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In-Text Citation (Author, Year): (Rose, 2012)

Population/Subjects: adult students

Methods: n/a – published as online essay

Main Findings:
- U.S. educational system was founded on “the general diffusion of knowledge.”
- Adult Americans have traditionally sought education for “intellectual stimulation, social benefit, or occupational advancement.”
- Rose referenced historian Joseph Kett’s work *The Pursuit of Knowledge Under Difficulties* – “each advance in educational opportunity sparks desire for more education.”
- This essay is excerpted from Rose’s book *Back to School: Why Everyone Deserves a Second Chance at Education*, published by The New Press.

Summary statement: Rose’s (2012) call to action is the creation of a true democratization of knowledge – moving past the constraints of the established social order and including everyone in a learning society.
History + Context
Julie Allstrom


In-Text Citation (Author, Year):  (Lane & Brown, 2003)

Population/Subjects:  Postsecondary institutions in U.S.

Methods: n/a – article is expository chapter of publication about postsecondary institutional research

Main Findings:
- Historical perspective since founding of Harvard in 1636 reveals vast changes in student access, educational outcomes and types of organizations offering postsecondary education in U.S.
- Reasons for establishing postsecondary institutions in U.S. defined generally as altruistic or social improvement; defined practically as education of citizenry, development of human capital, promotion of economic wealth.
- Challenges exist in effectively researching diverse institutional types (5 military service academies, 33 tribal colleges, fewer than 200 women’s and black colleges). Similar research challenges mentioned for religious-based and corporate educational institutions.
- Authors predicted future changes to postsecondary educational institutions likely will be caused by technology, entrepreneurship, and international competition.

Summary Statement:  Lane and Brown (2003) pointed out that in considering postsecondary education, researchers cannot assume all are four-year institutions serving a coeducational, predominately white student population. This means a "one size fits all" approach to assessment, evaluation and research cannot be used.
History + Context

Julie Allstrom

Full Citation in APA Format:  http://ahistoryofmason.gmu.edu/index

In-Text Citation (Author, Year): various

Population/Subjects: George Mason University

Methods: George Mason University: A History is a website containing seven exhibits of historical documents, personal papers, oral histories, photos and multimedia artifacts about GMU. It was created as a collaborative effort of GMU Libraries’ Special Collections & Archives Department (SC&A) and GMU Libraries’ Digital Programs and Systems Division (DPS).

Main Findings: The seven exhibits are arranged chronologically and identified as follows:
• 1949-1954: The Idea
• 1954-1958: Terra Incognita
• 1957-1964: The Little Red Schoolhouse
• 1964-1972: Permanence
• 1972-1978: Independence
• 1978-1996: Emergence
• 1996-2012: Prominence

Summary statement: The site calls itself “a collection of essays describing persons, places, organizations, and events in the history of George Mason University… The essays are meant to stimulate interest and provide jump-off points from which more detailed historical research can be conducted.”

In-Text Citation (Author, Year): (Mickelson & Smith, 2010)

Population/Subjects: students in U.S.

Methods: n/a – essay from anthology about the interconnections of race, class, and gender and their effects on social issues and human experiences

Main Findings:
• The authors asserted that inequalities of race, social class, and gender continue to characterize U.S. society.
• Despite 50 years of federal interventions to desegregate schools, most American students attend segregated schools.
• Despite passage of Title IX of the 1972 Higher Education Act, gender differences in educational opportunities have not been eliminated, but at best, narrowed.
• Increased equality of educational opportunity has not led to a corresponding decrease in income inequality.

Summary statement: Mickelson and Smith (2010) argued that inequality cannot be reduced solely by educational reform. They highlighted the importance of education for individuals’ growth and society’s benefit, and concluded, “We must look upon the schools as arenas of struggle against race, gender, and social class inequality.”
History + Context
Julie Allstrom


In-Text Citation (Author, Year): (Siegel, 2006)

Population/Subjects: four professional schools – School of Engineering, School of Social Work, School of Public Health, Business School – within U.S. research university; author assigned pseudonym “Lakewood University”

Methods: comparative case study analysis; 47 semi-structured interviews

Main Findings:

- Role of external pressures on institutions of higher education regarding responses to diversity is not well documented.
- Author suggested integration of institutional theory and resource dependency theory may provide useful framework for ongoing research.
- Each of four professional schools had markedly different issues in response to diversity.
- Each school’s responses to diversity were influenced and rewarded by different external stakeholders.
- Respondents tended to credit diversity responses to internal institutional motivations, despite evidence of external pressures and incentives.

Summary statement: Siegel (2006) proposed that a strong market rationale or business case for diversity in postsecondary educational institutions has emerged, perhaps as a stronger influence now than that of civil rights and social justice arguments. Further, he asserted that future systemic change (at the University level) will likely be complicated and difficult to evaluate because of the external forces on decentralized units (the four schools and smaller departmental components).
Breaking the Silence: Achieving a Positive Campus Climate for Diversity from the Staff Perspective

This study is interested in dimensions of the campus climate that are related to issues of diversity as perceived and experienced by university staff members

Method
- Survey instrument adapted from a diversity climate survey that was developed at the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA
- The survey questions continue to hold internal validity
- Potential determinants of the staffs’ perception: personal demographics, professional characteristics, department structural diversity, perception of department climate for diversity, perception of institution’s commitment to diversity and personal experience with diversity

Population/Subjects:
- 1029 staff members randomly selected from a population of 2202 at a large predominately Midwestern public University
- 437 returned useable surveys

Main findings:
- Staff members who perceived their local unit to be non-sexist, non-racist, and non-homophobic were consistently more likely to perceive that their community had achieved a positive climate for diversity
- Results indicate that there are important demographic differences amongst the views of postsecondary staff members at the institution examined
- Staff of color, compared to white staff, have more negative perceptions of the campus community’s success in achieving a positive climate for diversity

Summary Statement:
In their study of Issues of diversity as perceived and experienced by university staff members, Mayhew and Grunwald and Dey found that the perception of diversity within the local units of the staff and in relation to the institution as a whole differed in perception from one staff member to another under the basis of race and/or gender (amongst many other factors).
Learning about Social Diversity: The Undergraduate Experience and Intergroup Tolerance

This research was designed to study changes in intergroup tolerance over a single semester of undergraduate education.

