

**Women and Faculty of Color on Campus: Campus Diversity and Civic
Engagement Initiatives**

Sylvia Hurtado, Luis Ponjuan and Gilia Smith

University of Michigan

610 E. University Ave.

2117 SEB

Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1259

divdemo@umich.edu

www.umich.edu/~divdemo

Researchers and administrators have widely accepted the goal of educating college students for a diverse democracy through diversity awareness and civic engagement initiatives that can be achieved as part of a liberal education. Calls for college-level learning in the 21st century highlight the need to improve access to education that is both practical and essential for citizenship (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2002). Indeed, achieving greater diversity awareness and civic engagement initiatives among young people is thought to be essential for the “maintenance of a civic society” (Rudenstine, 2001). Institutional diversity and civic engagement initiatives, inside and outside the classroom, which engage students with different viewpoints, ways of life, and socio-cultural experiences encourage more complex and active thinking and contribute to their long-term development as citizens in a diverse society (Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002). Researchers have also documented how diversity in college benefits students across a variety of educational outcomes (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, & Allen, 1999; Smith, 1995).

Faculty members are essential partners in educating students for a complex, diverse society. Faculty conveys the institution’s educational goals through the valuing of knowledge represented in research, as well as through curricular and co-curricular initiatives. Gaff (1997) stated that higher education views faculty as conveyors of specific academic knowledge (content) that prepared students for the workforce, and yet today higher education requires faculty to not only instruct the next generation’s workforce, but also to challenge students’ preconceived notions of contemporary society. One of the essential goals, therefore, is to produce critical thinkers and students who are “empowered, informed, and responsible” life-long learners (AAC&U, 2002). The purpose of this paper is to determine the key organizational factors within higher education that contribute to the establishment of curricular and co-

curricular initiatives, and which prepare college students to participate in a diverse democracy.

Data are drawn from an institutional survey of chief academic administrators at four-year colleges and universities, as well as objective data for each campus that helps to determine the extent to which the presence of women faculty and faculty of color have an impact on this type of campus-based initiative.

One of the questions we raise in this paper is whether a diverse faculty is essential to preparing college students for a diverse society. Research suggests that women and faculty of color are still not adequately represented in higher education, particularly among the tenured ranks (Moss, 2000; Johnsrud & Des Jarlais, 1994; Bain & Cummings, 2000; Glazer-Raymo, 1999). In fact, some contend the diversity of the faculty in higher education has not changed much over the last forty years (Perna, 2001; Trower & Chait, 2002). Do low proportions of women faculty and faculty of color suggest a problem exists in achieving institutional goals or educating students to participate in a diverse society? Although few researchers provide compelling evidence that women and faculty of color are essential to a diverse curriculum or to broader institutional goals of preparing college students for a diverse society (Boxer, 1999; Hurtado, 2001; Milem, 2001), more research is coming to light that suggests possible answers to this question.

Teaching and Learning Issues and Faculty Race and Gender

Research suggests a diverse faculty can impact student learning outcomes as a result of distinctive use of pedagogical techniques, as well as through the introduction of diversity in the curriculum, and experiential opportunities that allow students to demonstrate the concepts they understand in real life situations. For example, controlling for practices within disciplines, a

higher proportion of women faculty and faculty of color are likely to employ a wide range of pedagogical techniques as well as introduce readings on the contributions of women and minorities into their courses (Hurtado, 2001). Female faculty members bring “new fields of knowledge and new approaches to pedagogy and research” (Statham, 1991 p. 2). Women’s studies programs have contributed to scholarship with innovative “methods of inquiry, new categories of analysis, and reconceptualized pedagogies” (Boxer, 1999). Moreover, students who were exposed to diversity in the curriculum demonstrated higher intellectual engagement, motivation, and civic engagement after four years of college than students who had little or no exposure to such diversity in the classroom (Gurin, et al., 2002). Similarly, students who completed their undergraduate diversity requirement exhibited significantly less prejudice compared to students who have not completed the requirement (Chang, 2000). The impact of diversity in the curriculum has been documented in many other studies that confirm it plays an important role in student learning outcomes (Humphreys, 1997; Milem, 2001; Morey, 2000).

