples they offered for how their campus changed. Essentially we used Chang's framework as a compliment to the campus racial climate framework to assess how much transformation occurred thus two conceptual frameworks guide the analyses in this study.

Method

This study uses multiple descriptive case studies to explore the current racial climate for Black and Hispanic faculty at three flagship universities with regard to the climate for faculty diversity and diversity discourse. Using the above-mentioned frameworks as a guide, this study addresses the following questions: How does the campus climate contribute to underrepresentation of Black and Hispanic faculty in the academy? How do faculty and administrators at the public flagship institutions in Georgia, Maryland, and Texas perceive the institutional climate and the work environment for faculty of color? In this study we were informed by the experiences of senior administrators. Understanding the challenges and opportunities that administrators encounter in promoting a positive racial climate on campus and helping to recruit faculty fills an important gap in the literature.

Merriam (2009) defines a case study "as the product of…an intensive, holistic description and analysis of a single entity, phenomenon, or social unit" (p. 46). Case study research allows the researcher to define and pinpoint the unit of study or *bounded context*, which in these cases are the individual institutions (Merriam, 2009). Case study methodology is appropriate given our interest in understanding how various forces shape the institutional climate for faculty diversity (Yin, 2009). In this study, we identified each flagship campus as a unit of study that we evaluated separately, and then conducted interviews with informants at the universities.

Sample

We address the research questions using case studies of a public flagship institution in each of the three states: Georgia, Maryland, and Texas. The case studies were designed to develop a deeper understanding of faculty and administrator perceptions of the campus racial climate on these three public flagship campuses.

We purposively selected these three public flagship universities based on indicators that describe the ability of these institutions to attract and retain a diverse student and faculty population, the characteristics of the state higher education policies, and the degree to which various diversity-related initiatives are present at the institution. Georgia, Maryland, and Texas are three of the 19 southern and southern-border states that, prior to the 1954 *Brown et al. v. Board of Education* Supreme Court decision, operated on a racially segregated basis.

The case studies focus on public flagship institutions for several reasons. First, as the "public elites" in their states, public flagship institutions have the potential to play a central role in advancing a state's (and the nation's) progress on race, equity, and diversity. They tend to have more resources than other public institutions in the state and they tend to employ highly competitive admission practices. Graduating from a flagship institution confers significant benefits to alumni who gain recognition for gaining a degree at one of the premier institutions in the state. Even more important, alumni from the public flagships are more likely to assume major leadership roles in these states and often serve as state legislators, members of Boards of Trustees, and members of higher education coordinating bodies.

Because flagship campuses are generally well resourced compared to other public institutions, with more highly ranked academic programs and faculty, we believe that they should have greater responsibility for preparing the leadership of the states and nation. Given the demographic shifts occurring in the three states, and the United States more generally, educating racially diverse leaders who can serve the needs of the American public in health, medicine, law, education, science, math, public affairs and the arts is imperative. In this post-affirmative action period that is often characterized as having little to no federal oversight regarding race equity and diversity (Williams, 1997), little is known about the efforts of flagship universities on these issues.

Data Collection and Analysis

On each campus, semi-structured 60-minute individual interviews were conducted with key senior officers and administrators. We also conducted 90-minute focus group discussions with representatives of such campus constituencies as faculty of color, undergraduate students of color, graduate students of color, leaders of minority programs, student government leaders, and campus administrators. Each individual interview and focus group was recorded and transcribed.

The data in this paper are derived from interviews and focus groups with faculty and senior administrators of color. The total sample from all three campuses included 33 informants. Fourteen senior administrators including provosts, chief diversity officers, and other senior academic administrators were interviewed. The senior administrator sample was comprised of four Black men and one Black woman, six White men and one White woman, one Latino man, and one Asian woman. Nineteen faculty of color, of whom nine were men and ten were women participated in focus groups. More specifically, the faculty sample was comprised of eight Black women, six Black men, two Latino men, one Latina woman, one Asian woman, and one Asian man.

Reflecting Yin's (2009) emphasis on the role of theory in guiding case study research, we developed data collection protocols based on the conceptual frameworks (Chang, 2002; Hurtado et al., 1998; Hurtado et al., 1999; Milem et al., 2004; Milem et al., 2005) with particular attention to the internal and external forces that the frameworks and the literature suggest impact race equity and diversity. The protocols focused on five broad categories of external and internal forces: federal, state, campus,

community, and private sector/foundation. Under each of these categories we asked additional questions pertaining to such topics as peers, faculty, budget, and state policies. The focus group protocols for students, faculty and administrators were slightly different to address issues specific to each population. Similarly, the individual interviews were tailored to address position-specific issues. Examples of standard probes that were asked across all groups included: (1) Describe the major institutional initiatives related to the institution's race equity and diversity goals; and (2) How would you characterize the climate for diversity on this campus? On what do you base this characterization? The use of these protocols also helped ensure comparability of data collection procedures across the three institutions (Yin, 2009).

The study uses content analyses of qualitative data collected through case studies of three public flagship institutions to address the research questions. The study uses the campus climate framework (Hurtado et al., 1998; Hurtado et al., 1999; Milem et al., 2004; Milem et al., 2005) and Chang's (2002) notion of discourse to frame the analyses.

To analyze the data, we created a database for each campus to organize all the information that we collected (Yin, 2009). Each database included transcriptions from individual interviews/focus group discussions, field notes, campus documents and reports. We utilized QSR NVivo software to assist in the coding and compiling of data into categories. We developed a preliminary list of deductive codes for the larger project using the conceptual frameworks and knowledge of the literature. The coding process, conducted by multiple members of the research team, also used inductive coding, to allow additional codes to emerge. After themes were identified from the individual cases a cross-case analysis was conducted to find common themes across the three cases.