**Method:**
- Quantitative research
- Random selection of undergraduate students of University of Michigan
- Questionnaires were mailed to students’ homes at the beginning and end of winter semester 1995
- A feeling thermometer was also used to measure the respondents’ feelings towards different social groups
- First questionnaire included demographic questions while the second also asked the students to list campus groups and organizations they participated in during the semester

**Population/Subjects:**
- Participants were undergraduate students at the University of Michigan
- First wave of student had 599 respondents
- First and second wave completion produced a total of 385 respondents

**Main findings:**
1. In general, students’ positive feelings toward other groups decline across the semester
2. Courses that focus on human diversity may have limited potential in enhancing positive feelings about social groups
3. Student affiliation with diversity-related campus organizations can have similar effects on intergroup relations

**Your Summary Statement:**
In their study of Undergraduate Experience and Intergroup tolerance, Henderson-king and Kaleta found that unlike was is commonly thought, human diversity courses does not increase intergroup tolerance. Intergroup tolerance declines over the semester and students’ affiliation with diversity-related campus groups does not necessarily enhance intergroup relations
Breaking the Segregation Cycle: Examining Students’ Precollege Racial Environments and College Diversity Experiences

- This study examines two critical processes:
  o (a) How precollege environments and experiences can shape college diversity outcomes
  o (b) How college diversity experiences can serve to interrupt the cycle of segregation that Braddock (1980, 1985) has posited

**Method:**
- Quantitative research design
- Precollege, background, and college experience variables
- Dataset collected as part of the project on Preparing College Students for a Diverse Democracy (DDP)
- Surveyed students at college entry (fall 2000) and again at the end of their second year (spring 2002)

**Population/Subjects:**
- Final dataset consisted of 1,509 men (32.1%) and 3,188 women (67.9%) from 9 public universities
- Consisted of four racial/ethnic groups: African American/Blacks, Asian American/Pacific Islander, Hispanic/Latino, White/Caucasian
- Median age in fall 2000 entry was 18

**Main findings:**
1. Students’ precollege racial environments and experiences have perpetuation effects on college diversity outcomes such as cross-racial interactions and students’ attitudes about racial discrimination
2. Racially and ethnically diverse college settings, as well as students’ college diversity experiences, significantly interrupt these perpetuation effects
3. Students’ precollege racial environments have varying and significant influences on their opportunities and on the nature of interactions with diverse others.
4. This finding suggests the urgency of improving intergroup relations in college.
5. This finding is a strong challenge to the belief that increased diversity leads to conflict on campus

**Your Summary Statement:**
In their study of precollege racial environment and college diversity experiences, Victor B. Saenz (2010) found precollege racial environments have an impact on the nature of the interactions of first year college students with diverse others. The findings from this research provide support and also provide a counterargument for our theme of Student Intergroup relations/segregation
Full Citation in APA Format:

In-Text Citation: (Smith, Bowman & Hsu, 2007)

Population/Subjects: The population studied was college students of different racial backgrounds. The subjects were 575 White undergraduates, and 122 East Asian International undergraduates at a U.S. public university.

Methods: The methods for conducting research were sending a survey to the students via the mail, as well as in class. The surveys were analyzed using a “Social Distance Scale”.

Main Findings:
- Consistent efforts by university programs to increase interracial interactions among students can be successful.
- Personal experiences play a role in increasing positive attitudes towards other social groups.

Summary statement: In their study of interracial interactions on the college campus, Smith, Bowman & Hsu, 2007 found that when colleges are proactive in encouraging different social groups on campus to interact, and students have personal experiences interacting with one another, tolerance towards other groups do increase.

In-Text Citation: (Henderson-King & Kaleta, 2000)

Population/Subjects: The population in this article was undergraduate students, and the subjects chosen were 1387 students at the University of Michigan.

Methods: A questionnaire was mailed to the participants, and from the respondents were two groups sampled, depending on whether they were registered for a Race and Ethnicity course. Throughout the semester, a feelings thermometer measured the students’ affect towards different the social identities of other students.

Main Findings:
- Over the course of a semester, results showed that undergraduate’s feelings towards other social groups became more negative.

- Participants in diversity/minority-related organizations and Race and Ethnicity course didn’t change their feelings towards other social groups. While these activities’ influence did not increase positive feelings towards other identities, they may have prevented them from becoming more negative.

- Students who were caucasian, with the participation in a diversity-related group, grew in awareness of the existence of racism.

Summary statement: In their study of undergraduate and intergroup tolerance, Henderson-King and Kaleta (2000) found throughout the semester, positive feelings towards other social groups began to decline. Classes about race and ethnicity, as well as participation in diversity or minority related groups created a barrier by helping feelings to remain where they were, although they did not make them any more positive.

In-Text Citation (Author, Year): (Cole, 2007)

Population/Subjects: The population was simply college students, and the subjects came from 119 predominantly white universities.