While many contend that diversity content cannot be incorporated into all courses or disciplines, it is important to note that active learning pedagogies are implemented broadly across a range of disciplines (science, mathematics, and professional fields) and significantly contribute to a wide range of student outcomes—the more engaged a student is in his or her learning, the more likely that concepts and content will be retained and assimilated. Faculty use of active learning pedagogies has much to do with their philosophy about student learning and development, however (Sandler, 1996). Feminist pedagogy has, for more than 30 years, been associated with active learning techniques in that it is meant to create a principle of inclusion in the classroom and incorporates collaborative learning that allows students to become self-directed learners (Wakai, 1994). This pedagogical style incorporates various teaching

methodologies that are more likely to match the learning needs of a diverse student body. Wakai (1994) found that male and female faculty members who value student development are more likely to use feminist pedagogical practices. In addition, women faculty who desire to change the curriculum are also more likely to practice feminist pedagogy. Milem (2001) found that women are more likely to be involved in teaching and learning activities that support a diverse student body, again illustrating the principle of inclusion that is a starting part for engaging students in active learning and assimilation of course material.

Similar to research on women and feminist pedagogy, research on faculty of color illustrates the impact of diversity in the classroom. Researchers have shown that faculty of color improve classroom dynamics by challenging students to cross social boundaries through collaborative learning techniques, and cross racial boundaries through a re-examination of their views about people of color and society (Antonio, 2002; Humphreys, 1998). More importantly, Antonio (2002) found that faculty of color are more likely to place a greater importance on the affective, moral, and civic development of students than their white colleagues. This suggests faculty of color place a strong emphasis on student learning outcomes for a diverse society and that they have a broad view of the educational goals they expect of undergraduates. Hurtado (2001) found faculty of color are more likely to engage students in classroom dialogue and provide additional readings on race and ethnicity issues that challenge student's preconceived ideas of minority groups. Studies revealed that faculty of color are more likely to use student cooperative learning techniques, and more likely to engage students in class discussions and student evaluations of each other's work in the classroom than white faculty (H. S. Astin, Antonio, Cress, & A. W. Astin, 1997; Hurtado et al., 1999). Additional research supports the notion that both women and faculty of color incorporate alternative teaching methods that

enhance student learning in the classroom (A. W. Astin, 1993; Johnson & Johnson, 1986; Milem & Wakai, 1996). Therefore, the current study seeks to identify a relationship between the presence of women faculty and faculty of color and the development of curricular and co-curricular activities that prepare colleges and students for participation in a diverse democracy.

Organizational Factors and Diversity Initiatives and Civic Engagement Initiatives

A revitalization of attention to the civic mission of higher education is sweeping the country and proponents contend that faculty need to also become rededicated to these efforts (Checkoway, 2001; Cooper, 1999). The civic mission of higher education educates students to “understand their own identities, communicate with people who are different from themselves, and build bridges across cultural differences in the transition to a more diverse society” (Checkoway, 2001). However, faculty cannot achieve these goals alone and there is a growing public disdain for higher education’s inability to meet its civic mission. Legislators and the public blame institutional leaders for the lack of institutional commitment to a civic mission (Boyer, 1994).

Higher education leadership continues to play an important role in the development of institutional priorities and the rewards for institutional activities. Administrators set the priorities that make diversity awareness and civic initiatives central to the institutional mission. For example, Checkoway (2001) contends that institutional transformation involves increasing the institutional capacity through leadership (e.g. restructuring of units, or increased community-higher education collaborations). Institutional rewards must also reflect an institutional commitment to faculty who incorporate these goals in their research and curriculum. Checkoway (2001) believes that institutions need a “systematic strategy for reintegration of

research, teaching, and service” (p136). Therefore, organizational factors such as institutional priorities and rewards theoretically play an important role in recruiting, retaining, and rewarding women and faculty of color who pursue curricular and co-curricular initiatives that further the institution’s civic mission. This paper seeks to establish a link between these organizational factors, the presence of a racially and gender diverse faculty, and institutional initiatives across a range of four-year institutions.

Methods

Data Source

The data for this study came from a nationwide survey, which was part of a research project entitled *Preparing Students for a Diverse Democracy*. The *Institutional Survey on Civic Engagement and Diversity*, administered in 2001, examined institutional approaches to increasing students’ diversity awareness and civic engagement behaviors. Additional data were obtained from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Fall 2001 Staff Data File, which contains institutional data on faculty by tenure status, academic rank, race/ethnicity, and gender.

Sample

The *Institutional Survey on Civic Engagement and Diversity* was sent to senior academic administrators at 1440 four-year institutions nationwide. After the first wave a reminder postcard was sent to non-respondents. Seven hundred and forty-four completed surveys were returned, which resulted in a 52% return rate. In order to examine how administrators viewed their institutions, we limited the sample to institutions that offered, at minimum, a four-year baccalaureate degree. Forty-two percent of the responding institutions were masters-level institutions, 38% were bachelors-level institutions and the remaining 20% were doctoral-level

institutions. The majority of the sample was under private institutional control (57%). After incorporating the IPEDS data, we found the proportion of faculty of color within particular institutions varied by Carnegie type. The institutions with the highest percentage of faculty of color are doctoral institutions (16%), followed by masters institutions (13%) and bachelor institutions (12%). (See Table 1 for selected descriptives).

