NEXT GENERATION @ IUPUI

A LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR FACULTY OF COLOR

Megan M. Palmer, Julianna V. Banks, Joshua S. Smith, Sherree A. Wilson, Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis

Next Generation @ IUPUI is an intensive one-year leadership program designed to develop the leadership potential of faculty of color. The program expands the pool of faculty who are ready to assume leadership positions. In addition to addressing higher education administration theories and trends, participants receive individualized coaching and mentoring to develop a broad network of peers.

Since the civil rights movement, universities have made efforts to diversify their student bodies, faculty, and administration. While student bodies have become increasingly diverse by race, ethnicity, and gender (Kuh, 2006; Rankin & Reason, 2005) and more minorities and women have entered the academy (Dailey-Hebert, Donnelly, & Mandernach, 2010; Thompson, 2008; Trower, 2009), faculty and administrators have remained disproportionately white and male (Antonio, 2003; Jayakumar, Howard, Allen, & Han, 2009; Villalpando & Delgado Bernal, 2002). Nationally, underrepresented faculty make up only 16 percent of the full-time professoriate (National Center for Education Statistics, 2008). Furthermore, only 5.3 percent of full professors are African American, Hispanic American, or Native American (Ryu, 2008; Thompson, 2008).

The path to leadership for faculty from underrepresented populations is difficult (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Increasing pressure to publish,

For a fuller description of the Next Gen program and an outline of the curriculum, contact the authors.

teach heavy course loads, adopt new pedagogies, meet tenure and promotion standards, and assume heavy service commitments dissuade many from pursuing leadership positions. For some faculty, the tension between work and life has resulted in decisions to seek alternative positions or leave altogether (Rosser, 2004).

Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) aspires to exceed peer institutions in its representation of gender and underserved minorities in its faculty and staff. The university's 2009 State of Diversity Report ranked the institution's performance on this goal as "unacceptable . . . but likely to improve in 1–2 years" (IUPUI Diversity Cabinet, 2009, p. 12). However, unless university administrators address barriers and avoid overly broad solutions, the diversity of the student and faculty bodies will continue to fall below expectations.

In an effort to counteract several of the barriers already noted, accelerate the development of faculty from underserved populations, and expand the pool of faculty who are ready to assume leadership positions, the Indiana University School of Medicine's Office of Faculty Affairs and Professional Development (OFAPD) launched the Next Generation @ IUPUI program (Next Gen). The program is designed to provide professional development with special emphasis on leadership, self-awareness, communication, institutional change, and career planning. It specifically examines higher education administration theories, trends, and best practices; provides individualized coaching and mentoring; and creates opportunities to expand professional networks across the campus. Although all faculty may benefit from this type of leadership program, the demands and struggles that faculty of color face make this an especially important matter.

Literature Review

Diverse faculty benefit college campuses by providing support to students from diverse backgrounds (Allen, Eby, & Lentz, 2006; Villalpando & Delgado Bernal, 2002); symbolizing the interest that institutions have in diverse populations; creating role models for increasingly diverse student populations (Allen et al., 2006); broadening epistemological frameworks; developing opportunities for collaboration; and ensuring that faculty are actively engaged in institutional change (Jayakumar et al., 2009; Thomas, 2001). Despite these benefits and the changing demographics of those earning the doctorate, leadership in American higher education lacks diversity.

Chilly Climates

The climate, culture, and collegiality that faculty encounter on entering academe are principal determinants of their capacity to excel as scholars and leaders (Trower, 2009). Studies show that many underrepresented faculty exit the academy prior to tenure decisions due to an array of campus climate issues (Bach & Sorcinelli, 2010; Griffin, 2008; Maher & Thompson Tetreault, 2007; Stanley, 2006; Suh, 2008; Thompson, 2008). These include limited opportunities to participate in decision making; excessive teaching, service, and committee assignments; limited access to leadership appointments; marginalization or devaluation of scholarship; lack of mentors; and limited guidance on professional expectations, networking, and promotion and tenure processes (Griffin, 2008; Jayakumar et al., 2009; Turner, 2002; Yoshinaga-Itano, 2006).