Methods: The students were surveyed over four years to analyze any effects their environment may have had on their educational success. Additionally, student-faculty relationships were investigated for further information. The data collection was used to uncover student intellectual self-concept as well as associations with faculty.

Main Findings (in individual bullet points list the main findings and contributions of the article; each of these ideas can stand alone and may contribute to different aspects of the overall literature):
- Interactions between different ethnic groups do not feasibly happen evenly for all groups, and adequate minority representation is not enough.
- Minorities are more likely to interact with other groups than caucasians.
- Student-faculty relations benefit from students participating in diversity either by designated activities or natural interaction
- Relations between students and faculty which were academics-based enhanced students intellectual self-concepts.
- Collegiate interaction in general needs to be better planned and analyzed, and needs faculty involvement to most benefit students’ intellectual self-concepts.

Summary statement: In their study of the collegiate relevance of diversity, Cole (2007) found that proper engagement of diversity by students improves student-faculty interactions, which benefits students intellectually.
Student Intergroup Relations / Segregation
Danietta Charles


In-Text Citation (Author, Year): (Gurin & Nagda, 2006)

Population/Subjects: The population was college students, and the subjects were students from colleges who had participated in the various studies referenced by this journal article. Unfortunately, we do not know much more about the subjects except that they belonged to social groups, and were studied in relation to intra-group interactions.

Methods: Comparing research studies on models used to dissolve intra-group tension.

Main Findings:
- Intergroup Dialogue is a relatively effective method. “Students from pairs of identity groups...explore their own and the other groups’ identities, analyze how power and inequality affect their groups, and examine ways to bridge the intergroup differences.” It rivals approaches such as “intergroup harmony” or “intragroup solidarity” in that its methods do not include de-emphasizing social identity or trying to boost psychological perceptions of groups which did not exist in the first place.
- Tension and conflict between social groups diminishes the benefits of diversity, because individuals cannot learn or gain from those outside of their social group. Diversity is most effective when individuals from different groups are interacting with each other.
- The authors of this article emphasize the need of further research; “We need campus diversity programs to be theoretically guided and empirically evaluated.

Summary statement: In their study of diversity initiatives, Patricia Gurin and Biren (Ratnesh) A. Nagda and Author (2006) found that encouraging students of different social groups to interact is key to relieving intergroup tension and enhancing diversity as a whole.
Student Intergroup Relations / Segregation
Rebekah Ortiz


In-Text Citation: (Strauss, 2007)

Population/Subjects:

Methods:

• Quantitative and qualitative research
• University of California of Los Angeles conducted The Civil Rights Project that analyzed data done by the National Center for Education Statistics
• 14 states, totaling up to 25% of total schools and 27% of total students in the nation for the collection of reported multiracial student enrollment counts

Main Findings:

1. Segregation in the U.S. public schools lead to a risk to success as a multicultural society
2. Segregation is growing based on race and poverty
3. Segregation in public schools affects the achievement of minorities.
4. Segregation can be mitigated by public awareness, advocacy that includes the monitoring of land use and zoning decisions, legal enforcement such as action by the Justice Department and the Office for Civil Rights to punish violations of anti-segregation laws and policies

Summary statement:

Segregation limits educational opportunities for minority students and the opportunity for all students to learn to live and work efficiently in a multicultural society. What program can be implemented at Mason to introduce students to multicultural engagement as preparation for a diverse workplace? What additional academic resources and opportunities could be provided for low income and minority students at G.M.U.?

**In-Text Citation:** (Conger, 2005)

**Population/Subjects:** This study was on ethnic segregation as a whole with an emphasis on between native born and immigrant students. It was done within elementary school classrooms in New York City comparing patterns in: ethnic groups, grades, boroughs and years.

**Methods:**

- Quantitative and qualitative research
- Conducted three simulations (a) randomly (b) to achieve complete ethnic segregation (c) according to their prior test scores

**Main Findings:**

1. Results indicate that racial segregation across different schools is far greater than within schools. However, it is the same within and across schools for immigrant students.
2. Within-school segregation cannot be entirely attributed to random processes or to the use of ability grouping practices, particularly in the case of black and Hispanic segregation.

**Summary statement:**

How can we mitigate segregation between native born and nonnative students? What are the cultural barriers that are linked to segregation? To study this furthermore, we can reflect on how segregation is addressed in society and incorporate the same concepts through a diversity program at G.M.U.. How can we articulate the importance of diversity in our school’s vision and carry it through in an academic structured environment?

**In-Text Citation:** (Ellis, Wright, Parks, 2004)

**Population/Subjects:** This is a study done in U.S. metropolitan area, Los Angeles, on urban racial segregation in residential communities versus the workplace.

**Methods:**
- Quantitative

**Main Findings:**

1. The data proves that more intergroup interaction takes place during work hours than residential communities.
2. The analysis reveals that reduced segregation at workplaces leads to an increase in interracial partnering which in turn may leverage change in residential segregation.

**Summary statement:**

The study shows that racial segregation from the workplace to residential communities is usually income based. This division in class, power and privilege makes it harder to connect on commonalities and leads to segregation. How can we further connect these to seek implementation of programs at G.M.U. that will build cultural strengths?

In-Text Citation: (D’Souza, 1995)


Methods:

• Quantitative research
• In his book, The End of Racism, D’Souza researches the history, nature, and effects of racism to argue that people in the United States are rethinking their attitudes toward race.