Given the small number of faculty of color and senior administrators on each campus, coupled with their high visibility, we were challenged with how to present the findings without compromising the participants' identities. Certain details in their stories made it difficult at times to camouflage their identities. In light of these challenges we report the majority of the findings across all three campuses rather than addressing each campus separately. On a few occasions we offer opposing observations from several faculty and/or administrators on the same campus to shed light on their different perceptions. In most instances we

identify the race/ethnicity and gender of the faculty member and on occasion we report their discipline and/or areas of expertise to clarify the meaning and context of a quote.

Multiple strategies were utilized to ensure the trustworthiness and credibility of the findings and conclusions (Yin, 2009). To ensure construct validity, we collected information from multiple sources including participants with different perspectives on each campus (e.g., faculty, administrators) (Yin, 2009). The use of the case study protocol and case study database also helped to ensure reliability (Yin, 2009), and the inclusion of multiple cases enhances the external validity of the findings (Merriam, 2009).

Findings

Interviews with the faculty and administrators reveal the challenges they face as they work to change the campus and move the issue of diversity forward in structural composition and campus programs. Without exception, the faculty and administrators we interviewed acknowledged some progress on their campus with regard to issues of racial climate and diversity. Not surprisingly, participants talked about the progress and challenges of their institution within their campuses' own unique historical contexts, legal challenges, and structural diversity. Nonetheless, participants' perceptions of campus racial climate varied within and across institutions. The analyses show that all three public flagships are concerned with the under-representation of faculty of color. Each campus is engaged in efforts to increase the diversity of the faculty, albeit with varying degrees of success. Interviews reveal uneven experiences and concerns for institutional practices across the three campuses. The participants shared their perceptions of the climate for race, equity and diversity on their campuses, and how their perceptions and experiences influenced the degree to which they, and their colleagues, felt supported and valued in their department and the larger communities.

Ideally, we would have liked to organize our findings using the same categories in the two frameworks that guided the study. This was easier in the case of the transformative discourse framework and somewhat challenging with the campus racial climate. We found evidence for the categories in both frameworks however because of the complexity and

interconnectedness of the factors in the racial climate framework it was difficult to use the original categories as a way to organize the themes. Faculty and administrators often discussed the elements interchangeably therefore making it difficult to create absolute distinctions. The concept of transformative discourse we found as a useful category in the analysis of our data and we turn to this analysis in the conclusion. We believe the themes we use to report the findings reflect the components in both frameworks and certainly the spirit of each. Finally, we found that the themes we use to organize the findings allow greater flexibility in reporting the findings and they accurately portray the context in which faculty and administrators raised these issues. Given these considerations we organized the findings around (a) overall campus climate and commitment to diversity, (b) recruitment, hiring and retention practices, and (c) institutional support for research interests and implications for promotion and tenure.

Overall Campus Climate and Commitment to Diversity

Some faculty and administrators perceived substantial institutional commitment to issues of race equity and diversity. However, several administrators noted challenges working with faculty to realize improvements in the campus climate for diversity on campus. One senior Black male administrator shared that, on his campus, it was very difficult to get majority faculty to really be committed to issues of diversity. Of all the campus constituents he talks to about diversity he felt that the faculty were the most difficult saying:

> You know, it's strange, but my greatest challenge comes from the faculty themselves. Whenever I go to meet with different faculty groups, we have extremely diverse discussions about this very topic, and we often have some serious disagreements…I've come to the conclusion that university faculty [are] more conservative than most groups that I've dealt with; they resist change, and they want to go about conducting business as they've always conducted it, and it has not been successful in terms of changing the composition of the faculty.

While most administrators described challenges in working with faculty to improve campus climate, a few administrators also pointed to other challenges that limit efforts to improve campus diversity. For example, a White female administrator did not encounter resistance from the faculty.

Rather, she noted that challenges of diversifying the composition of her faculty historically were related to the relative attractiveness of the geographic location of her institution to faculty of color. Although she once believed that the surrounding city reduced the success of her campus in recruiting faculty of color, she now believes that the location of her university is more attractive to faculty of color. She shared:

> when I used to look at the data in the 70s, we made job offers, and faculty of color and women would turn them down in greater numbers than White males because they had other places to go, and the African-Americans—particularly women more so than men—had a really tough time coming here. And it wasn't that the university wasn't hospitable, it was that the city didn't feel real comfortable. But that's getting better.

This change in the attractiveness of the geographic location likely reflects changes in the development that has occurred around her university in the past 30 years. The number of diverse individuals moving to the area, as well as the overall expansion in the city and surrounding counties to include a wide range of businesses and services appears to have increased the likelihood that candidates of color will see opportunities professionally and personally.

The faculty we interviewed had different perceptions of the level of commitment of their campus to diversity, based on their departmental experiences and their experiences of not being rewarded for the work they do. Several faculty observed a disconnect between the overall institutional commitment to diversity and their department's commitment to diversity. A Black female professor in African American Studies expressed that her department was responsible for carrying a lot of the load for meeting the university's diversity effort (e.g., offering classes to meet the institution's diversity requirement and admitting a large number of students of color from diverse backgrounds) but she felt that she received little recognition for these efforts in part because they were in African American Studies. She felt that, "the commitment to diversity is not always fully shared or fully implemented on a departmental level." Using different words, a faculty member at another institution expressed similar thoughts:

> I've taken some leadership in my college in trying to do some
> college-wide diversity initiatives. We have a standing diversity
> committee in our college. But the point is that none of those efforts
> are rewarded, and [with] the system of rewards, there are limits in
> terms of how my colleagues will approach the whole issue. What's
> in it for them? This is a whole system of rewards/benefits whether
> it's financial, promotion, all of it. So the other component to our
> dismal system of our student diversity is our faculty. I know we pick
> up a few each year, but we lose more.