The limited representation of diverse faculty in academia influences policies, procedures, and expectations, and it perpetuates a climate that impedes the development of future diverse leaders. The intersection of race and gender compounds pressures for female faculty of color (Hollenshead & Thomas, 2001; Turner, 2002). Similarly, minority faculty encounter challenges when other faculty devalue their scholarship by virtue of outlets or topics of inquiry. The subsequent isolation of minority faculty further excludes them from information and support that are important in acquiring resources and securing opportunities for leadership and career advancement (Aguirre, 2000; Thompson, 2008).

Mentoring Underrepresented Faculty

Mentoring and leadership programs mitigate the negative impacts of campus climate and improve professional outlook and career outcomes. Benefits of mentoring are prominent throughout the career development literature (Allen, Eby, Poteet, Lentz, & Lima, 2004; Spencer & Tribe, 2004; Wasburn, 2007) highlighting the importance of mentoring in the academic profession as it is the means by which faculty are socialized into and become familiar with organizational structures and culture (Casto, Caldwell, & Salazar, 2005; Fayne & Ortquist-Ahrens, 2006; Kirchmeyer, 2005; Snelson et al., 2002). Mentoring has the capacity to increase scholarly productivity (Mundt, 2001), faculty retention (Lottero-Perdue & Fifield, 2010), and faculty diversity (Davidson & Foster-Johnson, 2001) and may also help minority faculty manage and challenge inequality in academia (Green & King, 2001; Moody, 2004). Instead, mentoring can empower faculty to serve as change agents within the institution (Angelique, Kyle, & Taylor, 2002; Lottero-Perdue & Fifield, 2010).

Faculty benefit from engaging multiple mentors (Dixon-Reeves, 2003; King & Cubic, 2005; Packard, Walsh, & Seidenberg, 2004). Such models are based on Higgins and Kram's (2001) concept of mentoring as a developmental network and are deliberately designed for women and minorities and employ "peer mentoring to deemphasize [power differences] (McGuire & Reger, 2003) . . . or [to construct] empathetic communities of support (Chelser & Chelser, 2002; Green & King, 2002)" (Lotterop-Perdue & Fifield, 2010, p. 45).

Developing Faculty Leaders

Academe has traditionally devoted little effort to selecting leaders, chairs, and deans and spends even less time preparing them for the responsibilities they assume (Carroll & Wolverton, 2004; Meyer & Kaloyeros, 2005; Wolverton & Ackerman, 2006). In fact, in national surveys between 1990 and 2000, only 3 percent of more than two thousand academic leaders reported they had any type of leadership training or preparation (Gmelch, 2000).

Many institutions appoint department leaders based on the assumption that if a faculty member performs well in the faculty role, then he or she will perform well (or at least well enough) as a leader (Wolverton & Ackerman, 2006). But the skill sets required for research or instruction and those necessary for leadership are, with few exceptions, different. Teaching and research are generally conducted in isolation or within small clusters of like-minded faculty who thrive on autonomy (Wolverton & Ackerman, 2006). In contrast, effective leading is a collective venture. Communication, interpersonal skills, and rapid but thoughtful response are among the skills required of leaders and administrators. Although management tasks such as budgeting and conflict resolution can be learned fairly quickly (Hecht, 2004; Thomas & Schuh, 2004), leadership skills such as the ability to anticipate needs, plan strategically, and develop vision are more challenging to acquire, require significantly more time, and are rarely examined in faculty development (Thomas & Schuh, 2004; Wolverton & Ackerman, 2006).

Typical faculty development programs comprise a series of workshops that provide exposure to educational principles or instructional strategies with opportunities to apply and practice skills. Such programs are narrow in scope and limited in duration, and they tend to address immediate self-efficacy, teaching improvement, and curriculum development (Gruppen, Frohna, Anderson, & Lowe, 2003). Short-term workshops may be less effective in promoting educational leadership among faculty because of

their limited scope. More innovative formats linking extended workshops to programs that target a broader range of leadership issues and outcomes are encouraged in preparing faculty for active roles in leadership and governance (Gruppen et al., 2003).

