

TO: Vice President Theotis Robinson
Office of Equity & Diversity
University of Tennessee System

FM: Damon A. Williams, PhD 
Center for Strategic Diversity Leadership & Change Inc (CSDLC)

DT: July 2011

RE: Post-Visit Summary Recommendations

In recent years, higher education diversity planning has become more grounded in organizational learning, change management, and strategic planning as the nascent field of strategic diversity leadership has evolved in higher education and every other sector of organizational life.¹ While early campus diversity plans were developed in isolation from the rest of the institution and then grafted to discrete areas such as student services or admissions, there has been a growing realization that in order to be successful, diversity policies need to be both responsive to and harmonious with their institutional contexts. They must be infused throughout the organization and led with a keen focus on accomplishing change.

After years of less-than-optimal diversity plans, it has become apparent that success in diversity programs will be less determined by our knowledge and understanding of diversity and more by the quality of our contributions to the advancement of institutional diversity agendas. This is what is required to move the diversity agenda through our institutions. The following recommendations emerge from this perspective, numerous conversations with the Vice President of Equity and Diversity, review of diversity planning documents, and time spent at the University of Tennessee (UT) System in Knoxville, TN, May 2–4. More specifically, during my May visit at UT, I met with several groups, including President Joe DiPietro; Special Assistant to the UT-Knoxville Chancellor, Ms. Rita Geier; members of the Diversity Advisory Council; the UT system chancellors; UT diversity officers; and others.

In most instances, these meetings allowed me to ask critical questions, learn more about UT's diversity context, and share stories about diversity challenges, opportunities, and realities locally and nationally. They also allowed me to provide some sense of national best practices, although the majority of our time was spent more in exchange than in an actual presentation of promising practices, an approach that I found to be much more dynamic, engaging, and hopefully valuable to session participants.

Exhibit 1 outlines several recommendations that I offer in regard to (1) framing diversity and rationale, (2) institutional planning and implementation, (3) diversity reporting and

¹Clayton-Pederson, A. Parker, S., Smith, D., Moreno, J., and Teraguchi, D., (2007). *Making a real difference with diversity*. Washington, DC: The Association of American Colleges and Universities. Williams, D., Berger, J., McClendon, S. (2005). *Toward a model of inclusive excellence and change in postsecondary institutions*. Washington, DC: The Association of American Colleges and Universities.

accountability, (4) diversity infrastructure and coordination, and (5) faculty diversification. These recommendations provide another tool to help in your continuing discussion and implementation activities moving forward. I have included specific recommendations on faculty diversification that capture many of the promising techniques in this area.

UT Diversity Recommendations Overview

Exhibit 1. UT Diversity Recommendations

Dimension	Recommendations
Framework Philosophy & Rationale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Develop a UT educational diversity statement •Get formal buy-in for the UT diversity statement •Broaden the scope of your current diversity goals to include the educational benefits of diversity
Institutional Planning & Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Develop an institutional diversity planning and implementation process for the campuses to follow •Develop a five- or ten-year diversity strategy •Establish a diversity innovation grant fund •Develop an annual UT system diversity forum event
Diversity Reporting & Accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Develop a strategic diversity leadership scorecard •Give a presidential diversity report to the Board of Trustees •Request a diversity accountability report from every chancellor in the UT system
Diversity Infrastructure & Coordination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Expand the membership of the DAC •Examine the capacity needs of the Vice President for Equity & Diversity
Faculty Diversification Strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Big-picture strategic actions •Enhance search process

Framework Philosophy & Rationale

Develop a UT diversity statement of philosophy and purpose. The rationale for embracing diversity as a core commitment is evolving. Early models of diversity were based primarily on social justice arguments in which ensuring a college education for targeted minorities was grounded primarily in atoning for past injustices. While this remains a critical reason for striving to broaden access to higher education, another rationale has emerged that is powered by the courts² – and, more essentially, by changes in the world. Indeed, our success in the global knowledge economy is founded on our ability to educate an ethnic and racially diverse workforce, a point that becomes ever more important as the white Baby Boomer population ages and minority communities grow in size and proportion within the nation and the state. If harnessed, these demographic shifts can bring economic and competitive advantages to the State of Tennessee, just as they can elsewhere. In this evolving paradigm, diversity is defined both *as an end*, in terms of increasing the compositional diversity of our students, faculty, and staff, and, perhaps even more importantly, *as a means of fulfilling* our institutional mission to drive

²Gratz v. Bollinger. 2003. 539 U.S. 244 & Grutter v. Bollinger. 2003. 539 U.S. 306.

learning, enrich scholarship, and serve the men and women of the State of Tennessee as well as the world.

