Sample Annotation of Literature: Why is faculty diversity important?


Here, Alger argues that true inclusion goes beyond the admissions process. He highlights the different definitions of diversity and inclusion in Europe and the United States by looking at the ways universities build pathways of access and opportunity and create inclusive campus climates. Alger recommends centralized services for providing faculty support in addition to student support programs such as JMU’s D.E.E.P. Impact.


Dezsö and Ross find that top management teams with higher female representation tend to have improved firm performance, but only to the extent that a firm’s strategy is focused on innovation. Though women account for over a third of managers in the United States, they still remain largely underrepresented at the top of corporate hierarchies. The authors observe that female representation is also economically significant.


Results from the National Academy of Sciences Rankings of U.S. Research Universities show that a program’s diversity is positively associated with departmental rankings. Using this data, Henderson & Herring discuss the implications of these findings in reference to diversity in higher education. They point out that past studies have focused on diversity's benefits for a university’s students, but find that critical diversity “produced positive outcomes over homogeneity” for research institutions because “growth and innovation depend on people from various backgrounds working together and capitalizing on their differences (309). Program rankings are higher in research institutions with higher rates of diversity—meaning that diversity benefits students’ experiences in addition to the university’s standing and accomplishments.


Wiggins-Romesburg and Githens write about the psychological component of bias and discrimination that leads to resistance to unlearn and re-learn. They call this “diversity resistance,” or the “dynamic interplay of individual and collective behavior, with individual resistance rooted in unconscious motivation and organizational resistance rooted in the collective behavior of individuals” (180). While most institutions try to help diversity efforts through
training initiatives, this article argues that most diversity resistance occurs at individual levels, but organizations can and do resist diversity implementations. The authors recommend action-oriented approaches that include advocating for employee-driven and stakeholder-driven changes, affinity groups, and informal activist groups, which lead to higher attainment of policy changes and practices.

Best practices for underrepresented faculty retention and support


Boutte and Jackson write of a disconnection between the theoretical and actual support from white colleagues to become better allies in the creation of an inclusive culture. They write on how the absence of allies adversely affects minority colleagues at the institutions where they work. The authors observed that better-informed alliances culturally and linguistically improve the diversity environment for students who often suffer from colorblind universalist-policies that avoid addressing institutional issues. The authors make suggestions for how white allies can better support faculty of color if they become familiar with academic literatures on the topic, understand how racism is codified in policies and practices, be willing to unlearn and re-learn, and remember that silence is not an option if one wishes to be an ally.


Smith’s chapter adopts the rise in technology-use as an example of a factor that, like diversity, greatly affects higher education and represents a widespread change in its environment. He tracks the historical usage of diversity efforts, beginning with the prevalent 1960s and 1970s’ belief that by simply allowing students of color through its doors, an institution could remedy minority exclusion. Tracking the conversation through the 1970s-1980s, the author highlighted “the ways in which colleges and universities were and were not prepared to educate diverse students of color for success.” With this background history in mind, the author tackles the present issue of purely performative diversity efforts (53). He ultimately posits that the ways diversity is framed is critical to its sustainability and centrality within the university.

Best practices for supporting underrepresented faculty in their path to tenure and promotion


Asai addresses university diversity efforts that lack inclusion, which he argues “is an empty gesture.” He references colleagues’ responses at a multicultural forum where faculty of color felt that they constantly needed to justify their presence in the academy and were “constantly on guard to survive in an environment” not created with them in mind. Asai praises the Howard Hughes Medical Institute’s graduate fellowship program for its aim to increase diversity amongst scientific leaders while requiring thesis advisors to practice “communicating across cultures.”
Flaherty, Colleen. "Does Faculty Diversity Need Targets?" *Inside Higher Ed, 2015.*

Flaherty discusses the strategies Brown University intends to implement after promising to double its underrepresented minority faculty by 2025. Brown’s vice president for academic development, Liza Cariaga-Lo, stated that one method is by “creating a new postdoctoral fellowship program,” where post-docs are invited to work closely with Brown faculty for two years, as well as a young scholars’ program where outside graduate students will also be invited in to work with faculty. Lastly, Cariaga-Lo says that her office will be monitoring independent departments’ diversity action plans as a way of inviting and retaining faculty of diverse backgrounds.