Main Findings:

1. Barriers from keeping groups, institutions, etc. from constructing a multicultural society are: ignorance of ethnic backgrounds, fear of engagement due to assumptions and misconceptions, early childhood instilled beliefs that there is no importance and/or value in diversity and competitive worldview.
2. Civil rights leadership is committed to fighting racism and building cultural strengths of people of color. People of color is an inclusive term used among non-white groups emphasizing common experiences of racism.
3. Racism is a form of institutional oppression which occurs when established laws, customs, and practices systematically reflect and produce inequities based on one’s membership in targeted social identity groups.
4. The study notes that civil rights figures like Dr. Martin Luther King can help secure rights and influence institutional structures.

Summary statement:

How can G.M.U. incorporate leadership solely from people of color to influence diversity? How can G.M.U. empower students from marginalized communities? How can we mitigate segregation and encourage intergroup interaction at G.M.U.? Are there currently any U.S. Universities and workplaces that require professors/employers to assign intergroup tasks? Has this been proven to work?
Racial Diversity Matters: The Impact of Diversity-Related Student Engagement and Institutional Context

Full Citation in APA Format:

In-Text Citation: (Hurtado 1990)

Population/Subjects:

Methods:

Main Findings:
- Campus Life is very different for different racial/ethnic groups.
- Increasing the racial/ethnic diversity on campus, but not attending to the needs of these different groups can harm campus life for minorities as well as white students.

Summary statement:
In their study of racial/ethnic diversity on campuses, Hurtado, Sylvia-Milem, Jeffery-Clayton-Pedersen, Alma-Allen, Walter (1990) found that increased diversity is only a good thing when dealt with properly.
Racial Diversity Matters: The Impact of Diversity-Related Student Engagement and Institutional Context

Full Citation in APA Format:


In-Text Citation: (Denson & Chang, 2008)

Population/Subjects:

Methods: Hierarchical Linear Modeling

Main Findings:
Diversity contributes to student’s learning experience. More likely to engage in diversity initiatives. “Students as a whole were more engaged with diversity tended to also report higher levels of self-change in knowledge of and ability to get along with people of different races or cultures.”

Summary statement:
In their study of the effects of diversity on the life of college students and their college experience, Denson & Chang (2008) found that diversity on college campuses are good because students who engage in diversity initiatives tend to have higher satisfaction levels.
Staff Demographics
Caitlin Marais


(Chreiner, ect. al 2011)

**Population/Subjects:** It included 62 successful disadvantages students who successfully transferred from community college to selective institutions within the U.S. As well as the Faculty and staff interviewed.

**Methods:**
This exploratory qualitative approach of a study was to identify the attitudes and behaviors of faculty and staff that impact the success and persistence of high risk students. It included 62 successful disadvantages students who successfully transferred from community college to selective institutions within the U.S. They were asked who was the most influential person to help them succeed and influence their ability to persist giving their backgrounds. The study then further analyzes the difference of relationship between staff and student versus faculty and student.

**Main Findings:** Faculty and staff were most influential. When students described staff members and what made them influential, their statements rarely mentioned the position they held. These staff members that were chosen by these students as influential, saw their work with students as an important part of their identity and reported considerable satisfaction knowing they had made an impact on a student’s life. Staff have a more intimate relationship with students, from a student’s point of view, than a faculty member. It is hard to remember a student’s name when a Professor has hundreds of students to remember and on average the ratio is 1:200.

**Summary Statement:** In their study of influence on high risk students, Chreiner ect. al 2011 found that whether an inexperienced counselor or tenured faculty member, the student felt positive about their experience with staff members. This study is congruent with Levine and Nidiffer’s (1991) finding that mentors were consistently characterized by their desire to make a difference in student’s lives. Much more difficult for a faculty member rather than a staff member to make a one on one relationship with a student. This study found that it was evident these high risk students found staff as institutional agents. What mattered the most to these students were that they interpreted care and concern shown for them by campus staff.

In-Text Citation:(Mayhew et al. 2006)

Population/Subjects: Women and men of different racial backgrounds

Methods: Designed to provide descriptive information about the roles of staff in supporting diversity-related initiatives. Marcus (2000) case study found that women and staff of color responded differently than men and white staff to questions involving organizational politics and culture, quality of supervision and frequencies in mentorship opportunities.

Main Findings: Findings of this study underscore the importance of understanding how staff of color and women staff may perceive their institutions climate for diversity differently than white and male staff. Supported by Hurtado et. al.’s (1998) assertion that “ racially and ethnically diverse administrators, students and faculty tend to view the campus climate differently”. For that reason this study includes a series of staff demographic (gender, race, age, education) and professional (length of employment, position classification, and department) variables to shed light on how perceptions of campus climate for diversity varies across staff characteristics.

Summary Statement: In their study of Diversity from staff perspective (Mayhew, Grunwald, and Dey 2006) found that as a result of the recognized importance of diversity, campus leaders continue to scramble to identify the variety of factors that contribute to creating a positive climate for diversity on campus (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, and Allen, 1998). There is little to no studies or research done on Staff influence and demographics that show a positive outcome to the student population from the students’ perspective. To date, no empirical studies have examined the factors that predict staff members’ perceptions of their campus community’s ability to achieve a positive climate for diversity (Mayhew, Grunwald, Dey, 2006). The majority of research designed to provide information on the campus community’s ability to achieve a positive climate for diversity focuses almost entirely on faculty and student perceptions of, beliefs about, and experiences with diversity on campus (Chang 2002; Hurtado, 2001; Maruyama, Moreno, Gudeman, Harvey, and marin, 200; Milem, 2001).