The Diversity Advisory Council, with close support from the Office of General Counsel, should write an “educational benefit of diversity philosophy statement” that creates the rationale for why diversity is a *compelling educational interest* for the UT system. This statement might define diversity, express the key goals of your framework, provide a social scientific rationale for how diversity benefits all students at UT, and outline key terminology like “historically underrepresented minority,” “faculty diversity,” etc. With the changing demographics of student populations and the predicted emergence by 2060 of a “minority majority” country, faculty and staff on university and college campuses must reflect the increasingly diverse nature of the United States population; homogeneity is not an alternative.

A number of important rationales underscore the need for the hiring and retention of diverse and talented faculty, staff, and administrators and for admitting a diverse student body. This argument would be driven by the University of Michigan’s Supreme Court case rationale, national research on the educational benefits of diverse interactions, the need to prepare a diverse and educated citizenry in the economic interest of the State, data on persistent societal and educational inequities, the mission of the University of Tennessee, the historical commitment of UT to issues of diversity and equity, UT’s social scientific data on the educational benefits of diverse interactions in the curriculum and co-curriculum, if it exists, and other information.

Get formal buy-in for the UT Diversity/Vision Statement. It is also recommended that this statement be formally endorsed by UT governance leaders (faculty senates, faculty councils, deans, boards of trustees, etc.) as a way of insuring buy-in and establishing a formal rationale that can be called upon as a formal expression of the institution’s belief in diversity as a compelling educational interest. The more that it is formally endorsed by the campus communities, the more empowered this statement becomes as part of a shared covenant that expresses diversity’s importance across the UT System. Another benefit of having this statement and endorsing it broadly is that it provides an institutional rationale that could be formally used in a court of law as an expression of the institution’s intentionality and strategic focus on matters of diversity.

Broaden the scope of your current diversity goals to include the educational benefits of diversity. Expand the scope of the diversity framework to specifically include an “educational benefits of diversity goal” as a major priority. This goal would complement traditional demographic goals, such as increasing the ethnic and racial diversity of the faculty, staff, and student bodies, and be consistent with the aspirational goal of establishing the University of Tennessee as a “*Top 25 University*.” This expanded goal structure would further support the diversity philosophy statement and create a 21st-century strategic goal structure that would embrace not only traditional issues of access and equity, but also more contemporary diversity discussions that focus on preparing all students for a diverse and global world. The presence of both contemporary and historic diversity goals is a hallmark of 21st-century diversity plans and is essential to creating the type of educated citizenry that we require in all aspects of society.

While your current framework discusses the educational benefits of diversity, it does not specifically create a context that would allow global experiences, community service learning, living/learning communities, intergroup dialogue programs, general education diversity requirements, or other potential tactics to emerge as priorities of your current framework.

Institutional Planning & Implementation

Develop an institutional diversity planning and implementation process for the campuses to follow. The Diversity Advisory Council (DAC) should develop an institutional diversity planning and implementation framework that would leverage their expanded diversity goals and philosophy statement. DAC should also help each campus and institution write a unique diversity plan that would reflect its own institutional reality and infrastructure while aligning them to drive the overall UT vision for diversity. This process would allow for creativity and freedom at the campus levels while insuring that everyone is focused on advancing the same big-picture diversity agenda.

Some recommendations for the planning and implementation process might include developing: (1) recommendations for the types of roles to be included on each institutional planning committee (e.g., chancellor's chief of staff, diversity officer, institutional researcher, faculty diversity champion, institutional budget officer, student leader, etc.); (2) an overview of the big-picture diversity goals of the UT system, indicators, and recommendations for best practices for accomplishing each diversity goal; (3) requirements for institutional accountability (e.g., VCs, deans, E&D directors, and other stakeholders on diversity to each chancellor as part of their annual reports); (4) a timeline for planning/implementation; (5) a major retreat/training session on diversity planning and implementation for each campus and institutional planning committee; (6) a request that each chancellor, institutional vice president, and planning chair present their plan to the DAC for review as the charged voice of the president; (7) a diversity planning and implementation binder, (8) an electronic diversity plan submission system; (9) diversity planning and implementation resource guides for committees; and (10) diversity consultation resources for each campus. Timelines to complete this work will need to be developed as well.