Similarly, an Asian male professor commented that the degree of
commitment to issues of diversity was less evident in his home
department than in other places on campus, where there seemed to be
greater concern for issues of social justice:

> my home department reflects the institution of old, and on the
> surface does not appear to be very progressive. It pays lip service to
> diversity in some ways, then on the other side I know that I work
> with other programs and the work that we have outlined with social
> justice and betterment is happening. Depending on the area it is
> isolated and there are pockets where people are reaching out to
> communities and reaching out to help students. But I think it is not
> enough. How do we bring all of those together? There are missed
> opportunities for bringing it all together as a whole.

In contrast to both of these perspectives, a Black male who was a
member of the same campus as the Asian male felt that his campus
demonstrated a high degree of commitment to issues of diversity. He
commented:

> On this campus, in the department and in the college, there is a pretty
> sophisticated level of discourse about diversity. It is ongoing this
> conversation about diversity, about social justice, about race, about
> class. I—it is encouraging that at least the conversation is happening.
> I think it is a campus wide conversation and there seems to be a real
> commitment to these issues.

Although the two male professors initially described the climate of their
campus differently, the missed opportunities for bringing together the
work that people were doing on issues of social justice and diversity

described by the Asian male were similar to concerns later expressed by the Black male who shared that, "**…**the challenge is, are there structures in place to support the development of programs and other things to support these ideals?" Although this Black man applauded the work of his campus, he recognized that his institution faced major challenges with regard to creating structures that support programs born out of race equity and diversity discussions.

Some faculty associated the improvement of their campus climate with hiring of faculty of color. Increased compositional diversity mattered in the day-to-day interactions and work environment of faculty of color. In some cases the increased compositional diversity may have been the difference between one or two faculty of color in a department. A Black female professor reminisced about the days when her department had several professors of color. She described that, over time, they left and the department became a different place to work. With a degree of melancholy, she observed that she was the only one left in the department. She was clear in her preference in working on a campus with a greater number of faculty of color because it made for a better climate.

Similarly, an administrator commented on the low numbers of faculty of color particularly Latino faculty on his campus and the impact that this had on the climate and the ability of faculty to find others like themselves. While he had many concerns—some of which he did not want included "on the record"—he does offer the following on-the-record description of the challenges:

> I don't know what a critical mass is, but because there's a limited number of—smaller number of Latino faculty, it may be really the sense of isolation, exclusion, inability to work with people in other disciplines who look like yourselves, you know. I think that's less of a problem for blacks, but nonetheless, I think for both—in both cases, mentoring is a problem, therefore, a sense that the climate, you know, is not—I mean, the climate's not there for support—the kind of support that they want.

Recruitment, Hiring and Retention of Faculty

Enhancing the underrepresentation of faculty of color requires attention to the campus climate for recruiting, hiring, and retaining faculty of color. Some informants were more knowledgeable than others about the

formal and informal efforts on their campus to recruit faculty of color, and to educate the campus community about issues of race equity and diversity. The senior administrators were more keenly aware than the faculty of broader university policies and were able to shed light on the challenges faced by the campus and different departments. Not surprisingly many of the administrators acknowledged the long standing problem of the "pipeline" and efforts to find faculty of color in certain fields like science, engineering and math. A senior White male administrator who was sharing his frustration about the pipeline noted that some fields and departments only want candidates from top universities like an MIT or Cal Tech. These highly ranked institutions represent a narrow margin of schools and are less likely to have diverse candidates. He was frustrated with the priorities that seemed to be placed on these environments as the way to fill the pipeline:

> Part of it is priorities in terms of faculty hiring. Physics department—we want people from Cal Tech. Well, okay, fine. There's two people at Cal Tech—you know. We want people from MIT, we want people from Michigan. Well—it's very, very narrow…very, very narrow, and we haven't broken out of that in any successful way.

A senior Black male administrator on another campus had similar observations about institutional expectations and perceptions of the degree-granting institution. He reported witnessing many occasions when departments perceived a candidate as less qualified because of judgments about the institution where a candidate earned their degree:

> There's tacit assumptions made about, let us say … graduate degrees that come from… historically black institutions. They sort of devalue those degrees relative to a degree that may come from—I'm not even talking about a Harvard or a Yale, but that might come from [state university], and so that's a problem.

The informants acknowledged the complexity and challenges involved in recruiting, hiring and retaining a diverse faculty. They recognized that the low representation of faculty of color could not be explained solely by the actions of the university, but was also attributable to the decisions and choices of faculty of color to leave the university (e.g., because of

competitive offers, administrative appointments, more money, better location).

Nonetheless, while faculty acknowledged multiple explanations for the loss of professors, they also shared stories that reveal the institutional forces that impede the success of faculty of color. For example, a Black male faculty member shared that, when he was recruited, he was aware that his college had not successfully retained or tenured a number of Black professors. This information did not dissuade him from joining the faculty but did cause him to wonder what was happening in the college. Given the history of his department he felt it necessary to ask questions about what the department was doing to address this issue. Under the circumstances his questions seem reasonable. Nonetheless, he felt that, when he asked these questions, he was met with "curiosity and even a resistance in asking the questions." The resistance that this professor experienced was not dissimilar to what a senior administrator on the same campus observed as he talked about his efforts to get White faculty to understand the importance of recruiting and hiring faculty of color. As this administrator conveys his frustration, he explains how he tries to persuade the faculty that it makes sense to diversify the search committee so that they can have a balance but this recommendation is rejected as well:

> So I spend sometimes an hour, two hours talking with these people….The composition of the search committee—it makes sense…to…have good ethnic and racial balance, but they don't see it, some of these faculty. So I go to such a department, and we have all White males, and I say, no, no, no, this is not going to work. We're not going to search like this, you know. You're going to have some diversity on the search committee.