Conclusion: There has been little to no research done on the Staff demographics and influences on the student body. There still remains unanswered questions, data and factors of staff involvement on College campuses and the effects from it.
Full Citation in APA Format:

In-Text Citation (Author, Year):
(McPherson, Schapiro, 1999)

Population/Subjects:
Faculty and administration in universities

Main Findings:

Pros of having a tenure system:
Tenure provides for better hiring decisions and review because faulty don’t fear competition or loss of position when making these decisions
“Tenure is most important in fields where...faculty engage in high stakes evaluations that are potentially controversial; and where good personal decisions depend of faculty expertise that cannot be readily duplicated by administrators” (84)
Tenured hiring is more effective socially and economically in research based institutions
The existence of post tenure reviews provide faculty with safeguards to ensure job security and also work at an institutional level to ensure that faculty are meeting university standards

Cons of having a tenure system:
However, this idea is negated when technology is added: a great deal of autonomy by way of tenured faculty keeps institutions a cottage industry where faculty members work independent of one another lacking a strong network of information sharing and collaboration

Solutions:
Where tenure is inefficient universities should raise faculty wages to compensate the lapse. Additionally they suggest further analysis of the “institutional economics” of tenure (86). More broadly, a more developed understanding of tenure is suggested where tenure is not seen as an “all or nothing” issue.

Main Argument:
The authors make the argument that the issue of tenure is best understood in terms of authority structure in universities.
Tenure and authority - they ask the questions:
To what extent should members of the faculty have a voice in determining such key institutional issues as: Who should teach and conduct research
What subjects should be taught and investigated?
How should the work of teaching and research be conducted, including such issues as class sizes, teaching loads, and research expectations?

They also present areas of the tenure issue where conflict exists:
Conflict: tenured faculty provide a long term lens on research and decision making while administration and stakeholders think more short term:
Conflict: interests of stakeholders, including students, versus faculty

Previous research mentioned in Literature Review:
Robert T. Blackburn and Janet H. Lawrence¹, suggests that there is no reduction in either research or teaching productivity after tenure.
Albert Rees and Sharon P. Smith² find no evidence that uncapping of retirement for tenured faculty will have a serious adverse effect on teaching effectiveness.
Sharon G. Levin and Paula E. Stephan³ find that the research productivity of scientists is, on average, reduced with age.
Daniel S. Hammermesh⁴ looks specifically at the research output of economists and finds that it declines very sharply with age.
Rees and Smith, however, argue that professors generally continue to publish at the later stages of their academic careers and that the reputation of a faculty member, built over a lifetime, may be more important to an institution’s reputation and long-run effectiveness than his or her current output.
A National Research Council⁵ study concluded that the evidence did not justify continuing the exemption of tenured faculty from the federal policy of prohibiting mandatory retirement on the basis of age.
David W. Breneman⁶ argues that tenure is “largely dysfunctional,” because it limits institutional flexibility and leads to lower salaries and reduced levels of employment. While tenure may make sense for the most prestigious and selective schools, he argues, it makes less sense elsewhere. Breneman suggests that many young academics would favor employment arrangements other than tenure; for example, term appointments coupled with the benefits normally associated with tenured faculty like

¹ Robert T. Blackburn and Janet H. Lawrence, “Aging and the Quality of Faculty Job Performance,” Review of Educational Research (Fall 1986): 265-290. See also, Blackburn and Lawrence, Faculty at Work: Motivation, Expectation, Satisfaction (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995).
² Rees and Smith, Faculty Retirement in the Arts and Sciences (1991).
travel funds, sabbaticals, and so on. Breneman suggests letting faculty opt out of tenure in return for extra salary. The best faculty would choose to do so, given that their job prospects would be good regardless of any protection from tenure. Richard P. Chait\(^7\) has been arguing for some time that faculty be given the opportunity to opt out of the tenure system.

**Summary Statement:** The authors argue tenure serve as a constraint on the discretion of the administration by limiting the ability of administration to reduce faculty salaries. It also forces administration to rely more on persuasion then negative sanctions (81). They also present a conflict between faculty and administration where tenure agreements are concerned. They conclude that tenure should be viewed as a device for influencing authority. Further a resolution in the tenure debate will determine how much authority faculty have in their institutions in terms of what is taught, how its taught and what research is conducted.

Faculty Demographics
Amalia Asghar

Full Citation in APA Format:

In-Text Citation (Author, Year):
(Bradburn, Cataldi, Fahimi, Zimbler, 2005)

Population/Subjects:
The data was collected from the 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty which compiles results from interviews with faculty and staff from 35,000 different institutions in the US.

Methods:
"Completed interviews were obtained from about 26,100 faculty and instructional staff...The survey respondents represent an estimated 1.2 million faculty and instructional staff in the 50 states and the District of Columbia"

Main Findings (From study)
"•Among faculty and instructional staff in all institution types, 56 percent were employed full time and 44 percent were employed part time in fall 2003 (table 1).
•About two-thirds (67 percent) of faculty employed in public associate’s institutions reported working part time, compared with 22 to 55 percent of faculty at other types of institutions (table 1).