Evaluate the merits of creating a five-year versus a ten-year diversity strategy. As part of the work to prepare for launching UT's ultimate plan, the DAC and senior leadership should evaluate the merits of creating a five- or ten-year strategic diversity planning and implementation process. While no empirical study has ever evaluated these plans comparatively, both plans have merits that should be considered. The five-year plan allows for a reasonable amount of time to transpire and for some implementation outcomes to be understood in three or four years. Nevertheless, when the goal is to enhance not only representation, but outcomes and learning, five years is too brief a period. The challenges of diversity are deep and systemic and may require alliances with K-12 school systems, long-term relationship building, new alliances with the corporate community, and engaging in important institutional conversations about pedagogy and educational values – all themes that take time to develop and implement.

Ten-year plans are more consistent with the limited literature that we have on institutional transformation³ and present an opportunity to engage deeply in a more longitudinal change project that focuses on powerfully moving the UT diversity agenda over time. As we have learned in two ten-year diversity-planning efforts at the University of Wisconsin, ten-year plans represent a deep investment and commitment of energy and focus to a long-term trajectory that is not easily interrupted. At the same time, they may lead to diversity fatigue as the weight of a ten-year strategy can become difficult to maintain over time as administrations come and go, new priorities emerge, and commitment to issues of diversity and equity, while important, does not always enjoy the level of priority that it should.

Establish a diversity innovation grant fund to drive involvement and implementation. One of the greatest challenges to gaining buy-in from the campus communities for diversity is the lack of material incentives to drive engagement and implementation. One technique for getting buy-in is the establishment of competitive grants for which offices and units across the various campuses might apply to help drive their institutional diversity goals. The DAC could evaluate the merits of competing proposals intended to create new energy on campuses. While these resources would need to be paralleled by campus resources (made available by chancellors), this is one technique for attracting engagement from the campus communities and making diversity efforts more than “another unfunded mandate.”

The UT system office should host an annual University of Tennessee diversity forum event. This event would allow each institution to highlight their current accomplishments, describe new initiatives, and engage one another in conversations about best practices and common challenges. It would also provide an annual space for the president of the UT system and other leaders to give a big-picture vision for where the institution is on issues of diversity. It also presents an opportunity to engage diversity planning committees and others in workshops and sessions around successful diversity techniques and practices.

Diversity Reporting & Accountability

Develop a strategic diversity leadership scorecard.⁴ The UT system should develop a strategic diversity leadership scorecard across the various dimensions of its diversity goals’ framework. Exhibit 1 presents a sample of potential data indicators as well as guidance for ways that campus leaders may want to disaggregate their information. These indicators should align to the big-picture diversity goals of the system and inevitably might include a focus on the demographic composition and success of the students, faculty, and staff, disaggregated by race and ethnicity, gender, and students’ first-generation educational status (Exhibit 2). These cuts of the data will provide relevant stakeholders with a perspective of institutional diversity at each of the institutions and, overall, across the system.

³Simsek H. and Louis, K. S. (1994). “Organizational change as paradigm shift: Analysis of the change process in a large, public university,” *Journal of Higher Education*, 65(6), 670–695.

⁴We talk about strategic diversity leadership scorecards extensively in my forthcoming book, *A Matter of Excellence: Strategic Diversity Leadership in the Academy*, with Dr. Katrina Wade Golden of the University of Michigan. Expected fall 2011 and published by Stylus Publishing Press. Some other wonderful treatments of similar topics take place in Bauman, G., Bustillos, L., Bensimon, E., Brown, M., and Bartee, R.D. (2005). *Achieving equitable outcomes with all students: The institution’s roles and responsibilities*. Washington, DC: The Association of American Colleges and Universities. Milem, J., Chang, M., and Antonio, A. (2006). *Making diversity work on campus: A research-based perspective*. Washington, DC: The Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Exhibit 2. Potential UT System Diversity Data Indicators