There are emerging and successful leadership development programs for faculty (see, for example, Michigan State University's Academic Leadership Program, <http://fod.msu.edu/Leadership/about.asp>). However, because underrepresented faculty play vital roles in an institution's education, research, and service functions, campus leaders and faculty developers must recognize that in order to achieve excellence in each of these areas, they must develop and draw on the intellectual vitality and innovation that come from a racially and ethnically diverse professoriate (Moreno, Smith, Clayton-Pederson, Parker, & Teraguchi, 2006). Given the current state of affairs, OFAPD launched the Next Gen program.

The Next Gen Program

The Next Gen Program was founded at an urban university with more than twenty-five hundred faculty in over twenty schools and two hundred degree-granting programs. The campus is home to several nationally ranked programs and is distinguished by its commitment to research, service, and civic engagement. Over the course of the one-year program, the founding cohort provided information and feedback on the impact of program participation.

Participants

All faculty of color on campus were invited to submit applications (personal statement, letter of support, curriculum vitae) to participate in the 2009–2010 program. Of the approximately sixty applications received, members of the Next Gen advisory board reviewed and selected five male and nine female faculty members representing three American minority groups: three African or African American, six Latino/a, and six Asian or Asian American. Other program participants hailed from India, China, Burma, Argentina, Mexico, Brazil, and Puerto Rico.

Faculty from the United States of Chinese and African American descent also participated. The schools of medicine, dentistry, engineering, health, informatics, law, liberal arts, and physical education were represented. Some participants were relatively junior faculty without much formal leadership experience, while two others were about to take on the role of department chair.

Assessment

A semistructured interview was conducted with each participant early in the program and again at the end of the one-year experience to develop a rich understanding of the cohort group, including challenges that impede promotion to leadership positions. Sample questions included, "What are your expectations for this experience, or rather, what do you expect to gain professionally and personally?" and, "How will this prepare you to become a leader in your field?" The follow-up interviews conducted at the end of the program assessed participant perspectives of the program's impact and gathered feedback on the utility of the curriculum, resources, opportunities, and support provided.

To evaluate the program's format, structure, curriculum, and group dynamics, observations of each workshop session were conducted by the third author. He was part of the advisory board that reviewed applications and oversaw the implementation of the program. Following each workshop, he reflected on his experience and the interaction that participants had with one another and the workshop facilitators.

Data Analysis

The data analysis procedure was guided by the constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), which involved sorting individual units of data and then grouping and categorizing them into more general conceptual themes. The initial coding scheme followed an open coding model that loosely corresponded to the overarching questions in the two interview protocols. Observation field notes were coded separately and then combined with emerging interview themes where appropriate.

Outcomes

A strong bond among faculty emerged early in the Next Gen program, and although participants came from different disciplines and had diverse leadership experiences and years of service, personal connections and a shared commitment to support one another were evident in the passionate disclosures of concerns and accomplishments. Participants were genuinely enthusiastic about the program and entered with a desire to increase their leadership skills and gain awareness of their own strengths and weaknesses. Participants identified people skills, including oral communication and how to deal with conflict, as intended outcomes of the program, along with a desire to obtain knowledge of leadership

opportunities at the university and network with faculty who experienced similar challenges. Despite the fact that the participants were part of a leadership program, associate and full professors alike consistently stated that they had no intention of seeking higher posts and noted their distaste for the politics, bureaucracy, and the limitations formal leadership posts had on scholarly production.

Early in the program, the general feeling was that leadership was associated with formal administrative roles that often required an abundance of meetings, responding to university-wide demands, and being pulled away from the day-to-day functions of a faculty member. These perceptions were complicated by specific barriers faculty faced as they considered their current and future roles within the university. Participants described significant challenges in their respective fields, including a lack of time, racial and gender discrimination, and unrealistic role expectations.