Despite many obstacles, faculty of color are recruited to the professorate but then they are faced with the challenge of learning how to navigate the academic process. Oftentimes they turn to their colleagues for support but these colleagues are not always sure how to help. This dilemma is vividly expressed by an untenured Black male who was trying to support a fellow faculty of color while trying to ensure his own survival. We offer significant portions of his quote in several sections because it reflects a rich description of the strain and pressure that faculty, particularly faculty of color, often encounter in the academy. The quote

also conveys the anxiety that accompanies the process of succeeding in an academic career:

> I was talking to a junior faculty member in my department today, and a person of color, and they were telling me that they were basically paralyzed by the environment that exists, and because they were given all sorts of advice on how to publish, where to publish, and was basically told that they could not talk to certain people, they could not associate with people outside of their field, so was basically told…to be isolated, and only publish in the top journals in the field, as a first year person, in order to be successful in the department, and just got to a point after that first year where they could not do anything.

In this first part of this quote, he is simply describing the experiences of his colleague and the advice that she is receiving and how she feels un-empowered by this advice. As he continues he begins to shift his concern to his own survival realizing that he keeps being put in this position of hearing the problems of his colleagues:

> You know I am standing there watching saying, 'Oh my God, what am I going to do, and being put in this position over and over again. Trying to figure out how to help people, when I am trying to figure out how to help myself!' As people come and go, I am trying to actively talk to people about what they are experiencing and to offer a different point of view, and one of the things this person told me today is that they had to systematically ignore the advice they were given in order to survive. And these are the people who are making decisions about tenure of course, but the only way that person could survive was to say, 'Look, I have to carve out a path and figure out what is best for me – otherwise I am not going to be able to do this.' I try to support this person in trying to have a number of different perspectives about her work. I think that has helped, but I am always asking her, 'Are you leaving? You are not looking for a job are you?'…I have come to expect that.

Embedded in this faculty member's comments is a powerful juxtaposition of trying to figure out how to help people, while at the same time trying to figure out how to help himself. Faculty of color have fewer mentors and resources to draw upon for support. They often turn to

each other for guidance and direction. In so doing they share their stories, and experiences, and while these interactions can be very important they can also be discouraging when they learn about hostile and difficult situations. The above example illustrates that, when a faculty member is untenured and unsure of their own survival, it may be more difficult to serve as a source of support. As in the case above the faculty member stood there listening, but wondering, what was he going to do? At some level the advice that his colleague received he believes also applies to him by default. Moreover, he was concerned about losing a colleague who was unhappy and he had been put in the position of listening to similar concerns many times to the point that he began to expect this person to leave hence his questions: "are you leaving? You are not looking for a job are you?"

Institutional Support for Research Interests and Implications for Promotion and Tenure

Interviews with faculty of color and senior administrators reveal that many faculty perceive a lack of support for their research interests:

> I think, you know, as a Research One institution, we don't give legitimacy and voice to diversity as a scholarly pursuit in the same way that we do other forms of scholarship or other topics of scholarship. And so I know for faculty and for graduate students especially, sometimes that becomes a barrier to their progression, to their promotion and tenure.

This observation, offered by a senior administrator who was also a tenured faculty member, reflects the sentiments of many of the faculty in the study whose research agenda included work that addressed racial/ethnic issues and/or sought to address issues that impact underrepresented populations.

While the majority of the faculty in the sample were tenured professors, a few were untenured. Despite their tenure status, they all shared perceptions of how scholarship mattered in the promotion and tenure of scholars of color. A Black female professor shared that she knew a number of colleagues who left for reasons of better employment, increases in salary, and promotion. However, as she shared these reasons, she also noted, "I think had they been valued for their many successes in the same ways that other people are valued for successes in more

mainstream areas of research, they probably would have stayed." She expressed these concerns because she felt that, at elite research universities, there is less legitimacy given to areas of research that deal with diversity, and that faculty of color often pursue these lines of inquiry. Similarly, another Black female commented:

> I think we are still in an institution and a society where White is superior, so knowledge looks a certain way and even people who think of themselves as liberal and progressive, when they come down to evaluating people, see it differently, are not challenged to think differently or be self-reflective about it.

Commenting on her own research, yet another Black female shared that she had conducted research on how certain journals were devalued over others. She noted that the advice that people offered faculty of color about where to publish their work creates unique pressure and stress that faculty of color have to deal with when considering their scholarship. She was particularly concerned about the stress because of the recent deaths of several senior Black women on her campus that she and others surmised was exacerbated by the stress in the academy:

> I've done work on the devaluation of certain journals. Don't do that, you will get pigeonholed.... So we find ourselves saying okay, this one is going to a journal we recognize, this one is not. Others do not have to do that. And I think that is one of the differences, our scholarship and the roles that we have because we embody certain things we are expected to fill the slot. That is why there is tremendous burnout. Tremendous levels of stress are causing Black women professors to die.