Dimension		Guidance ⁵	Sample Dashboard Indicators
Access & Equity	Students	Disaggregate by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Race/Ethnicity •Historically Underrepresented Minority Status •Gender •First-Generation Status •Nationality 	<u>Undergraduate</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Undergraduate population/degree recipients •Six-year graduation rate •Four-year graduation rate •First-year retention rate •Average unmet financial aid •Community college transfers •National Merit finalists <u>Graduate</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Graduate/professional student population/degree recipients •Five- and ten-year trend lines
	Faculty	Disaggregate by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Race/Ethnicity •Historically Underrepresented Minority Status •Gender 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Number of ladder faculty by academic rank •Number of full professors •Time to tenure •Percent successfully promoting to tenure •Five-, ten-, twenty-year trend line
	Staff	Disaggregate by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Race/Ethnicity •Historically Underrepresented Minority Status •Gender 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Number of staff by rank •Chancellors/VP-level executives • Five-, ten-, twenty-year trend line

If your ultimate diversity framework and goals include a focus on campus climate and preparing students for a diverse and global world (an educational benefit of diversity goals), you should also create a series of indicators for these data as well. While reporting on these goals is not as easy as reporting on goals in the access and equity dimension, it is critically important and possible. For example, some campuses may have certain types of experiences or courses tagged in their data systems – like participation in study abroad, service learning, or campus dialogue programs – as proxy measures of engagement with the types of learning opportunities that will prepare students to leverage the educational benefits of diversity. By examining the percentage of students that participate in these types of experiences, one can get a sense of the level of student engagement with these critical educational opportunities to acquire the ability to take the position of the other, engage with empathy, etc.

⁵These data might be analyzed at the institutional and the cross-campus UT System levels allowing for understanding at multiple levels of institutional/organizational life.

More than likely, these dimensions of your final strategic diversity leadership scorecard should be captured using a confluence of data that might come from institutional databases, secondary analyses of campus participation in national research projects (e.g., National Survey of Student Engagement [NSSE], Committee on Institutional Cooperation Project [CIRP], etc.), and structured projects implemented to capture various types of data; for example, a common campus climate survey for faculty/staff, or a student experience survey implemented to capture a number of elements of data. Indeed, one proxy indicator at the system level is the degree to which each institution has a general education diversity requirement as part of its formal curriculum. The presence of a three- or six-hour requirement is the only way that students are assured of having some type of exposure to diversity-themed educational issues. Although the quality and learning goals of these requirements can vary greatly when viewed across numerous institutions, they represent a potentially powerful way of preparing students.

Establish a formal presidential diversity report to the Board of Trustees. The UT president should provide an annual state of diversity report to the board in the form of a presidential report on diversity. This report would highlight your strategic diversity scorecard dimensions and successes, as well as a description of tactical actions being put in place to drive implementation of UT diversity goals. This report would form one component of UT's diversity accountability framework. Another aspect of accountability might include having each chancellor report on diversity annually in a report that would be reviewed by the DAC or a third-party group of diversity experts. This report might be received, commented upon by the DAC, or scored in some way using a rubric of analyses, thereby creating an even more rigorous performance management accountability process.

Diversity Infrastructure & Coordination

Expand the membership of the DAC. Shared leadership and ownership are critical to moving any change agenda forward. Indeed, I have often found that the process of collegial leadership is just as important, if not more important than, the product, particularly when attempting to move the campus diversity agenda forward. Hence, I recommend expanding the membership of the Diversity Action Council (DAC) to include more faculty, students, and administrative leaders. While the current constitution of the committee is strong, more perspectives may not only strengthen the material plans of the committee but also insure a greater degree of buy-in for whatever implementation process the DAC may ultimately propose.

Some recommendations for inclusion are (1) leaders from the UT system faculty governance community; (2) diverse student leaders; (3) faculty with particular scholarly expertise on issues of diversity in the academy, including legal perspectives; (4) faculty with particular expertise on issues of strategic planning and organizational change; and (5) diversity champions who may encourage strategic thinking around issues of diversity defined in terms not only of race and ethnicity but also gender, sexuality, and nationality, to name a few dimensions of diversity that you may want to include in your framing discussions. The committee might also benefit from having at least one more diversity officer engaged in the planning process as well.