The largest proportion of full-time faculty and instructional staff were White (80 percent), compared with Asian/Pacific Islander (9 percent), Black (5 percent), Hispanic (3 percent), and other racial/ethnic groups (2 percent; table 2). Full-time faculty and instructional staff in agriculture/home economics and fine arts were more likely to be White (88 percent) than faculty and instructional staff in business, education, engineering, health sciences, humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences (69–83 percent; table 2).
•Asian/Pacific Islander faculty represented a larger proportion of full-time (table 2) than part-time faculty (table 3). Nine percent of full-time faculty were Asian/Pacific Islander, compared with 4 percent of those employed part time.
•Full-time faculty and instructional staff were more likely to be male than female in fall 2003: 62 percent were male and 38 percent were female (table 4).
•Full-time faculty and instructional staff at public doctoral and private not-for-profit doctoral institutions were less likely to be female (32–33 percent) than those at public master’s, private not-for-profit baccalaureate, and other institutions (41 percent each),
private not-for-profit master’s institutions (43 percent), and public associate’s institutions (50 percent; table 4).
• Gender differences in program area were apparent among full-time faculty and instructional staff at 4-year institutions (table 4). Male-dominated fields included engineering (90 percent were male, 10 percent were female), the natural sciences (77 percent were male, 23 percent were female), and business (73 percent were male, 27 percent were female). Education was the only program area with a larger proportion of women than men (58 percent were female, 42 percent were male).
• Women represented a larger proportion of part-time (table 5) than full-time faculty (table 4). Forty-eight percent of part-time faculty and instructional staff were women, compared with 38 percent who worked full time.
• The largest proportion of faculty and instructional staff employed full time in all institutions held tenure in fall 2003 (48 percent). Another 24 percent were not on the tenure track compared with 21 percent who were on the tenure track and 8 percent who were employed in institutions that did not have a tenure system (table 6).
• The largest proportion of part-time faculty and instructional staff were not on the tenure track (86 percent) compared with 3 percent who were tenured, 2 percent who were on the tenure track, and 9 percent whose institutions had no tenure system (table 7).
• The average total income for the 2003 calendar year among full-time faculty and instructional staff was $81,200. This includes an average of $67,400 in basic salary from the institution, $5,000 in other income from the institution, $2,200 in outside consulting income, and $6,600 in other outside income (table 8).
• Health sciences faculty and instructional staff employed full time in 4-year institutions earned an average income of $116,600, the highest total income in 2003 compared with their peers in other program areas (table 8). In 2003, faculty and instructional staff in engineering earned $100,800, those in business earned $99,200, and those in other program areas earned between $66,000 and $86,000.
• Faculty and instructional staff employed part time had lower total incomes (table 9) than those who worked full time (table 8). However, outside income other than consulting income for faculty employed part time averaged $37,500 compared with $6,600 for those who were employed full time.”
These findings compared to demographic data for George Mason for 2011:

Full-Time Academic Faculty Demographic Profiles
Two-Year Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Unit</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health and Human Services</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>69.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Visual and Performing Arts</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education and Human Development</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School for Conflict Analysis and Resolution</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volgenau School of Engineering</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Law</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Management</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary statement:

The findings were consistent with the demographics of Mason faculty: the majority of faculty was White at 67.3%. However, the largest percentage of minority faculty was not Asian/Pacific Islander as the study suggested. Instead, the largest percentage of minority faculty was unknown and then Asian American (9.8%).

Although the chart of Mason faculty did not specify tenured and non-tenured faculty, there was a difference in the ratio of men and women employed. At Mason the number of men and women were more close at 40.1% female and 59.9% male.

The results were consistent with Mason faculty in terms of the number of male and female faculty in each field. For example, as the study suggested there are more male faculty in engineering then women. At Mason there were 30 female faculty members in Engineering and 115 male faculty members. The study was also accurate in arguing that the only academic unit where there were a majority of women was education. In the College of Education and Human Development 83 faculty members were female and 43 were male.
Full Citation in APA Format:
The Impact of Appointment Type on the Productivity and Commitment of Full-Time Faculty in Research and Doctoral Institutions
Carole J. Bland, Bruce A. Center, Deborah A. Finstad, Kelly R. Risbey and Justin Staples
*The Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 77, No. 1, Special Issue: Moving into the Next 75 Years (Jan. - Feb., 2006), pp. 89-123
Published by: [Ohio State University Press](http://www.jstor.org/stable/3838733)

In-Text Citation (Author, Year):
(Bland, Center, Finstad, Risbey, Staples, 2006)

Population/Subjects:
The study looks specifically at full time faculty at Research and Doctoral institutions and compares the tenure versus non-tenure faculty. The study also looks at a subset of these faculty who have been in the academy for less than seven years.

Methods:
The study used data collected in 1999 during the National Center for Educational Statistics’ National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF).
- IV: Appointment type (tenured, non-tenured, no-tenure)
- DV: Productivity in research, productivity in education, commitment

Important Points from the Literature Review:
- Institutional impacts have the greatest impact on faculty productivity
  - ex: non-tenured contract employees are less likely to have access to opportunities and resources that promote institutional productivity, e.g., internal grant programs (Bland et al., 93)
- Individuals committed (for example, committed through contract) are less to leave an organization voluntarily, and “are more likely to feel :psychologically bound” to their organization and their role within it (Bland et al., 93).
- Institutional that employ a mi of appointment types are expected to experience lower turnover and attrition rates,” thereby mitigating economic and personal costs wile reserving a culture of productivity and commitment (Bland et al., 94).

Main Findings:
- Whether comparing full-time faculty or newly hired full-time faculty in Research and Doctoral institutions, faculty on tenure are “significantly more productive in
research, more productive in education, [and] more committed to their work (Bland et al., 115).”
  o Conditions of employment, especially reward systems, affect productivity and satisfaction (Lazear, 1998)
• “A non-tenured system may be less conducive to productivity and commitment (Bland et al., 115).”