All of the Next Gen participants consistently commented on service to other students and faculty of color in their departments and schools and across the university. One African American woman stated, "I think the biggest barrier for faculty of color is we tend to get involved and do a lot of service. . . . A lot of committees . . . need 'representation.' They ask us." During program discussions, the "they" often referred to were university administrators who would contact faculty of color and "invite" them to be on a committee, chair a committee, or advise a student group. The pressure of the invitation was subtle, but the entire group felt that saying no would not bode well for them. In addition to the committee work, participants spoke of countless hours supporting, advising, and mentoring other faculty and students of color. There was consensus that although recognition for committee work was nominal, mentoring students and faculty was not viewed favorably. However, there was an overwhelming sense that it was important to give back. All participants reported that time pressure and role expectations contributed to their decisions not to pursue formal and informal leadership roles on campus.

Personal accounts of racial and gender discrimination involving administrators, peers, and students surfaced in more than half of the interviews. Several participants reported that they had not personally experienced racial or gender discrimination as a barrier but thought they were "lucky" or the "exception." Issues of race and gender were included in curricular materials, incorporated into presentations, or brought up by individual participants.

Although feedback regarding the program was overwhelmingly positive, only a few participants thought the Next Gen program would have a direct impact on barriers that minority faculty face. As one faculty member put it, "It is not going to change the barriers, because it is people [current leaders] who are the barriers. They either don't know what this program is doing, or they are against it." Others echoed this sentiment but acknowledged the potential for the program to diminish some of the obstacles to promotion and tenure. "Opportunities are there; we just don't know how to go and get them," explained one participant, who went on to say that the program helped remove a barrier by exposing minority faculty to the system and the positions available throughout the institution. Another participant indicated that the program itself constituted recognition on the part of the university that minority faculty and "their contributions to the university are things that are valued." She suggested that this may inspire minority faculty to take on more challenging positions.

Specific benefits associated with participating in the program included expansion of professional networks, applied skills, latent knowledge, and preparation and access to leadership positions. Participants established positive connections with other program members, their mentors, and program coordinators. Many indicated that they had a better understanding of the upper levels of the system. One participant noted, "I have been exposed to some of the people in administration that I would not normally have been exposed to." Newly acquired knowledge clarified misconceptions about the roles of executive administrators and access to such positions. Several participants appeared more open to leadership positions as a result of their participation in the program. One participant insisted that being an administrator "was the furthest away from what I ever want to do. Then when I agreed to come to the program, I was on the fence. My program participation helped me understand what an administrator does and doesn't do. I understand what the opportunities for administration are on campus."

Throughout the sessions, the observer noted that faculty were reticent about aspirations to high-level positions of leadership. When asked by a guest speaker what their dream position was, the vast majority cited their current role or earning the next tenure rank within the same unit. Explanations for the rather conservative aspirations of these exemplary faculty members included that they were comfortable in their positions or did not fully trust the fact that these opportunities are a reality for faculty of color.

By the end of the program, three participants had already accepted new committee or council appointments, directorships, and advanced teaching positions. For other participants, the Next Gen program had a clear impact on their decisions to assume leadership positions. One participant, who was “very hesitant” to accept a chair position, admitted that had it not been for the program, he might not have accepted. Others indicated that the program helped them become more confident and settled in their current leadership roles.

Most participants applied skills learned in the Next Gen workshop sessions, reporting that they were improving time management, opening communication with colleagues, building teams in their current positions, using a strengths-based approach, and learning to be more selective about research and service opportunities. In the area of communication, they developed an understanding of the perspectives of others and improved their ability to collaborate with diverse groups. One participant noted, “It also helped me understand better who I am and how I operate.” Another participant likened academia to a “wheel where we just keep running without ever kind of having the chance to stop” and valued the program for providing time to “come up with a plan.”

Although not all faculty identified specific ways they had applied the lessons gleaned from the workshop sessions, over two-thirds suggested that the knowledge, though currently lying dormant, would be “converted into actions in the future.” One participant summed this up by saying, “Now I am armed with knowledge,” while another indicated that she now had “an arsenal.” Another participant described the program as an aha! moment because it forced her to realize that if she wanted to become a leader, she needed a plan. “If you are going to be wishy-washy about the whole thing,” she said, “you are going to go nowhere. If you are going to do it, what is your plan?” The Next Gen program was a call to action that provided the space to map out a future in leadership and the tools to complete the job successfully.