Measures

Two dependent variables, each representing a factor-scaled index of multiple items, were used to measure campus initiatives that include, or bridge, civic engagement and diversity awareness.

Exploration of the survey suggested that six questions about curricular initiatives could be incorporated in a factor analysis, as a data reduction technique, and create a dependent variable measuring the outcome of interest. To this end, we conducted a Principle Access Factor Analysis (PAF), with varimax rotation. This factor analysis indicated that the curricular initiative items had a high degree of internal consistency (see Table 3 below). There were six variables that converged on this factor, which, for the purpose of this analysis, will be called Curricular Initiatives. Curricular Initiatives was calculated using the SPSS regression method that saves rotated and unrotated factor scores to an active system file for computation.

Cronbach's Alpha for the factor was calculated at $\alpha = .69$.

Further exploration suggested that eight questions regarding co-curricular initiatives could be combined to create a second dependent variable measuring the civic engagement and diversity awareness initiatives by campus. To this end, we conducted a Principle Access Factor Analysis (PAF), with varimax rotation. This factor analysis indicated that the co-curricular initiative items had a high degree of internal consistency (see Table 3). There were eight

variables that converged on this factor, which for the purpose of this analysis will be called Co-curricular Initiatives. The co-curricular initiatives factor was calculated using the SPSS regression method that saves the rotated and unrotated factor scores to an active system file for computation. Cronbach's Alpha for the factor was calculated at $\alpha = .87$.

Fourteen independent variables were used to predict these institutional outcomes in five general categories: Institutional Background Characteristics, Institutional Priorities, Core Leadership, Peer Comparisons and Faculty Representation (see Table 4). Institutional background characteristics were measured by Carnegie type, institutional control and admissions rate (or selectivity). As part of the preparation for analysis, Carnegie types were collapsed into three categories (doctorate-granting institutions, masters-granting institutions and bachelor-granting institutions) and dummy-coded respectively. The institutional control variable was dummy-coded so that private institutions were the reference group. Institutional priorities were measured by three distinct factor indices: Institutional Diversity Priorities, Institutional Civic Engagement Priorities and an Evaluations and Rewards for Diversity factor that measured intra-institutional incentives to create and sustain diversity awareness and civic engagement initiatives (see Table 4). Core leadership was examined through the influence of three factor indices: the first factor measured Support for Civic Engagement by core leadership (central administrators), the second measured Support for Diversity, and the third measured Faculty Civic Engagement on a campus. The influence of institutional programming relative to peer comparisons was measured with two factor indices: the extent to which the institutions succeeded in Creating a Diverse Environment and the extent to which they led peers in Integrating Civic Engagement.

Data related to the gender and race of tenured and nontenured faculty was derived from IPEDS and merged with data from the *Diverse Democracy Institutional Survey on Civic*

Engagement and Diversity to create the dataset used for this study. Faculty representation data was used to measure the percentage of white women and faculty of color on each campus in order to assess their relative influence on curricular and co-curricular initiatives.

Analysis

Two hierarchical multiple regression analyses were employed to identify the significant determinants of curricular and co-curricular initiatives. The relative contribution of each of the five blocks of independent variables was subsequently examined. Carnegie type, institutional control, and admission rate were entered in the first block of institutional background characteristics. The second block included Institutional Diversity Priorities, Institutional Civic Engagement Priorities, and Evaluation and Rewards for Diversity as well as institutional background characteristics. The third block added tests for Core Leadership Support for Civic Engagement, Core Leadership Support for Diversity and Faculty Civic Engagement. The fourth block measured Creating a Diverse Learning Environment and Enacting Civic Engagement. The fifth and last block added the representation of white female faculty and faculty of color to the model.

Results

Predicting Curricular Initiatives

The final model consists of a five-block hierarchical regression predicting 41% of the variance in campus curricular initiatives that fall within the nexus of civic engagement and diversity awareness (see Tables 5 and 6 for details.) The first block of variables is designed to measure the impact of institutional background characteristics on curricular initiatives. Neither controlling for Carnegie type, nor institutional control nor admissions rate is statistically significant. These variables account for less than 1% of the variance in the dependent variable, $F(4, 469) = 1.09$. Of the four variables in the first block, only bachelor-level institutions had

significance (though marginal) as a negative predictor of initiatives within the classroom but this became non-significant in the second step of the model. This suggests that relatively any type of institution may engage in curricular initiatives that further the goals of preparing college students for diverse democracy.