Summary statement:
In their study of tenured and non-tenured contracts on faculty commitment, research productivity and educational productivity, Bland, Center, Finstad, Risbey, and Staples (2006), found that although non-tenured contracts do allow for flexibility for both the faculty and the institution, tenured contract faculty have shown to have higher levels of commitment, and productivity in education and research. With an estimated 50% of tenured employees on the track to retire, the authors argue that institutions need to shift back to hiring tenured faculty with set long term contracts that provide room for growth and mobility in order to ensure institutional productivity.
Faculty Demographics
Amaria Asghar

Full Citation in APA Format:
Tenure's Impact: Male versus Female Viewpoints
Shane R. Premeaux and R. Wayne Mondy
College Teaching , Vol. 50, No. 4 (Fall, 2002), pp. 154-157
Published by: Taylor & Francis, Ltd.
Article Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/27559113

In-Text Citation (Author, Year):
(Monday, Premeaux, 2002)

Population/Subjects:
1,306 professors and members of The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business

Methods:
Faculty surveys from institutions in the US, Canada, and Mexico, all members of the AACSB

Main Findings:
• there are differences between men and women regarding tenure
• more women are likely to turn to litigation on tenure issues
• men feel tenure is being overapplied
• women, more frequently than men, feel tenure should be modified

Summary statement:
This study makes the argument that men and women have different experiences and attitudes regarding tenure. This belief was tested through surveys of different faculty members in colleges and universities. The results found that women are increasingly addressing tenure issues in court and not in their institutions. Additionally the study also found that more women feel tenure is an issue as compared to men.
Faculty Demographics
Typhaney Sebrey

Full Citation in APA Format

Population/subject: faculty at Harvard University
Methods: faculty surveys and interviews for the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (Coache) at Harvard University

Main Findings:
- One of the factors most highly correlated with success was the issue of institutional "fit." If a professor doesn’t feel like they “fit” into an institution this affects their happiness at the institution.
- One of the findings show that minority faculty expressed less satisfaction with all climate variables included in the study, this also included “fit” compared to their white peers
- 17% of the 8,500 faculty members said that underrepresented minority groups and a lack of diversity is one of the worst aspects of their institutional second to compensation (19%)
- There was an agreement between minority and white faculty over the understanding of the tenure process and say that it is clear and reasonable.
- When looking at an institution minority applicants look at how many professors and faculty are in their minority group so that they do not feel alone at the institution, according to an interview conducted.
- Attracting woman and minority groups is a struggle that all institutions face. They suggest that institutions offer leadership positions to these groups so that when more minorities come along they see that they are and will be represented in roles of power on the campus.
- Recruiting is just one piece of the puzzle, once hired woman and minority groups need to feel welcomed and comfortable at the institution when they are entering an institution where they have low numbers represented

Summary Statement:
To get minority groups and woman to want to join a faculty they have to feel like they fit in at the institution. This includes having support from the other faculty members as well as the administrative body. They also have to feel like their minority will be represented and not just pushed aside like they do not matter, it is best for an institution wanting to embrace institutional diversity to give minority groups and woman visible roles of leadership so they are represented and that will set a precedent for incoming or future faculty. There also needs to be equal rights within the faculty so that no one group is given better perks than another

In-Text Citation (Author, Year): (Kezar, Glenn, Lester & Nakamoto, 2008)

Population/Subjects: 14 educational institutions (universities, community colleges and liberal arts colleges)

Methods: An action research approach was used meaning members of the individual institutions project team collaborated with the professional researchers to examine the research project across a three year time span. Two professional researchers attended each institution’s monthly meetings in which the project was being discussed. An average of 25 meetings took place over the course of three years.

Main Findings:

- Research identified six contextual variables which when improved upon provided for the institutions to be the most successful at implementation: knowledge capacity, physical capacity, institutional willingness to reflect, project connection with institutional operations, leadership within both the team and the institution, and racial climate
- Themes had a particular impact on the ability of the university to effectively implement the Project. One example is that the hiring of a female African-American at Scipio University had a major impact. The President held weekly meetings which helped connect the institution to the Project. Additionally, her leadership skills were strong which allowed her to challenge assumptions
- When conducting initiatives such as this context plays a key role in the implementation process
- It is beneficial for leaders to acknowledge their contexts are social constructed.
- A team’s perception of the contexts can play a large role in the intervention’s progress. These perceptions do not have to be accurate to have an impact. This is why understanding they are socially constructed is so helpful.

Summary statement:
In their study of organization contextual features that affect implementation of equity initiatives Kezar, Glenn, Lester and Nakamoto (2008) found there are six contextual features that impact the successfullness of interventions at universities, community colleges, and liberal arts colleges. While there are important programs available to decrease inequities on campus the lack of understanding in regards to organizational and institutional barriers can be a hindrance to implementing these interventions.

In-Text Citation (Author, Year): (Brown & Miller, 1998)

Population/Subjects: Disenfranchised constituents such as African-Americans and Hispanics; The role they play in student affairs governance

Methods: Questions from the National Data Base on Faculty Involvement in Governance (NDBFIG) were used to survey self-identified racial minorities at various universities.

Main Findings:
• Minority faculty involvement can impact programming and policy for minority groups
• Research found the faculty agreed a “governance unit” was necessary to procure the involvement of minority faculty
• An issue can ensure in which minority faculty get numerous requests to participate in activities, because there are fewer of them on each campus
• Non-minority and minority faculty agreed they should be involved earlier in the decision making process
• Previous findings indicated faculty involvement is not seen as a necessity, but rather as a luxury

Summary statement:
In the Study of diversity in decision-making Brown and Miller (1998) found faculty as a whole need to advocate more about their rights to be involved in decision-making. Student affairs must be proactive and set a precedent for other areas of academics and show the value of diversified higher education governance.

