Faculty Diversity and Search Committee Training: Learning From a Critical Incident

Gertrude J. Fraser and Dawn E. Hunt
University of Virginia

Many universities have experienced success at improving student, but not faculty, diversity. This paper examines how, over the past few years, a major U.S. research university made significant progress in recruiting faculty candidates from underrepresented groups. The paper situates this progress in the earlier context of a racial incident that disrupted the community's sense of order and civility. It was in the aftermath of this critical incident that a galvanized collective created positive conditions for change. We show that insiders' tacit knowledge can provide key clues to successful organizational change. In particular, we offer our experience of creating a university-wide, online tutorial on recruiting diverse faculty that every search committee member is required to take. Our case also demonstrates that organizational context and history are important factors to consider in understanding why specific faculty life initiatives succeed or flounder.

Keywords: faculty diversity, faculty recruitment, critical incident technique, search committee training, tacit knowledge

There is a shared anxiety that underlies the literature on change in higher education in the United States, one that goes beyond specific conceptual or empirical permutations; the concern is that despite extensive research—and many calls for reform—there is no consensus as to the capacity of institutions to effect meaningful organizational change. Hearn (1996) asserts that desire for change is as prevalent on university campuses as is resistance to it, yet attempts at reform often fail because administrators are often averse to change because they are unaware of the rich vein of scholarship on the theory and practice of change in higher education. Tierney (2000) warns that universities and colleges are often viewed as ineffective organizations precisely because they are seen as unable or unwilling to change: On the 15 campuses he studied, more reform initiatives failed than succeeded. Kezar and Eckel (2000, pp. 295–296) claim that sustained and transformative change "is unfamiliar to most higher educational institutions," where most adjustments are additive, reactive, incremental, or growth based.

Drawing on the two authors' experience—both are academic administrators who designed and instituted the program discussed—the paper presents perspectives on diversity and organizational change that practitioners and scholars alike may find useful. It demonstrates how sustained, positive changes emerged from a racial incident that triggered institutional and community action. It offers an analytical method to assess the complex dynamics that can develop when a crisis occurs, and by focusing on the resultant changes made in the arena of faculty diversity, it also offers practical, best-practice advice about a specific intervention in faculty recruitment. This work also contributes to the dialogue among diversity scholars about the degree to which transformative change occurs when an organization experiences what Williams (2008) terms a "diversity crisis" or what Davidson and Proudford (2008) define as "external shocks . . . events and actions that upset the status quo . . . loosen long held assumptions and beliefs and open people to new data, to rethinking assumptions" (p. 266).

The paper is organized into two parts. Part One offers a descriptive analysis of an incident at a research university that, for the purposes of this paper, we will call "Caliber." Among the analytical tools used is an adaptation of critical incident technique (Flanagan, 1954), which offers the well-grounded practitioner a systematic way to decode complex organizational conflicts, processes, or values (Angelides, 2001; Butterfield, Borgen, Amundson, & Maglio, 2005; Davis, 2006; Hettlage & Steinlin, 2006; Jaakson, 2006; MacFarlane, 2003; Radford, 2006; Urquhart et al., 2003). This method is especially salient because it has often been used to describe and understand the meanings that people attach to significant events in organizational life (Kain, 2004).

Having situated the campus crisis within its broader institutional context, Part Two examines an initiative that resulted from the critical incident. It begins with a description of the steps taken by the first author to improve Caliber's capacity to recruit diverse faculty. This work led to the development of a faculty search committee tutorial. We will then discuss what we learned and how the project fit within other transformational initiatives at Caliber. The literature on transformational organizational change (Eckel, Hill, & Green, 1998; Hearn, 1996; Kashner, 1990; Keup, Walker, Astin, & Lindholm, 2001; Kezar & Eckel, 2000, 2002; Lueddeke, 1999; Swenk, 1999) and on diversity change strategies (Barceló, Dickson, Fraser, & O'Rourke, 2007; Brown-Glaude, 2009; Davidson & Proudford, 2008; Maher & Tetreault, 2006; Smith, Turner, Osei-Kofi, & Richards, 2004; Sturm, 2006; Wasserman, Gallegos, & Ferdman, 2008; Williams, 2008; Williams & Clowney, 2007) provide guidance. Finally, we offer practical knowledge (Van de Ven, 2007) that may be useful to other universities that are engaged in faculty diversity initiatives, especially those focused on best practices for training search committees.

Part One

Critical Incident Technique

Critical Incident Technique (CIT) was developed by industrial psychologist John Flanagan in the 1940s (1954). In its original formulation, a critical incident was a significant event, activity, or situation that could be systematically described, observed, or elicited retrospectively and through which performance-related behaviors could be categorized and interpreted. In his work with Air Force pilots, Flanagan argued that the critical nature of a performance-related error could be measured by whether it evoked behaviors that were oriented to solving a practical problem, such as technical malfunctions or resolving a conflict, resulting from deeper systemic issues. In this usage, CIT was a behaviorally driven task-analysis method with the critical incident as the unit of analysis. The focus on problem solving when there were surprising or non-routine events was a keen insight. It allowed researchers to map the content domains of effective and ineffective responses and outcomes, and produced a heightened awareness in participants of the tasks, routines, norms, and expectations inherent in their work (Butterfield et al., 2005; Chell, 1998; Clamp, Gough, & Land, 2004; Fivars & Fitzpatrick, 2001).