The second block in the regression measures the effect of institutional priorities, controlling for institutional background characteristics, on campus support for curricular initiatives. This block proved to be statistically significant, and added 33% to the explanatory power of the model, $F(7, 469) = 33.64, p < .001$. Each of the three institutional priorities had a positive and significant predictive value ($p < .001$). The most powerful predictor is Institutional Diversity Priorities, followed by Institutional Civic Engagement Priorities and then Evaluation and Rewards for Diversity. With the addition of institutional priorities to the regression, the distinction between bachelor-level institutions and other Carnegie types ceases to be significant, indicating that the variance are explained by institutional priorities.

The third block in the regression controls for the combined effect of institutional core leadership, institutional priorities and background characteristics on the criterion. The addition of the three variables in this block results in an increase in variance of 3%, which is statistically significant, $F(10, 469) = 27.02, p < .001$. Two of the new variables, Core Leadership Support for Diversity and Faculty Commitment to Civic Engagement, also have significant predictive values of their own at the $p < .001$ level.

The fourth block measures the added effect of institutional progress relative to peers on curricular initiatives. The addition of the two variables in this block boosts the variance of the model by a statistically significant 5%, $F(12,469)=27.29, p<.001$. Creating a Diverse

Environment proves to be the stronger predictor of the two, ($p < .001$), though Integrating Civic Engagement Programming is also statistically significant ($p < .05$).

The fifth block contains all the variables in the equation, adding a test of the effect of the percentage of faculty of color as well as white women faculty on curricular initiatives. In total, the model explains 41% of the variance in curricular outcomes $F(14, 469) = 24.54, p < .001$. Both white female faculty and faculty of color prove to have statistically significant individual predictive power. The five most powerful predictors in the final model, however, are: Creating a Diverse Environment, Institutional Civic Engagement Priorities, Enacting Civic Engagement, the presence of Faculty of Color and Institutional Diversity Priorities.

Institutional priority variables (represented by Diversity Priorities and Civic Engagement Priorities) had the largest impact on curricular outcomes, followed by the peer comparison variables. This suggests that institutional priorities drive the manner in which institutions establish initiatives regarding civic engagement and diversity. Literature on student learning outcomes indicates that students gain valuable cognitive skills from innovation. The peer comparison measure, Creating a Diverse Environment, is the strongest individual predictor in the entire model, affirming that institutions that have taken significant leadership among peers in this area undoubtedly have a broad range of initiatives that occupy the nexus between civic engagement and diversity.

Not surprisingly, faculty of color is the fourth most powerful predictor in the model. This serves to confirm that the presence of faculty of color plays a vital role in the frequency and breadth of curricular initiatives on college campuses. Core institutional leadership variables, such as Support for Diversity, and Faculty Civic Engagement, are also important, but do not share the same predictive power with respect to the curriculum. From this we can conclude that

faculty of color are at the forefront of the effort to incorporate diversity and civic engagement initiatives into existing curricula.

Holding faculty of color constant, however, the percentage of white women faculty also contributes significantly to the presence of curricular initiatives. This model does not seek to explain why white women faculty have a significant effect on curricular initiatives, but it suggests that further research in this area might be fruitful. Future analysis might include: interactions between gender and race (note that for the purpose of this study faculty of color was not disaggregated by gender), interactions between civic engagement priorities and faculty of color, or interactions between evaluations and rewards and white female faculty, etc. However, the most important result of the analysis is that faculty of color and white female faculty independently prove to have a significant predictive impact on an institution's level of curricular initiatives that address diversity and civic engagement.

Predicting Co-curricular Initiatives

The full model predicted 50% of variance in institutions' co-curricular initiatives, but in contrast to the equation for curricular initiatives, there are slight variations in significant institutional factors that affect co-curricular innovations. For example, more selective institutions (measured by a low admissions rate) tend to have more co-curricular initiatives as indicated by the highly significant effects ($p < .001$) in Block 1. However, when one accounts for other organizational factors, the picture regarding co-curricular initiatives becomes much clearer.

Measures in Block 2 of Institutional Priorities account for 40% of the variance in campus co-curricular initiatives. Specifically we find that Institutional Priorities for Diversity, Civic Engagement, and implementing an Evaluation and Rewards structure for diversity all have highly significant effects on co-curricular initiatives to prepare students for a diverse democracy

($p < .001$). By the third block, however, civic engagement priorities are no longer significant due to the entrance of the core leadership variables. Specifically central leadership (President, Vice President for Student Affairs, Provost, etc.) support for diversity is a primary factor in the implementation of co-curricular initiatives ($p < .001$) and Faculty Involvement in Civic Engagement also has a somewhat weaker, but still statistically significant, effect on this outcome ($p < .05$).