Similarly, a Latino male described advice that he received from mentors that discouraged his scholarly interests:

> my interest [in] doing research on Latino issues really ended up leading my faculty mentoring committee to discourage me from that, to get done the stuff, but spread out into other things, and I tried, and I think I didn't play to my strengths. And I think that led to me not getting tenure. And to some extent, that's a real disappointment, but it's not surprising because the school…has had a real tough time getting junior people to go up through the ranks. In fact, only…I

think in the last 15 years or so…five or six people who've come in as junior, maybe only two have made it through the ranks. So it's not unusual, but there was an added dimension of race diversity issues.

Faculty also talked about the ways in which the tenure and promotion of faculty of color were impacted by the many roles they have on campus as members of committees, working with students, and, in particular, serving as mentors and role models for students of color. Although faculty of color advise students from diverse backgrounds, they are likely to have a large number of students of color seek them out for support and advice. Oftentimes these students are not in their program and may even be registered in another college. A few faculty noted that faculty of color feel that they are expected to educate others.

Ultimately, faculty have to deal with the competing time demands of these many roles and how spending time on these roles limits time for research and other work that is rewarded in tenure and promotion processes. Faculty are conflicted about the relative importance of fulfilling these many roles versus conforming to the norms expected for tenure and promotion. A Latino male argued that, at one level, he would be happy not getting promoted. He questioned:

> as faculty of color, are we somehow charged with a different mission beyond just making associate/full professor? Because I do not think that is enough for me. I do not feel that I have to be a full professor, that I would be happy as an associate professor who is executing what I want to do because I am a faculty member of color and there are different agendas.

In contrast, a Black female colleague stressed the importance of pursuing promotion to full professor. She argued:

> if you want to make a difference in the academy, you need to become a full professor. Because you have leverage at that level that you do not have at another level. You have leverage to do something about those people who are coming and leaving and being told all this stuff.

Faculty did not uniformly report patterns of success in the promotion and tenure of faculty of color in their department or on the campus. However,

one Black male administrator who was tenured at the university in the 1970's shared that his college had recently reached a milestone in the tenure of three Black women. Commenting on the milestone for the college and the importance of this decision, "…which is a milestone, given that there hadn't been a minority faculty tenured [in this department] since I was tenured, and that was back in the late 70's. I mean up through the ranks tenured. I mean, we bring people in tenured, but going up through the ranks tenured." This professor also identified some recent history progress but discussed these successes with mixed emotions recognizing that the particular field has a high number of degree recipients of color and that the college had recruited a number of minorities over the years but they had not been successful in retaining them.

At all three campuses, participants spoke with passion and deep concern about the changes that needed to occur on their campus. In fact they were very willing to share their personal concerns. Many of the stories had similar themes such as providing additional resources and matching funds from the colleges and recruiting top scholars of color. Although the details of their stories differed, the central purpose was the same—to support funding for diversity efforts to enhance the campus. Some participants described efforts by their institutions to evaluate diversity efforts, with one measure being the number of faculty of color who received tenure. Typically, the numbers were low. A representative comment was offered by one of the administrators who noted that, "promotion rates of African-American faculty in the past eight or ten years—the promotion rate has been really dismal. I mean, it's disproportionately bad compared to the other people coming up." At this particular campus the administration has begun to hold people accountable for these numbers. He went on to share that:

> I think the most important thing that we're doing currently is to establish a way of evaluating chairs and deans with respect to how well they've done in changing the composition of their faculty. And we're looking at that very closely and making that a part of their [evaluation process]. So it could conceivably impact the amount of money they get each year, and that's the stick. And some are more aggressive than others, and some, even that doesn't work. You know, even that doesn't work.

Even with accountability measures in place, this administrator noted that diversity was not increasing. On another campus the senior leadership provided ample funding to diversity issues and tied the funding of certain faculty positions to diversity. Essentially the desire is to put some "teeth" behind the diversity initiative on the campus and to make it attractive for people to work with the campuses diversity initiatives.

These types of incentive programs are not unusual and are often cited in the literature (e.g., Kayes, 2006; Smith et al., 2004; Turner et al., 1999). Yet, these efforts are rarely successful in solving the problem. Perhaps some of the most important efforts are those that really create a climate in which faculty members feel that they matter and that their scholarship is valued. One senior administrator shared that on his campus they try to celebrate the arrival of new faculty. Although this is a fairly universal and basic practice, but perhaps what matters is the symbolism and how genuine it is perceived by the faculty:

> at the beginning of each year, we have something that may not seem like an awful lot, but it's a celebration of new faculty, minority faculty. The president comes, provost is there, almost all the senior administrators, and all we—looked at the kind of energy in the room, and usually what everybody talks about when they're up in front of that group is we're delighted to have you here, we hope we can do everything we can to make your stay a first-rate experience. You're welcome here. So it's a lot of symbolic work that's being done, and as you walk around the room and talk with people, you sense that they feel like we've normalized them being a part of the University.

Some faculty were aware of special programs and pools of money on their campus to support the hiring of scholars of color. Generally sponsored by the Provost's office, these programs were given mixed reviews. Several faculty were frustrated with the lack of efforts by departments to utilize resources on campus to recruit candidates of color. Even when departments were successful in using these monies to recruit faculty of color they were still challenged in their ability to retain faculty of color.