Committing time to the program meant cutting out other work. However, all of the participants indicated that they felt the sacrifice was worthwhile. Absences from workshops were rare and attributed only to faculty illness or previously scheduled conferences. This reflects the personal drive and responsibility of the faculty, but also the fact that the Next Gen curriculum required active participation that was meaningful, timely, and engaging.

Participants had mixed feelings about the impact of the mentoring aspect of the program. Two participants never established working relationships with their mentors, while others met regularly and found the

mentoring relationship extremely useful. One positive experience was described this way: "Without my mentoring sessions, I don't know where I would be. I just have great mentors. They really take the time . . . keep me on task. They respond quickly and directly, and they will tell me I am not going to help you because you should do this yourself. Or they will tell me, 'Here are the steps you need to take before I can help you.'" Several maintained strong mentoring relationships throughout the program, and a few others never found a successful match. Implicit in their comments about mentoring was the idea that a good mentor could meet regularly, provide honest feedback, help solve problems, and connect their mentees to other people and resources.

Discussion

The findings suggest that participation in the Next Gen program leads to increased interest in seeking leadership among program participants and confidence to be successful in these positions. As we continue to follow participants, we will be able to better ascertain if participation in the program helps the institution develop a culture that embraces diversity and one in which leaders are chosen from a wider range of races and cultures. Given the diverse population of students in colleges and universities, we must strive to ensure that leadership in American higher education reflects the diversity of the student body and communities where they are located.

IUPUI has an opportunity to cultivate emerging leaders for the campus specifically and higher education in general. The first cohort of the Next Gen program was diverse, not only in race, ethnicity, and gender, but also in terms of academic discipline. Since leadership can take many forms and does not have to be defined or determined solely based on position title, we recommend that campus administration consider how the expertise of the cohort members can benefit the institution. It is entirely possible to be engaged in leadership development in rather informal ways such as chairing campuswide or search committees; serving on campus teams in national workshops or institutes; asking the faculty to read, write, and provide commentary on issues of relevance to the campus; serving on review or accreditation teams; or seeking input from faculty regarding policy deliberations. If we expect to develop faculty of color and diversify leadership, our focus must be on cultivating a welcoming climate that fosters full participation from its members.

The early impact of the Next Gen program is promising. If similar programs were adopted at other colleges and universities, we may more quickly meet our goal of having a more diverse group of campus leaders.

REFERENCES

- Aguirre, A. (2000). *Women and minority faculty in the academic workplace: Recruitment, retention, and academic culture*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Allen, T. D., Eby, L. T., & Lentz, E. (2006). Mentorship behaviors and mentorship quality associated with formal mentoring programs: Closing the gap between research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(3), 567–578.
- Allen, T. D., Eby, L. T., Poteet, M. L., Lentz, E., & Lima, L. (2004). Career benefits associated with mentoring for protégés: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(1), 127–136.
- Angelique, H., Kyle, K., & Taylor, E. (2002). Mentors and muses: New strategies for academic success. *Innovative Higher Education*, 26(3), 195–209. doi:10.1023/A:1017968906264
- Antonio, A. L. (2003). Diverse student bodies, diverse faculties. *Academe*, 89(6), 14–17.
- Bach, D., & Sorcinelli, M. D. (2010). The case for excellence in diversity: Lessons from an assessment of an early career faculty program. In L. B. Nilson & J. E. Miller (Eds.), *To improve the academy: Vol. 28. Resources for faculty, instructional, and organizational development* (pp. 310–326). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Carroll, J. B., & Wolverton, M. (2004). Who becomes a chair? In W. H. Gmelch & J. H. Schuh (Eds.), *New directions for higher education: No. 126. The life cycle of the department chair* (pp. 3–10). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Casto, C., Caldwell, C., & Salazar, C. F. (2005). Creating mentoring relationships between female faculty and students in counselor education: Guidelines for potential mentees and mentors. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 83(3), 331–336.
- Dailey-Hebert, A., Donnelly, E., & Mandernach, B. (2010). Access to success: A new mentoring model for women in academia. In L. B. Nilson & J. E. Miller (Eds.), *To improve the academy: Vol. 28. Resources for faculty, instructional, and organizational development* (pp. 327–340). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Davidson, M. N., & Foster-Johnson, L. (2001). Mentoring in the preparation of graduate researchers of color. *Review of Educational Research*, 71(4), 549–574. doi:10.3102/00346543071004549
- Dixon-Reeves, R. (2003). Mentoring as a precursor to incorporation: An assessment of the mentoring experience of recently minted Ph.D.s. *Journal of Black Studies*, 34(1), 12–27. doi:10.1177/0021934703253680
- Fayne, H., & Ortquist-Ahrens, L. (2006). Learning communities for first-year faculty: Transition, acculturation, and transformation. In S. Chadwick-Blossey &