Krupnick uses his interview with Ebony McGee, an associate professor at Vanderbilt University, to explain why Public White Institutions (PWIs) do find it difficult to retain underrepresented faculty members. According to Ebony McGee, as Krupnick reported, Black faculty are often hired as “eye candy.” These faculty members of color become uncomfortable and, eventually, their retention become problematic at PWIs. Black tenure-track faculty and university instructors are disproportionately clustered at historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), despite those schools representing just 1.7% of all faculty nationwide. PWIs’ promise to expand diversity efforts, Krupnick reports, still have made little to no progress in increasing their faculty diversity, and retention is where they typically fail. He points out that research has shown nonwhite students are more likely to succeed in college when they are taught by nonwhite professors. The proportion of annual faculty hires who are Black has actually decreased over the past few years; about 5% of faculty nationwide are Black, compared to 12% of underrepresented students. Krupnick’s essay is a call to increase and retain underrepresented faculty at PWIs.

University of Michigan. “Case Study Exercise on Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion in Higher Education.” *National Center for Institutional Diversity.*

This case study evaluates the disambiguity found in many higher education institutions’ diversity statements. The study finds that usually institutional leaders extend only a fraction of opportunities they are able to provide—based on localized determination of risk-reward, which is calculated on factors such as state political climate, economic climate, demographic trends, and the geographic region in which the issues and context are situated (Michigan, 6). The Center for Institutional Diversity at the University of Michigan, as a case study, suggests that those in positions of leadership and equity be granted the resources needed to provide greater accountability, rather than relying on hiring people with good intentions without providing them with the tools necessary to create change in their institutions.
Best practices for retaining and supporting students from underrepresented populations


Asikainen addresses recruitment practices for and by minority students who aim to attract incoming students to a network of other represented groups. Such organizations foster community for students of different cultures and work to combat the belief that students are trying to self-segregate. Cultural organizations do emphasize that they are open to all students, even those who do not identify as part of the group’s target culture, yet org leaders have trouble attracting attention from outsiders. Organizations like the Black Student Alliance and the Asian American Student Association often prioritize creating inclusive communities where minority students feel welcome and are an integral part in minority student support in universities.


Berrey’s article tracks the use of “diversity” in higher education, arguing that the push for diversity “entails, at once, a focus on race and a shift away from race,” mainly because diversity programs use race as a model but rely on an expansive definition of diversity that “includes multiple categories of identity and difference” (577). She raises concerns about the institutional trivialization of inclusion and the ways in which diversity programs can give the impression that change is occurring when no real changes have been made.


Chang analyzes the ways in which overlooking diversity-related campus initiatives may actually contribute to preserving the system that university-advocates want to transform. A discourse of transformation, rather than preservation, he argues, creates greater possibility for “student learning and for meaningful and sustained democratic change” (126).


Morris and Staggenborg aim to expand explanations of issues in social movement theory by focusing on leadership roles. They review existing approaches to leadership in social movements and their social composition, pointing out that different leaders “come out of different types of preexisting organizational structures” (173). Social movements are the ultimate agents and actors in social movements. The authors observed that leadership roles are critical to the success of any social activities.
Implicit biases are not permanent, writes Zaretta, and can be malleable and changed. She highlights common “solutions” that often do not work. These include whole staff diversity training, which does not typically address structural racialization or change deep-rooted, unconscious beliefs. “The race talk” or cross-race dialogue, which places a disproportionate burden on people of color, is also not useful. Instead, Zaretta suggest three conditions for individuals to work on in an effort to reducing and removing biases. 1) She acknowledges that people harbor unconscious biases and are motivated to change, 2) paying attention to triggers and knowing when stereotypical responses or assumptions are activated, and 3) making time to practice new strategies designed to “break” automatic associations that link negative judgement to behavior that is culturally different from one’s own. After these conditions are in place, de-biasing requires re-association, refuting stereotypes, taking on the other person’s perspective, and increasing opportunity for positive contact.