Discussion

The results of this study provide a more nuanced understanding of the experiences of faculty of color at public colleges and universities at three public flagship institutions in higher education. Through interviews and focus groups, the findings of this study confirm that some faculty of color perceive an uncomfortable campus climate and suggest that these perceptions are linked to barriers in recruitment and retention. This study builds on prior research describing these barriers (e.g., Tierney & Bensimon, 1996) using the campus racial climate framework first developed by Hurtado, Milem, and Clayton-Pederson (1998) and Chang's (2002) diversity discourse framework. Moreover, unlike other studies, this study also provides insights into the struggles that senior administrators face in achieving equity and diversity among faculty. We recognize that interviews with 33 informants limit our ability to make definitive conclusions across the three campuses. Nonetheless, because many of the informants held senior level positions they had access to institutional data and historical perspectives on the campus. Their expertise and understanding of the campuses efforts with regard to race equity and diversity enhanced the quality of the data we were able to gather. Moreover, these data illustrate, and characterize, the barriers that faculty of color encounter. The qualitative findings amplify quantitative analyses (Perna et al., 2008) and confirm prior research on the experiences of faculty of color (Allen et al., 2000; Bourguignon et al.,1987; Johnsrud & Des Jarlas, 1994; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996).

The analyses show that understanding the recruitment and retention of faculty of color is complex. Once faculty of color are recruited, they are often overburdened with demands on their time from formal work obligations such as advising loads, and formal committee assignments, as well as informal requests to serve on panels, campus projects, and community programs. They are sought out for mentoring by students of color in, and outside, their program. Balancing the demands of research, service, and teaching can be difficult. In many respects these challenges are not unique to faculty of color but are also experienced by majority White faculty. The difference for faculty of color is that the academy often seeks representation of diverse groups on committees which means that faculty of color tend to experience a type of cultural taxation that Tierney and Bensimon (1996) submit work uniquely against them. The comments of the faculty in this study reflect the cultural taxation that

comes from serving on diversity committees, mentoring, and advising large numbers of students.

The findings also illustrate the failure of institutions to uniformly value the research interests of faculty of color. This devaluing may contribute to the lower levels of equity for Blacks and Latinos among full professors than for assistant and associate professors, and for tenured than for tenure track faculty, as described in other research (Perna et al., 2008). The data reveal that professors of color perceive a lack of institutional support for their research interests. Several faculty noted that if they, or their colleagues, are engaged in research on minority issues and/or race related topics, then they are less likely to receive support for tenure and promotion. Other studies also show that minorities believe that their research interests are devalued and often dismissed as self-serving (Bourguignon et al., 1987; Turner & Myers, 2000). A related finding is the conflicting advice that some faculty receive about where to publish their work. These findings are important because faculty of color tend to have fewer individuals who support and understand their work, and fewer outlets for publishing their work in top-tier journals. The extent to which faculty believe that their research is valued and supported is significant to their sense of professional identity and their decision to remain at an institution. On the surface, what may look like a personal decision to leave may be masking subtle, and not so subtle, pressure to find a better "fit" for their intellectual interests.

Finally, the climate for race equity and diversity at the public flagships continues to present challenges to the day to day interactions of faculty of color. While previous scholarship indicates that increasing the compositional diversity of a campus is an important first step in improving campus climate, it cannot be the only step that is taken (e.g., see Hurtado et al., 1998; Hurtado et al., 1999; Milem et al., 2004; Milem et al., 2005). Our analyses suggest that the dominant discourse regarding campus diversity tends to be preservation (Chang, 2002) because the discourse focuses almost exclusively on increasing the numbers of students and faculty of color on the campus. How informants talked about their campuses suggested preservation. They offered statements like, "my department reflects the institution of old…it pays lip service to diversity". These statements were fairly representative. Hence, the transformative aims of diversity are largely ignored, as are the important questions that Chang (2002) asserts are raised as campuses become

increasingly diverse. We see evidence of a discourse of preservation rather than transformation in the reports by faculty of experiences that suggest that diversity initiatives on their campus are not consistently valued, supported, or rewarded at the campus or departmental levels. We see further evidence of the absence of a discourse of transformation in faculty reports that the important work that they do, and the work done by their peers, is not valued or rewarded by their institutions. Similarly the comments of senior administrators reveal a discourse of preservation on the campus. While several administrators noted that there had been some progress over the years in improving the campus climate they continued to face real challenges in diversifying the professoriate. They talked about the difficulty of working with faculty on search committees and described the faculty as resisting change and wanting to conduct business as usual. These comments support the observations made by faculty who faced a number of challenges at the departmental level.

On the other hand, a few informants described their campus as more engaged and innovative in their approach to diversity. This view is best illustrated by the comments of one faculty member who noted, "there is a pretty sophisticated level of discourse about diversity. It is ongoing this conversation about diversity, about social justice, about race, about class". These observations are promising because they suggest that the discourse on diversity on this campus may have included those deeper more meaningful questions posed by Chang (2002). Certainly sustained conversations over time suggest a deepening of the dialogue and a commitment to keep diversity central to mission of the campus. Engaging in a discourse of transformation requires working diligently to offer environments that value the contributions of all faculty and recognize that diversity and excellence must not be separated

Implications for Policy, Practice and Research

With the recent Supreme Court litigation concerning affirmative action in college admissions (i.e., *Gratz et al. v. Bollinger et al., 2003, Grutter v. Bollinger et al.,* 2003) the discourse regarding race equity and diversity at institutions that were operated on a racially segregated basis prior to the 1954 *Brown et al. v. Board of Education* Supreme Court decision has been largely ignored. We hope that the results of this study will help to renew and expand the discourse about race equity and diversity in public higher education, civil rights communities, and public

policy arenas. The results of this study may be used to establish a context for changes that need to occur, as well as to facilitate action by stakeholders who are interested in creating a campus climate that is inclusive and supportive of all faculty.