- D. R. Robertson (Eds.), *To improve the academy: Vol. 24. Resources for faculty, instructional, and organizational development* (pp. 277–290). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.
- Gmelch, W. H. (2000, February). *Rites of passage: Transition to the deanship*. Paper presented at the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Conference, Chicago, IL.
- Green, C. E., & King, V. G. (2001). Sisters mentoring sisters: Africentric leadership development for black women in the academy. *Journal of Negro Education*, 70(3), 156–165.
- Griffin, K. A. (2008). *Can reaching back push you forward? A mixed methods exploration of black faculty and their relationships with students* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of California, Los Angeles.
- Gruppen, L. D., Frohna, A. Z., Anderson, R. M., & Lowe, K. D. (2003). Faculty development for educational leadership and scholarship. *Academic Medicine*, 78(2), 137–141.
- Hecht, I.W.D. (2004). The professional development of department chairs. In W. H. Gmelch & J. H. Schuh (Eds.), *New directions for higher education: No. 126. The life cycle of the department chair* (pp. 27–44). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Higgins, M. C., & Kram, K. E. (2001). Reconceptualizing mentoring at work: A developmental network perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(2), 264–288.
- Hollenshead, C., & Thomas, G. D. (2001). Resisting from the margins: The coping strategies of black women and other women of color faculty members at a research university. *Journal of Negro Education*, 70(3), 166–175.
- IUPUI Diversity Cabinet. (2009). *State of diversity 2009: Chancellor's message*. Retrieved from www.iupui.edu/~divrsity/docs/Diversity%20Report-April%202009.pdf
- Jayakumar, U. M., Howard, T. C., Allen, W. R., & Han, J. C. (2009). Racial privilege in the professoriate: An exploration of campus climate, retention, and satisfaction. *Journal of Higher Education*, 80(5), 538–563. doi:10.1353/jhe.0.0063
- King, C. A., & Cubic, B. (2005). Women psychologists within academic health systems: Mentorship and career advancement. *Journal of Clinical Psychology in Medical Settings*, 12(3), 271–280. doi:10.1007/s10880-005-5746-3
- Kirchmeyer, C. (2005). The effects of mentoring on academic careers over time: Testing performance and political perspectives. *Human Relations*, 58(5), 637–660. doi:10.1177/0018726705055966