Examine capacity needs of the Office of the Vice President for Equity and Diversity (OED). While I did not engage in an intensive review of the Office of the Vice President of Equity and Diversity (OED), I have concerns about whether OED's current human resource capacity (2 FTE) and budget would prove sufficient to provide the type of integrative leadership required to assist with a multi-campus diversity planning and implementation process.

Parallel diversity offices at the University of Wisconsin (UW), the Minnesota State System of Colleges and Universities (MNSCU), the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education (PASSHE), the University of Oregon, the State University of New York (SUNY), and numerous others have greater capacity both in terms of human resources and formal budget authority. While I have no basis for a specific recommendation for an increase in capacity, I offer this observation for consideration as you move forward with your efforts and balance the numerous fiscal responsibilities that must be juggled in these very difficult economic times.

Faculty Diversification Strategies

The recruitment and retention of faculty of color remains one of the most difficult challenges facing American higher education. A proactive stance toward solutions and strategies is crucial if change is to result. Too often, departments and search committees assume they can simply place a job advertisement, sit back, and wait to see which applicants emerge.⁶ It is almost as if we believe that actively pursuing candidates will somehow undermine the dignity of the department and the process. One of the things that research has shown time and again is that passivity will result in neither a diverse pool of applicants nor a diverse hire.

If we are to build outstanding departments, we need to take a page from competitive athletics and the world of business and aggressively pursue the best and the brightest candidates wherever we can find them. Effective recruitment takes many forms and will depend on the context, but it begins with a department and search committees that have a clear understanding of the most promising practices. At the institution, school/college, and department level, leaders have to become aggressive if they want to diversify their faculties (Exhibit 3).

Exhibit 3. How to Diversify the Faculty – Some Best Practices

These best practices are a first step to thinking outside the box and developing innovative retention practices:

- Hiring diverse faculty starts with cultivation from a visiting dissertation scholars-in-residence program to non-majority speakers in every lecture and seminar series.
- Departments must move beyond the “self-fulfilling myths” about the difficulty of hiring

⁶Please see the following for more information on faculty diversification challenges and techniques: Dowdall, J. (2005). Courting elusive candidates. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. 51(23). Retrieved on October 1, 2009, from <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v51/i23/23c00201.htm>. Moody, J. (2004). *Faculty diversity: Problems and solutions*. New York: Routledge Press. Olson, G. A. (2007). Don't just search, recruit. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. 53(8). Retrieved on January 23, 2008, from <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v53/i38/38c00101.htm>. Smith, D. G., Turner, C. S. V., Osei-Kofi, N., & Richards, S. (2004). Interrupting the usual: Successful strategies for diversifying the faculty. *Journal of Higher Education*, 75(2). Turner, C. S. V., & Myers, Jr., S. L. (1999). *Faculty of color in academe: Bittersweet success*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

underrepresented faculty and approach recruitment with rigor and creativity. Effective recruitment requires an explicit commitment, diligence, and innovation.

- Recruit year-round. Dedicate departmental specialists to the task.
- Reflect diversity in all search committees.
- Send personal letters to high-potential candidates and make follow-up phone calls to entice them into the applicant pool.
- Develop a dedicated website for faculty positions that specifically addresses issues of diversity, sells the department, and provides tools to entice candidates.
- Bring potential faculty members as speakers and visiting scholars. Consider all speaking events and programs as areas for cultivation.
- Draw on campus resources. Have staff and search committees receive coaching from the Chief Diversity Officer or Provost.
- Send representatives to diversity-themed conferences and events to connect with potential applicants and create awareness of opportunities.
- Promote transparency through ongoing monitoring and accountability during recruitment and negotiations.
- Marketing makes a difference. Detailed language in job ads should emphasize the desire for diversity.
- Get everyone on board. Commit time, money, and staff support to diversify the faculty.
- Sponsor cluster hiring.
- Address lifestyle concerns of candidates. Once hired, provide housing assistance and partner/spouse hiring support.
- Hire across levels, including senior faculty.
- Department chairs and deans should make the final choice – and be held accountable for advancing faculty diversity.
- Recruit with laser-like focus and discipline.