It is important for campuses to challenge and continually improve their institutional culture on diversity. Diversity initiatives must be part of a larger more comprehensive effort to extend the values of the university to unconditionally recognize that excellence comes with diverse faculty, students and staff. In so doing campuses are more likely to create the kind of campus climate that is attractive to all members of the university especially faculty of color. Genuine efforts in this regard are evidenced in strategic planning documents that reflect a real commitment to diversity though resource allocation and the development of programs.

Universities must increase equity in recruitment of Blacks and Hispanics at PWIs. These campuses must also make conscious decisions to promote equity and diversity in the faculty. Institutions that promote diversity through the implementation of specific interventions such as using non-traditional search processes, ensuring diverse search committees, and having a diverse finalist pool are more likely than other institutions to have a more diverse faculty (Smith, Turner, Osei-Kofi, & Richards, 2004). To improve the recruitment of faculty of color, institutions must break out of the narrow expectation that only certain schools can produce top scholars. In this climate of institutional competition, and quest for prestige, where institutional affiliations translate into higher rankings and greater access to human talent, and fiscal resources, faculty of color with less prestigious affiliations may find greater scrutiny and less access to coveted academic positions. Senior administrators have an important role to play in this process. Despite the challenges they encounter they are often ambassadors for diversity and promoting a campus climate of inclusion. They have opportunities to talk with faculty in the search process to help shape the discourse and they have access to fiscal resources to provide incentives in hiring.

The racial/ethnic composition of faculty is determined not only by hiring practices, but also by retention and promotion. Like other studies (Alex-Assensoh, 2003), the results of this study show that colleges and universities must not only focus on hiring more faculty of color, but also

on addressing the barriers that limit the success of faculty once they are on campus (Alex-Assensoh, 2003). Tierney and Bensimon (1996) recommended that, once faculty of color are hired, they should be treated equitably and guided through the tenure process. Antonio (2003) also recommended that having a diverse student body on the campus contributes to a positive diversity climate and reduces the feelings of isolation that faculty of color sometimes experience. Baez (2000) recommended that institutions review how they classify service in promotion and tenure policies, as part of a reconsideration of their definition of merit.

If we are to achieve the goal of race equity and enhanced racial climate at PWIs, the discourse regarding diversity on these campuses must shift from a discourse of preservation to one of transformation. Institutional leaders must be willing and able to answer the difficult questions that Chang (2002) argues must be answered. Institutions that transform their discourse on diversity will serve as models of excellence. American research universities have always been held in high esteem (Vest, 2007). MIT former President Charles M. Vest identified many factors that he believes contribute to excellence in American higher education. Two factors are worth recapping here because they are supported by our commitment to diversity. He submits that what contributes to our excellence is that:

> We welcome students, scholars, and faculty from other countries. They bring a defining quality of intellectual and cultural richness to our institutions [and]… New assistant professors have the freedom to choose what they teach and the topics of research and scholarship they pursue. They are not subservient or apprenticed to senior professors, so they bring to our institutions a constant flow of new ideas, passions and approaches (Vest, 2007, p.7-8).

These observations are important for leaders in higher education to understand, as they point to the role of human diversity and talent. Those leaders who demonstrate a commitment to diversity are instrumental in moving our campuses forward to serve in an educational context that is increasingly diverse. These leaders must be acknowledged for work that moves an institution to align campus reward structures to support equity and diversity.

Finally, we close with several observations for future research. First, future research should include a wider range of Black and Latino/a faculty who hold different academic rank and tenure status. Future research should also include longitudinal studies to follow faculty members over time to see how their institutional experiences differ from year to year. Third, future research should explore the status of race equity and diversity for other racial/ethnic groups, particularly Native Americans and sub-groups within the Asian/Pacific Islander population. Fourth, we need to continue to learn from senior administrators about the strategies they utilize to help recruit faculty of color and to improve the climate for faculty.

References

Alex-Assensoh, Y. (2003). Race in the academy: Moving beyond diversity and toward the incorporation of faculty of color in predominantly White colleges and universities. *Journal of Black Studies, 34,* 5-11.

Allen, W.R., Epps, E.G., Guillory, E.A., Suh, S.A., & Bonous-Hammarth, M. (2000). The Black academic: Faculty status among African Americans in U.S. higher education. *The Journal of Negro Education,* 69(1/2), 112-127.

Allen, W.R., Epps, E.G., Guillory, E.A., Suh, S.A., Bonous-Hammarth, M., & Stassen, M.L.A. (2002). Outsiders within: Race, gender, and faculty status in U.S. higher education. In W.A. Smith, P.G. Altbach, & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *The racial crisis in American higher education: Continuing challenges for the twenty-first century* (pp. 189-220). Albany, NY: State of New York Press.

Antonio, A.L. (2003, Nov/Dec). Diverse student bodies, diverse faculties. *Academe, 89*(6), 14-17.

Baez, B. (2000). Race-related service and faculty of color: Conceptualizing critical agency in academe. *Higher Education, 39,* 363-391.

Bensimon, E.M., Hao, L., & Bustillos, L.T. (2006). Measuring the state of equity in public higher education. In P. Gándara, G. Orfield, & C.

Horn (Eds.), *Leveraging promise and expanding opportunity in higher education* (pp. 143-164). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Blackwell, J.E. (1996). Faculty issues: The impact on minorities. In C. Turner, M. Garcia, A. Nora, & L. Rendón (Eds.), *Racial and ethnic diversity in higher education-ASHE Reader Series* (pp. 315-326). Needham, MA: Simon and Schuster.