By far the strongest predictor has much to do with the level of institutional leadership taken relative to peer institutions: campuses that were ahead of other institutions in terms of creating a diverse learning environment ($p < .001$) and integrating civic engagement ($p < .01$) into campus life are more likely to have a significant level of involvement regarding co-curricular initiatives. However, the percentage of women or faculty of color are not significantly related to the implementation or level of co-curricular initiatives. Together these results are further discussed in the implications section of the conclusion of this paper.

The Nexus Between Diversity and Civic Engagement Initiatives

For many years, campus-based conversations and initiatives regarding diversity and civic engagement have proceeded on parallel tracks and yet they tend to occur on the same campus. We believe our newly constructed indices of campus initiatives captured this phenomenon with the curricular initiative index capturing those practices that embed, integrate, and place value on both of these ideas. Similarly, our index for co-curricular initiatives capture events, programs, and opportunities of a more temporal nature, but here too we found that reports of diversity co-curricular programming are also linked with civic engagement co-curricular programming (e.g. intergroup dialogue and opportunities for students to assist communities). Moreover, institutions

that incorporate many of the curricular and co-curricular practices that prepare college students for a diverse democracy have similar characteristics.

Those institutions that indicate they are ahead of their peers in terms of progress on diversity and civic engagement initiatives indeed have many more practices that demonstrate institutional effort and innovation. They take pride in being identified as an “engaged campus” and may define their excellence according to the level of engagement they demonstrate in terms of public service and diversity issues that are addressed in both curricular and co-curricular initiatives. Our study establishes that a set of focused priorities in the areas of diversity and civic engagement also work across both the curriculum and co-curricular programming. Institutional leadership helps to attract diverse faculty, which in turn stimulates diversity awareness and civic engagement initiatives at both the curricular and co-curricular levels. In addition, another key organizational feature is the demonstration of central administrative leadership support and a vision for how diversity and civic engagement should be incorporated in the central educational mission of the institution.

It is important to note that our study also confirms the importance of diversifying the faculty by race and gender if we expect to see real curricular innovation in preparing college students for a diverse democracy. The percentage of faculty of color is a consistent predictor of curricular initiatives that address both diversity and civic engagement. The presence of white women faculty is also important, particularly in light of the relatively low numbers of faculty of color on some campuses. However, co-curricular programming was not impacted by the presence of women or minority faculty. This is not surprising since faculty are charged with conveying knowledge necessary for participation in an increasingly complex, diverse society and as a matter of role differentiation, they have not been involved in great numbers in co-curricular

programming. Moreover, many faculty have deeply embedded views about where and how learning occurs among students. As campuses begin to think about creating a seamless learning environment, however, we may see this change in the future. Additional work is needed to identify institutional factors that create an “engaged campus,” as well as further exploration of the faculty role in promoting student skills and dispositions that make them better citizens in a diverse society—they are, after all, our future.

- Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2002, October). *Greater Expectations: A New Vision for Learning as a Nation Goes to College*. Washington, DC.
- Antonio, A. (2002). Faculty of Color Reconsidered: Reassessing Contributions to Scholarship. *Journal of Higher Education*, 73(5).
- Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college? Four Critical years revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, H., Antonio, A., Cress, C., & Astin, A. (1997). *Race and Ethnicity in the American Professoriate, 1995-1996*. Los Angeles: University of California.
- Bain, O., & Cummings, W. (2000). Institutional Barriers to the Career Advancement of Academic Women. *Comparative Education*, 44(4), 493-514.
- Boxer, M. J. (1999). *When Women Ask the Questions: Creating Women's Studies in America*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Boyer, E. L. (1994, March 9). Creating the new American college. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A48.
- Bunzel, J. H. (1990). Minority Faculty Hiring: Problems and Prospects. *American Scholar*, 59(1), 39-52.
- Carter, D. J., & O'Brien, E. M. (1993). *Employment and Hiring Patterns for Faculty of Color*. U.S.; District of Columbia.
- Chang, M. J. (2002). The Impact of Undergraduate Diversity Course Requirement on Students' Racial Views and Attitudes. *Journal of General Education*, 51(1), 21-42.
- Checkoway, B. (2001). Renewing the Civic Mission of the American Research University. *Journal of Higher Education*, 72(2), 125-147.
- Cooper, D. D. (1999). Academic Professionalism and the Betrayal of the Land-Grant Tradition. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 42(5), 776-785.
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1991). Introduction to the new institutionalism. In W. Powell & P. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gaff, J. G. (1997). The Changing Roles of Faculty & Administrators. *Liberal Education*, 83(3), 12-17.
- Glazer-Raymo, J. (1999). *Shattering Myths: Women in Academe*. Baltimore, MD.: The Johns Hopkins Press.
- Hargens, L., & Long, J. S. (2002). Demographic Inertia and Women's Representation Among Faculty in Higher Education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 73(4), 494-517.
- Humphreys, D. (1997). *General Education and American Commitments. A National Report on Diversity Courses and Requirements*. U.S.; District of Columbia.
- Humphreys, D. (1998). *Higher Education, Race & Diversity: Views from the Field*. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Hurtado, S. (2001). Linking Diversity and Educational Purpose: How Diversity Affects the Classroom Environment and Student Development. In G. Orfield & M. Kurlaender (Eds.), *Diversity Challenged: Evidence on the Impact of Affirmative Action*. Cambridge: Harvard Education.
- Hurtado, S., Milem, J., Clayton-Pedersen, A., & Allen, W. (1999). *Enacting Diverse Learning Environments. Improving the Climate for Racial/Ethnic Diversity in Higher Education* (No. V26,8). Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University.

- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1986). Mainstreaming and cooperative learning strategies. *Exceptional Children, 52*, 553-561.
- Johnsrud, L. K., & Des Jarlais, C. D. (1994). Barriers to Tenure for Women and Minorities. *Review of Higher Education, 17*(4), 335-353.
- Mathews, D. (1997). Character for what? Higher education and public life. *Educational Record*(78), 11-17.
- Milem, J. (2001). Increasing Diversity Benefits: How Campus Climate and Teaching methods Affect Student Outcomes. In G. Orfield & M. Kurlaender (Eds.), *Diversity Challenged: Evidence on the Impact of Affirmative Action*. Cambridge: Harvard Education.
- Milem, J., & Wakai, S. (1996). *Understanding how faculty teach: Facilitators and inhibitors of student-centered pedagogy*. Paper presented at the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Memphis.
- Morey, A. I. (2000). Changing Higher Education Curricula for a Global and Multicultural World. *Higher Education in Europe, 25*(1), 25-39.
- Moses, Y. T. (1989). *Black Women in Academe. Issues and Strategies*. U.S.; District of Columbia.
- Moss, L. A. (2000). *Recruitment, Retention, and Mentoring of Female and Minority Faculty in Higher Education*. University of Arkansas.
- Perna, L. (2001). Sex and Race Differences in Faculty Tenure and Promotion. *Research in Higher Education, 42*(5), 541-567.
- Rendon, L. I. (1993). *Validating Culturally Diverse Students*. U.S.; Arizona.
- Rudenstine, N. L. (2001). Student diversity and higher learning. In G. Orfield & M. Kurlaender (Eds.), *Diversity Challenged: Evidence on the Impact of Affirmative Action* (pp. 31-48).
- Sandler, B. (1996). *The Chilly Classroom Climate: A guide to Improve the Education of Women*. Washington DC.
- Smith, D. (1995). Organizational Implications of Diversity in Higher Education. In M. Chemers, S. Oskamp & M. Costanzo (Eds.), *Diversity in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Statham, A. (1991). *Gender and University Teaching: A negotiated difference*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Trower, C., & Chait, R. (2002, March-April). Faculty Diversity: Too Little for too Long. *Harvard Magazine, 33-37*.
- Wakai, S. (1994). *Barriers to and Facilitators of Feminist Pedagogy in College and University Teaching* (No. ED375729). Tucson, AZ.

TABLE 1. Summary of Variables and Indices in the Research Model

Variable Name	Scale Range	Variable Type
<i>Dependent Outcomes</i>		
Curricular Initiatives	Scaled index, four items	1=Strongly Disagree to 4=Strongly Agree
Co-Curricular Initiatives Supports	Scaled index, seven items	1=Does Not Support to 7=Strongly
<i>Institutional Background Characteristics</i>		
Doctoral	Dichotomous	0=Other, 1=Doctoral
Bachelor	‘	0=Other, 1=Bachelor
Public	‘	0=Private, 1=Public
Admission Rate	Single item, continuous	13=Minimum 100=Maximum
<i>Institutional Priorities</i>		
Diversity Priority	Scaled index, four items	1=Not a Priority to 4=Highest
Priority	‘	‘
Civic Engagement Priority	‘	‘
Evaluation and Rewards for Diversity	Scaled index, four items	1=Never to 4=Always
<i>Core Leadership</i>		
Support for Civic Engagement	Scaled index, four items	1=Strongly Disagree to 4=Strongly Agree
Support for Diversity	‘	‘
Faculty Commitment to Civic Engagement	‘	‘
<i>Peer Comparisons</i>		
Creating a Diverse Environment	Scaled index, four items	1=No Activities to 4=More
Activities than Others	‘	‘
Integrating Civic Engagement	‘	‘
<i>Faculty Representation</i>		
White Female Faculty	0-100	Percentage of Whole Faculty
Faculty of Color	0-100	‘