Big-Picture Strategic Actions

Build 21st-century target of opportunity efforts. Create a new strategy to allow search committees to search outside of normal hiring parameters through a target of opportunity recruitment effort. This strategy moves beyond the reactionary perspective of finding talent only through conventionally authorized open-search processes. Although the program would inevitably need to be optimized, one way to approach this type of program is to provide 50% of the cost of a line for “x” number of years to units/colleges that work through the Office of the Provost at each institution to identify prospects for target-of-opportunity recruitment. While these types of efforts have existed for several years, it may be necessary to articulate the “target of opportunity” more broadly than race and ethnicity to create more legal protection.

At UW-Madison, we identify our targets of opportunity in terms of race and ethnicity, women in STEM, and individuals of all backgrounds with a specific research agenda consistent with our strategic agenda as an institution (e.g., a white male in nursing or a white male with a research agenda focused on issues of racial and ethnic equity). Although the fund places a high priority on racial and ethnic diversity, because of this group’s extreme underrepresentation, it nevertheless does define diversity broadly, embracing numerous diversity outcomes as strategic goals.

Develop a Future Faculty Fellows Institute for high-potential diverse faculty candidates. This academy would be targeted towards diverse faculty candidates during the advanced stages of their graduate and post-doctoral programs. Ideally, it would involve hosting potential candidates one to two years before they entered the job market and remaining in close contact with them, actively recruiting them to pursue opportunities at the University of Tennessee through any pre/post-doctoral fellowships, open positions, and the target of opportunity resource pool identified here. The academy would focus on professional development regarding the vital preparation/interview process in a low-stress environment, relationship building with potential faculty both in the department and across campus, and exposure to the various UT campuses and surrounding communities. This event would be for the best of the best and involve senior leadership, academic leaders, community members, and others in an effort to position UT institutional possibilities.

UT-Knoxville has a future faculty institute initiative underway that will launch in 2011. Although each institution is different, it may be important for others to learn from the UT-Knoxville model and even consider the merits of potential collaboration across institutions. Because each campus may have a slightly different faculty profile, sharing lessons learned, contacts, and names may lend itself to greater diversity across the entire UT system.

Establish a diversity community liaison database of individuals that would help with recruiting prospective faculty and/or spousal hires to join various University of Tennessee institutions. This community liaison bank would inevitably include membership from several civic organizations like the Urban League, Black churches, NAACP, Latino community organizations, and others, as well as corporate leaders interested in becoming involved with the university and assisting in developing a diverse faculty at each institution.

Improve search process tactics

- Develop a specific diversity faculty recruitment strategy tailored to the unique professional development trajectories of talent emerging in the humanities, social sciences/professional schools, and the STEM/health science areas. Each of these areas has different expectations with respect to when talent is “ready” for a tenure-track faculty role at each of the UT institutions. A tailored strategy would allow each institution to build outreach and pipeline initiatives in line with this reality. Further, this refined strategy would capitalize upon the strengths of certain pipeline disciplines (e.g., PhDs in social sciences/education), as well as those schools/colleges/departments with an especially strong commitment and plan to diversify their faculty ranks. Limited resources would be strategically directed in a manner that makes maximal difference in bottom-line hires.
- Often job information is shared as part of regular contact and communication, and those who find out about jobs through these methods are in the best position to have the time and relationships to prepare competitive applications. Conversely, those who are not part of the usual networks of senior faculty and administrators miss out on the advantage this kind of networking and recruiting provides. Thus, departmental policies and practices need to be aimed toward supporting expansion of these networks. Remember, if there is no racial, ethnic, or gender diversity in the candidate pool, it is guaranteed that the new



hire will not reflect these identities either. New policies and practices put into place should recognize that expanding networks must be an ongoing activity, not just something that is done at the time of a search.