Bourguignon, E., Blanschan, S.A., Chiteji, L., MacLean, K.J., Meckling, S.J., Sagaria, M.A., Shuman, A.E., & Taris, M.T. (1987). *Junior faculty life at Ohio State: Insights on gender and race.* Columbus, OH: Ohio State University, Affirmative Action Grant Program.

Butler-Purry, K. (2006). In search of community: The challenges and successes of an isolated engineer. In C.A. Stanley (Ed.), *Faculty of color: Teaching in predominantly White colleges and universities* (pp. 115-122). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.

Chang, M. (2002). Preservation or transformation: Where's the real educational discourse on diversity? *The Review of Higher Education, 25,* 125-140.

Chronicle of Higher Education. (2005). *Almanac issue 2005-06.* Washington, DC: Author.

Cole, S., & Barber, E. (2003). *Increasing faculty diversity: The occupational choices of high-achieving minority students.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cook, B.J., & Córdova, D.I. (2006). *Minorities in higher education: Twenty-second annual status report.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Gratz et al. v. Bollinger et al., 539 U.S. 244. (2003).

Grutter v. Bollinger et al., 539 U.S. 306. (2003).

Harlow, R. (2003). ''Race doesn't matter, but...'': The effect of race on professors' experiences and emotion management in the

undergraduate classroom. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 66*, 348–363.

Hurtado, S. (2001). Linking diversity and educational purpose: How diversity affects the classroom environment and student development. In G. Orfield & M. Kurlaender (Eds.), *Diversity challenged: Evidence on the impact of affirmative action* (pp. 187-203). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hurtado, S.; Milem, J.F.; & Clayton-Pedersen, A.R. (1998). Enhancing campus climates for racial/ethnic diversity: Educational policy and practice. *Review of Higher Education*, 21, 279-302.

Hurtado, S., Milem, J.F., Clayton-Pedersen, A.R., & Allen, W.R. (1999). *Enacting diverse learning environments: Improving the campus climate for racial/ethnic diversity in higher education* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports Series No. 26-8). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Johnsrud, L.K., & Des Jarlas, C.D. (1994). Barriers to tenure for women and minorities. *Review of Higher Education*, 17, 335-353.

Johnsrud, L., & Sadao, K. (1998). The common experience of "otherness": Ethnic and racial faculty of color. *Review of Higher Education, 21*, 315–342.

Kayes, P.E. (2006). New paradigms for diversifying faculty and staff in higher education: Uncovering cultural biases in the search and hiring process. *Multicultural Education, 14*(2)*,* 65-69.

Merriam, S.B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Milem, J.F., Dey, E.L., & White, C.B. (2004). Diversity considerations in health professions education. In B.D. Smedley, A.S. Butler, & L.R. Bristow (Eds.), *In the nation's compelling interest: Ensuring diversity in the health-care workforce* (pp. 345-389)*.* Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

Milem, J.F., Chang, M.J., & Antonio, A.L. (2005). *Making diversity work on campus: A research based perspective.* Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2007). *Digest of education statistics 2006.* Washington, DC: Author.

Perna, L.W., Fries-Britt, S.L., Gerald, D.S., Rowan-Kenyon, H., & Milem, J.F. (2008). Underrepresentatation in the academy: A study of race equity in three southern states. *Journal of the Professoriate, 3*(1), 5-28.

Reyes, M., & Halcon, J.J. (1988). Racism in academia: The old wolf revisited. *Harvard Educational Review, 58*, 299-314.

Smith, D.G. (1989). *The challenge of diversity: Involvement or alienation in the academy*. Washington, DC: The George Washington University.

Smith, D.G., Wolf, L.E., & Busenberg, B.E. (1996). *Achieving faculty diversity: Debunking the myths*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Smith, D.G., Turner, C.S., Osei-Kofi, N., & Richards, S. (2004). Interrupting the usual: Successful strategies for hiring diverse faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education, 75*, 133-160.

Smith, E., & Witt, S.L. (1993). A comparative study of occupational stress among African American and White university faculty: A research note. *Research in Higher Education, 32,* 229-241.

Stanley, C.A. (2006a). Coloring the academic landscape: Faculty of color breaking the silence in predominantly White colleges and universities. *American Educational Research Journal, 43,* 701-736.

Stanley, C.A. (Ed.) (2006b). *Faculty of color: Teaching in predominantly white colleges and universities.* Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.

Stanley, C.A., & Lincoln, Y.S. (2005). Cross-race faculty mentoring. *Change, 37*(2), 44-50.

Tierney, W.G., & Bensimon, E.M. (1996). *Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Turner, C.S., & Meyers, S.L. (2000). Snapshots from literature: Elements influencing the workplace environment. In C.S. Turner, A.L. Antonio, M. Garcia, B.V. Laden, A. Nora, & C. Presley (Eds.), *Racial and ethnic diversity in higher education, ASHE Reader Series* (pp. 222-247). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Turner, C.S., Meyers, S.L., & Creswell, J.W. (1999). Exploring underrepresentation: The case of faculty of color in the midwest. *The Journal of Higher Education, 70,* 27-59.

Umbach, P.D. (2006). The contribution of faculty of color to undergraduate education. *Research in Higher Education, 47*(3), 317-345.

Vest, M.V. (2007). *The American research university from World War II to world wide web*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Villalpando, O., & Bernal, D.D. (2002). A critical race theory analysis of barriers that impede the success of faculty of color. In W.A. Smith, P.G. Altbach, & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *The racial crisis in American higher education: Continuing challenges for the twenty-first century* (pp. 243-269). Albany, NY: State of New York Press.

Williams, J.B. (1997). *Race discrimination in public higher education: Interpreting civil rights enforcement, 1964-1996*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Yin, R.K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.