- Kuh, G. D. (2006). Making students matter. In J. C. Burke (Ed.), *Fixing the fragmented university: Decentralization with direction* (pp. 235–265). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lottero-Perdue, P., & Fifield, S. (2010). A conceptual framework for higher education faculty mentoring. In L. B. Nilson & J. E. Miller (Eds.), *To improve the academy: Vol. 28. Resources for faculty, instructional, and organizational development* (pp. 37–62). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Maher, F. A., & Thompson Tetreault, M. K. (2007). *Struggling to diversify: Privilege and diversity in the academy*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Meyer, H. D., & Kaloyeros, A. E. (2005, June 10). What campuses can do to pick up the pace of decision making. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. B16.
- Moody, J. (2004). *Faculty diversity: Problems and solutions*. New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Moreno, J., Smith, D., Clayton-Pederson, A., Parker, S., & Teraguchi, D. (2006). *The revolving door: Underrepresented minority faculty in higher education*. San Francisco, CA: James Irvine Foundation.
- Mundt, M. H. (2001). An external mentor program: Stimulus for faculty research development. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, 17(1), 40–45. doi:10.1053/jpnu.2001.20241
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2008). *Digest of educational statistics 2007*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Packard, B. W-L., Walsh, L., & Seidenberg, S. (2004). Will that be one mentor or two? A cross sectional study of women's mentoring during college. *Mentoring and Tutoring*, 12(1), 71–85. doi:10.1080/1361126042000183039
- Rankin, S. R., & Reason, R. D. (2005). Differing perceptions: How students of color and white students perceive campus climate for underrepresented groups. *Journal of College Student Development*, 46(1), 43–61.
- Rosser, V. J. (2004). Faculty members' intentions to leave: A national study on their work-life and satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, 45(3), 285–309.
- Ryu, M. (2008). *Minorities in higher education 2008: 23rd status report*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Schuster, J., & Finkelstein, M. (2006). *The American faculty: The restructuring of academic work and careers*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Snelson, C. M., Martsolf, D. S., Dieckman, B. C., Anaya, E. R., Cartechine, K. A., Miller, B., . . . Shaffer, J. (2002). Caring as a theoretical perspective for a nursing faculty mentoring program. *Nurse Education Today*, 22(8), 654–660.

- Spencer, C., & Tribe, K. (2004). *Mentoring made easy: A practical guide* (3rd ed.). Retrieved from www.une.edu.au/od/files/mentoring_made_easy.pdf
- Stanley, C. A. (2006). Coloring the academic landscape: Faculty of color breaking the silence in predominantly white colleges and universities. *American Educational Research Journal*, 43(4), 701–736. doi:10.3102/00028312043004701
- Suh, S. A. (2008). *The significance of race for Asian Americans: Access, rewards, and workplace experiences of academics* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of California, Los Angeles.
- Thomas, G. (2001). The dual role of scholar and change agent. In R. O. Mabokela & A. L. Green (Eds.), *Sisters of the academy: Emergent black women scholars in higher education* (pp. 80–91). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Thomas, J. R., & Schuh, J. H. (2004). Socializing new chairs. In W. H. Gmelch & J. H. Schuh (Eds.), *New directions for higher education: No. 126. The life cycle of the department chair* (pp. 11–25). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Thompson, C. (2008). Recruitment, retention, and mentoring faculty of color: The chronicle continues. In N.V.N. Chism (Ed.), *New directions for higher education: No. 143. Faculty at the margins* (pp. 47–54). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Trower, C. A. (2009, September/October). Toward a greater understanding of the tenure track for minorities. *Change*, 41(5), 38–45.
- Turner, C.S.V. (2002). Women of color in academe: Living with multiple marginality. *Journal of Higher Education*, 73(1), 74–93. doi:10.1353/jhe.2002.0013
- Villalpando, O., & Delgado Bernal, D. (2002). A critical race theory analysis of barriers that impede the success of faculty of color. In W. A. Smith, P. G. Altbach, & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *The racial crisis in American higher education: Continuing challenges for the twenty-first century* (pp. 243–269). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Wasburn, M. H. (2007). Mentoring women faculty: An instrumental case study of strategic collaboration. *Mentoring and Tutoring*, 15(1), 57–72. doi:10.1080/13611260601037389
- Wolverton, M., & Ackerman, R. (2006). Cultivating possibilities: Prospective department chair professional development and why it matters. *Planning for Higher Education*, 34(4), 14–23.
- Yoshinaga-Itano, C. (2006). Institutional barriers and myths to recruitment and retention of faculty of color: An administrator's perspective. In C. A. Stanley (Ed.), *Faculty of color: Teaching in predominantly white colleges and universities*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.