- Place advertisements of open positions in journals and periodicals that make special efforts to reach minority faculty and graduate students. There are more than 100 academic journals publishing research of interest to racial and ethnic groups. Do not forget electronic advertising; new positions should be posted on disciplinary electronic discussion lists, especially those likely to be subscribed to by minority faculty and graduate students.
- Send announcements of open positions to targeted faculty members or graduate students at minority-serving institutions, organizations that work on minority issues, affinity groups within organizations such as minority caucuses in national scholarly associations, personal contacts in the field who are likely to know promising graduate students or other potential applicants, faculty at majority white schools granting a substantial number of doctoral degrees to minorities, or at historically black colleges and universities.
- Create and maintain a list of diverse publications, electronic mailing lists, institutions, and resources for outreach. This prevents each search committee from having to regenerate such a list and creates a forum for sharing knowledge and resources.
- Consider adjunct and part-time faculty. Minorities and women are more highly represented in these categories, and thus including such candidates will increase opportunities for a diverse candidate pool. In addition, such candidates may already be teaching the students in your departments and, therefore, bring the benefit of that experience.
- Craft a position description that reflects the full range of skills and knowledge needed. This will lead to a better pool and present a strong argument against claims that race or sex was impermissibly considered in hiring. Departments may consider whether the research interests of a candidate meet the particular research or curricular goals of the institution, program, or department. Thus, if the institution has expressed diversity as part of the definition of academic excellence, it can give positive consideration to candidates' research agendas that enhance understanding of race, ethnicity, gender, multiculturalism, etc. Similarly, curricular initiatives that focus on issues like comparative cultural studies and social justice warrant job descriptions that specify experience and research issues in those areas as preferred qualifications.
- Consider including criteria related to increasing diversity such as demonstrated ability to work with diverse students and colleagues or experience with a variety of teaching methods and/or curricular perspectives. Infusing these criteria into the job description is a way of enhancing the department's potential to attract a diverse applicant pool and eventually make a diverse hire.
- Avoid simply tying the position to immediate teaching needs or to the qualifications or experience of those who have filled the position in the past. While a person may have a particular area of expertise in 20th-century African American literature, he or she may be perfectly capable of teaching courses on 20th-century American literature. Hence, overly rigid definitions of the tasks should be eschewed to avoid framing the job description so narrowly that it discourages anyone other than the ideal candidate from applying. The job description should be framed in a way that will capture what you must have in the



- position but allow for other benefits to bubble up, thus maximizing the potential to attract a diverse applicant pool.
- Include interdisciplinary or interdepartmental work, which creates a broader applicant pool. Creating opportunities for potential faculty to employ a variety of pedagogical techniques and approaches not only is more likely to bring in a greater variety of candidates, but also accommodates a greater variety of students and learning styles.
 - Work with search committees to educate those doing the hiring on the nuances of the issues and legal restraints in this area. Provide guidance to committees about reaching out to the complete pool of qualified applicants, subtle forms of discrimination that can creep into the process, ways to evaluate candidates in a way that values diversity, and what they should and should not say and promise. Be sure to discuss ways to avoid stereotypical assumptions. Often, search committees carry assumptions of which they are not even aware. Such assumptions can be particularly strong in relation to particular disciplines or areas of study. Just as professors do not need to be white to teach Shakespeare, they do not need to be black to teach African American studies.
 - Provide search committees with specific materials about the institution's commitment to diversity and its educational benefits. Make diversity recruitment resources available to search committees and consider creating a school/college/department diversity recruitment document if one does not exist.
 - Consider how your search committees are chosen. Faculty members who are active researchers and attendees at professional conferences are more likely than others to have encountered minority faculty in their areas of study. Because people value and are most comfortable with that with which they are most familiar, search committees are likely to replicate themselves. Therefore, the more diverse the committee, the more diverse the candidates are likely to be. Processes that lead to diverse, active committees go a long way in expanding diversity.
 - Support search committees throughout the process. Dedicated efforts to reach out to diverse candidates take extra time and effort. The support and encouragement of the administration is crucial to keep these efforts going. Such support might include providing resources like funding for travel to conferences that facilitate exposure to more diverse colleges, sponsoring presentations by faculty members who have led diverse searches, providing class buyouts for those spending significant amounts of time on such efforts, etc.
 - Develop a faculty diversity search multimedia educational tool. This tool would be jointly developed among departments and may leverage the department of theater and drama to create faculty diversity vignettes. Also, the Office of Human Resources would be a key player in developing the discussion guide and facilitation guide. The Diversity Office might also play a key role in developing a training program to prepare a group of facilitators who would implement the tool with committees.
 - Develop a system to insure that more than the "choir" uses the new multimedia tool in a number of different ways. Perhaps each campus might develop an online certification process, similar to the institutional resource board, to find a way to creatively and systematically activate the tool. Still another might have deans require that every committee have at least one member who has taken the training and is prepared to serve as the committee's diversity specialist.