TABLE 2. Descriptive Statistics for Variables in the Analyses ($n=469$)

<i>Variable Name</i>	<i>Percentage/Mean</i>
Dependent Outcomes	
Curricular Initiatives	.03
Co-Curricular Initiatives	.10
Independent Variables	
Doctoral	22%
Bachelor	34%
Public	50%
Admission Rate	72%
Institutional Diversity Priority	.93
Institutional Civic Engagement Priority	.04
Evaluation and Rewards for Diversity	.11
Core Leadership Support for Civic Engagement	.03
Core Leadership Support for Diversity	.09
Faculty Commitment to Civic Engagement	.03
Peer Comparison: Creating a Diverse Environment	.06
Peer Comparison: Integrating Civic Engagement	.01
<i>White Female Faculty</i>	31%
<i>Faculty of Color</i>	13%

TABLE 3. Factor Loadings and Reliabilities for Dependent Variables

Item Wording	Factor Loading	Alpha
<i>Curricular Initiatives</i> ¹		.69
Opportunities for Intense Discussion between Students	.591	
Courses Incorporate Selections on Women and Ethnic Minorities	.582	
Living-learning Communities	.556	
Students Required to Complete Community-based Experience	.544	
Students Required to Enroll in One Cultural or Ethnic Diversity Course	.490	
Academic Credit Given for Public Service Activities	.454	
<i>Co-curricular Initiatives</i> ²		.87
Debates and Panels about Diversity Issues	.824	
Race Awareness Workshops	.800	
Presentations, Performances, Art Exhibits on Diversity	.701	
A Diversity Awareness Program in Orientation	.730	
Intergroup Dialogue Program	.683	
Centers and Institutes Related to Diversity	.635	
Multiethnic Food Fest on Campus	.548	
Volunteer Opportunities for Students to Assist Communities	.429	

¹Four-point scale: From Strongly Disagree=1 to Strongly Agree=4.

²Seven-point scale: From Does Not Support=1 to Strongly Support=7.

TABLE 4. Factor Loadings and Reliabilities for Independent Variables

Item Wording	Factor Loading	Alpha
<i>Institutional Diversity Priorities</i> ¹		.85
Developing Appreciation for a Multicultural Society	.785	
Creating a Diverse Learning Environment	.779	
Increasing Representation of Minorities and Women	.710	
Recruiting More Underrepresented Students	.665	
Maintaining a Climate where Differences Can Be Discussed	.541	
<i>Institutional Civic Engagement Priorities</i> ¹		.82
Increasing Institutional and Community Capacity for Public Work	.854	
Working to Create Long-term Partnerships with Communities	.664	
Allocating Institutional Resources for Faculty Public Service Participation	.630	
Fostering Greater Civic Engagement Among Students	.608	
Addressing Societal Problems	.530	
<i>Evaluation and Rewards for Diversity</i> ³		.85
Promotes Research in Areas of Diversity	.737	
Encourages Conferences and Workshops on Diversity and Civic Engagement	.673	
Publishes Institution's Accomplishments and Efforts Related to Diversity	.666	
Recognizes Students, Faculty and Staff for Participation in Diversity Programs	.658	
Assesses Campus Climate Related to Diversity	.640	
Evaluates Progress Towards Diversity Goals	.633	
Promotes Research in Civic Engagement	.608	
Assesses Institutional Efforts in Civic Engagement and Service Learning	.522	
<i>Core Leadership Support for Civic Engagement</i> ²		.84
Institution Has a Long-Standing Commitment to Civic Engagement	.762	
Strategic Planning Documents contain Civic Mission Goals for the Institution	.746	
Institution Directs Resources Toward Civic Engagement Initiatives	.662	
University Leaders Articulate the Institution's Public Service Commitment	.641	
Faculty Encouraged by Institution's Leaders to Participate in Civic Partnerships	.468	
<i>Core Leadership Support for Diversity</i> ²		.73
University Leaders Articulate the Value of Diversity	.944	
University Has a Long-Standing Commitment to Diversity Issues	.577	
Strategic Planning Documents Contain Goals for Diversity	.476	
<i>Faculty Commitment to Civic Engagement</i> ²		.64
Faculty Lead the Promotion of Civic Mission for the University	.735	
Faculty Engage Campus Community in Public Discussions	.602	
Faculty Tenure and Promotion Decisions Value Public Service*	.338	
<i>Peer Comparison: Creating a Diverse Environment</i> ⁴		.79
Innovative Practices and Programs Related to Social Diversity	.758	
Programs Tying Institutional Diversity Goals to Allocated Resources	.641	
Activities that Help Students Respect Differences	.612	
Integration of Social Diversity Issues into General Curriculum	.524	
Enrollment of African American and/or Latino Students	.500	
<i>Peer Comparison: Integrating Civic Engagement</i> ⁴		.74
Making Civic Engagement a Core Component of Institution's Curriculum	.866	
Innovative Practices and Programs Related to Civic Engagement	.623	