**Summary**

*In Competing Conceptions of Academic Governance, William G. Tierney brings together faculty members, administrators, and policy experts to discuss multiple perspectives on academic governance at institutional, national, and international levels. The authors address the effects of globalization and the prospect of international accreditation; balancing the entrepreneurial and philosophical goals of higher education; the interaction between state governments and public universities; and the conflicting interests and roles of boards of trustees, administrators, and faculty. Carefully weighing various models and strategies, this volume provides new ways of understanding and addressing the changes that are transforming higher education.*

**Relevance to the Science of Diversity Project**

Tierney examines models and strategies of university wide academic governance and the role of all stakeholders in decision making. The book does not consider diversity agendas, the demographic of these stakeholders, or the role of privilege in decision making. However, this analysis of academic governance is important in order to consider diversity within a framework of power and privilege. Ortiz (2010) argues that building democratic campus climates that promote social justice is a noble goal and a form of embracing diversity on college campuses. Tierney makes recommendations for improving academic governance by expanding democracy though shared governance. He explores four models: a legislative model, a symbolic model, a consultative model, and a communicative model. This book identifies problems with the concentration of power in academic governance and makes recommendations for improvements. While the impacts of diversity or lack of diversity are unknown and likely intangible and immeasurable, the power structure may be analysis with a consideration of stakeholder demographics to draw correlations between power and privilege.

**References:**


**Abstract**

Research demonstrates that leadership, particularly among presidents, is important for moving a diversity agenda forward and make appreciable progress on it. The research questions pursued here are: What is the role of the college president in advancing a diversity agenda? What strategies do presidents identify as important to facilitating a diversity agenda? There were three main findings: (1) strategies are deployed in a non-linear way best represented through a web metaphor, (2) six sets of actors that serve as key nodes on the web and specific strategies were crucial to enhancing and deepening the web-developing an internal network, hiring, mentoring, partnering with faculty on the curriculum, supporting student affairs staff, working directly with and learning from students, and establishing external networks; and, (3) strategies within the human resource frame are noted by presidents as particularly important to moving a diversity agenda forward.

**Relevance to the Science of Diversity Project**

The article highlights the role of university presidents in the implementation of university wide diversity agendas. While recognizing some standard best practices on college campuses, no standard exists for university wide diversity agendas. The qualitative research done and existing research in this field is largely antidotal as this data is difficult to quantify. The authors use the process of thematic analysis published by Boyatzis in 1998 which involves both deductive and inductive coding to analysis data gathered from interviews and university records. The article explores a web model involving different stakeholders across campus. The article reports six essential stakeholders in implementing diversity agendas and six distinctive strategies. A developing direction of the Science of Diversity project is to explore academic governance and the role of the upper administration in diversity. This research provides important data on the role of the upper administration in implementing diversity agendas.

**Summary**

*Enhancing Campus Capacity for Leadership* explores a mostly untapped resource on college campuses—the leadership potential of staff and faculty at all levels. This book contributes to the growing tradition of giving voice to grassroots leaders, offering a unique contribution by honing in on leadership in educational settings. In an increasingly corporatized environment, grassroots leadership can provide a balance to the prestige and revenue seeking impulses of campus leaders, act as a conscience for institutional operations with greater integrity, create changes related to the teaching and learning core, build greater equity, improve relationships among campus stakeholders, and enhance the student experience. The text documents the stories of grassroots leaders, including the motivation and background of these "bottom up" beacons, the tactics and strategies that they use, the obstacles they overcome, and the ways that they navigate power and join with formal authority. This investigation also showcases how grassroots leaders in institutional settings, particularly more marginalized groups, can face significant backlash. While we like to believe that organizations are civil and humane, the stories in this book demonstrate a dark side with which we must reckon. The book ends with a discussion of the future of leadership on college campuses, examining the possibilities for shared and collaborative forms of leadership and governance.

**Relevance to the Science of Diversity Project**

Chapter 10. Top-Down Meets Bottom-Up: Challenges and Opportunities offers relevant information of the differences, relationships, and development of grassroots leaders outside the existing power structure and people within leadership positions. An interesting case study is explored in this chapter where a group of women advocate for a diversity agenda with a commitment to hiring more women and faculty of higher and student of color support. This is an important dynamic to consider when analyzing diversity agendas and provides a different perspective than strategies focusing on administrative leadership through a top-down approach.

**Abstract**

Many institutions of higher education are facing the challenge of finding ways to diversify their campuses. The purpose of this paper is to provide recommendations for recruitment and retention of faculty and students at institutions of higher learning. These recommendations are based on a review of literature and research conducted on 29 universities in Midwestern United States. Specific suggestions and examples are provided for the following strategies: (1) Develop a university-wide philosophy statement that encourages cultural diversity. (2) Analyze the cultural diverse faculty and student composition on campus and set goals for enhancing diversity. (3) Conduct research on best practices/programs/activities that promote recruitment and retention of culturally diverse faculty and students. (4) Develop, implement, and evaluate a comprehensive plan for recruitment/retention activities that focus on enhancing cultural diversity on campus among faculty and student populations.

**Relevance to the Science of Diversity Project**

An extensive amount of research has been done on the best practices, strategies, and programs for diversity agendas. While a bit older, this article provides a comprehensive analysis of this research as a review of the literature with some of their own original research. Much of the research since this article has focused on faculty demographics, specific racial identities, etc. which lacks a comprehensive analysis. George Mason University has numerous recruitment and retention programs already implemented which may be largely responsible for our relatively high enrollment and graduation rates of many historically underrepresented identities. While every university requires a unique strategy, best practices are a tool of analysis and comparison. The scope, size, and strategy of these programs at Mason with a reference of best practices in the literature may provide insight to the caliber of these programs. Additional data collected of demographics in enrollment, retention, graduation, leadership involvement, and other area may also be analyzed with a comparison to other universities to determine the effectiveness of diversity programs.