¹Four-point scale: from Not a Priority=1 to Highest Priority=4.²Four-point scale: from Strongly Disagree=1 to Strongly Agree=4.³Four-point scale: from Never=1 to Always=4.⁴Four-point scale: from No Activities=1 to More Activities than Others=4.⁵Seven-point scale: from Does Not Support=1 to Strongly Supports=7.

*This item was reversed for scaling of the index.

TABLE 5. Standardized Beta Coefficients for Blocked Entry Regression on Curricular Initiatives ($n=469$)

Variable Name	Block 1	Block 2	Block 3	Block 4	Block 5
<i>Institutional Background Characteristics</i>					
Doctoral	-.040	-.069	-.050	-.051	-.023
Bachelors	-.103*	-.039	-.038	-.024	-.017
Public (Private)	.029	.068	.043	.018	.033
Admission Rate	<u>-.039</u>	.058	.068	.081*	.096*
<i>Institutional Priorities</i>					
Diversity Priorities	.404***	.235***	.163***	.131**	.127**
Civic Engagement Priorities	.386***	.269***	.217***	.212***	.199***
Evaluation and Rewards for Diversity	.505***	<u>.289***</u>	.179***	.096	.115*
<i>Core Leadership</i>					
Core Leadership Support for Civic Engagement	.274***	-.023	.033	-.023	-.031
Core Leadership Support for Diversity	.403***	.156**	.188***	.120*	.116*
Faculty Civic Engagement	.336***	.132**	<u>.159***</u>	.118**	.110**
<i>Peer Comparisons</i>					
Creating a Diverse Environment	.467***	.265***	.232***	.245***	.218***
Integrating Civic Engagement	.336***	.121*	.112*	<u>.134**</u>	.138**
<i>Faculty Representation</i>					
White Women Faculty	.093	.049	.037	.038	.102*
Faculty of Color	.164***	.122**	.118**	.086*	.134**
R²	<.01	.33	.36	.40	.41

Note. Beta coefficients presented in italics represent each variable not yet in the model. Parentheses indicate the referent group used for comparison.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

TABLE 6. Standardized Beta Coefficients for Blocked Entry Regression on Co-curricular Initiatives ($n=469$)

Variable Name	Block 1	Block 2	Block 3	Block 4	Block 5
<i>Institutional Background Characteristics</i>					
Doctoral	.093	.042	.060	.059	.050
Bachelors	-.031	.031	.030	.045	.042
Public (Private)	.011	.057	.046	.024	.016
Admission Rate	<u>-.162***</u>	-.056	-.038	-.025	-.032
<i>Institutional Priorities</i>					
Diversity Priorities	.489***	.269***	.182***	.149***	.151***
Civic Engagement Priorities	.296***	.132***	.075	.073	.078
Evaluation and Rewards for Diversity	.606***	<u>.420***</u>	.305***	.228***	.220***
<i>Core Leadership</i>					
Core Leadership Support for Civic Engagement	.276***	.020	.074	.029	.032
Core Leadership Support for Diversity	.494***	.187***	.219***	.157***	.157***
Faculty Civic Engagement	.290***	.077*	<u>.112**</u>	.076*	.079*
<i>Peer Comparisons</i>					
Faculty Civic Engagement	.523***	.258***	.227***	.237***	.248***
Integrating Civic Engagement	.318***	.108**	.084*	<u>.106**</u>	.104**
<i>Faculty Representation</i>					
White Women Faculty	.050	.009	-.009	-.008	-.034
Faculty of Color	.035	-.003	-.005	-.039	-.055
R ²	.03	.43	.46	.50	.50

Note. Beta coefficients presented in italics represent each variable not yet in the model. Parentheses indicate the referent group used for comparison.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.