A review of the literature suggests that curriculum and learning are the topical areas in research on higher education where CIT has taken root, seemingly more so in Europe than the United States (Cain, 1981; Douglas, McClelland & Davies, 2008; Oaklief, 1976; Tigelaar, Dolmans, Wolfhagen, & van der Vleuten, 2004; Urquhart et al., 2003). CIT methodology has been used to understand how firms respond to and initiate change and to the related field of organizational learning (Chell, 2004; Cope & Watts, 2000; Davis, 2006; Easterby-Smith & Lyles, 2005; Kaulio, 2003; Lines, 2005; Mallak, Lyth, Olson, Ulshafer, & Sardone, 2003). It is surprising that CIT is not more broadly used in higher education to understand critical diversity incidents; one could argue that such incidents initiate the problem solving that leads to change (whether positive or negative), to learning at the individual or organizational levels, or to both. For our purposes, we adapted the technique to a narrative form based on the four CIT questions posed by Davis (2006): (1) What events led up to the critical incident? 2) Who were the focal agents and what were their actions? 3) What were the outcomes of the critical incident? and 4) What are possible future implications?

Caliber University

Until the 1960s and 1970s, most institutions in the southern United States—and many in the north—were segregated by race. Some, like Caliber, also excluded women. Most, including Caliber, now have a stated commitment to both student and faculty diversity (Brown, 1999; Smith et al., 2004; Williams & Clowney, 2007).

Caliber did not admit African-American men to the undergraduate program until the late 1950s, or women (except to the School of Nursing) until 1970. Although the racial and gender desegregation of the student body grew slowly—and initially with much resistance—today, Caliber has made significant strides with student diversity in general, and, when compared to its peers, to a remarkable degree with African-American students. Faculty racial and gender demographics, however, tell a different story.

Caliber's faculty desegregated in the early 1970s when a few African-American, Hispanic, and Asian-American faculty members were hired. But this shift, even accompanied by institutional and individual efforts over the next three decades, resulted in what can best be called a state of slow, almost stalled growth for African Americans and Hispanics, minimal growth for Asian Americans, and small gains for women. It is no great consolation that Caliber's pattern of being demographically mired when it comes to faculty does not differ significantly from that of other universities across the country (Maher & Tetreault, 2006; Moreno, Smith, Clayton-Pederson, Parker, & Teraguchi, 2006; Trower & Chiatt, 2002).

The Critical Incident

Just prior to Student Council elections in February 2003, an African-American candidate for president of the Student Council reported that she had been violently attacked on campus. According to a newspaper account, "[the student] was leaning into her car when someone grabbed her by the hair and slammed her head against the steering wheel." The student reported that her assailant told her, "No one wants a nigger to be president." She also reported having received several threatening phone calls before the night of the attack. Her attacker was never found.

Students galvanized in support and, joined by faculty and staff, called for the administration to act decisively to deter discrimination and intolerance. Many said that Caliber had failed to create a community where ethnically and racially diverse group members could feel safe and welcome. Others felt that the overall racial climate was a good one and that the attack had been an isolated incident. They cautioned against adopting diversity requirements or creating an environment where debate was stymied by what they termed "political correctness." Still others believed that the incident was triggered by the increasingly active and visible presence of African-American students in student leadership positions. They called for administrative action, claiming that in matters pertaining to diversity, there was an atmosphere of apathy and veiled racism. Externally, there was intense state and national media attention, and internally, there was concern that undergraduate applications from students of color would decline.

Students dispersed for Spring Break soon after the incident. They returned to an open letter from the president that acknowledged the need for individual and collective reflection and for significant organizational change.

Students are typically seen as catalysts for change, but not as contributors to sustained institutional action (Walters, 2007). At Caliber, however, students were a pivotal force both in the initial outrage over the attack and the ongoing push for change and accountability. Together with faculty and staff, they pressured the president, the Board of Trustees, and senior administrators to effect dramatic and far-reaching organizational change. This required strategies that would overcome cynicism, draw on the moral energy permeating the campus, and connect individual and organizational actions.

Analytical domains and the languages of diversity. In the aftermath of the critical incident, diversity became an omnibus term encompassing many issues; so, too, did ideas and proposals for how to create a more inclusive campus. Race and ethnicity were the primary categories discussed, but sexuality and gender also emerged in broader discussions. Parents, especially those of African-American students, raised safety concerns: They wanted assurances not only that their children were welcome and included in the full scope of university life, but also that the university had systems in place not

only to identify incidents of bias, but to mitigate or prevent them as well.

One of the primary topics for discussion was how the university could encourage students to learn about diversity and become self-aware in this area. In terms of faculty, discussion centered on current demographics and how a more diverse faculty could be recruited and retained. These improvements, it was argued, would not only enhance institutional excellence but also provide all students with role models from many points along the spectrum of race, gender, and sexuality. In the past, going from aspirations to practical and effective efforts to recruit diverse faculty had often been difficult at Caliber University. During these university-wide discussions, there was a sense of hope of new beginnings, as well as apprehension that nothing would change.

Immediate outcomes and implications. Shortly after the critical incident, Caliber's Board of Trustees created a Special Committee on Diversity and directed the president to appoint a university-wide commission on gender and race. Students, faculty, parents, alumni, staff, and members of the local community served on commission subcommittees. The commission interviewed stakeholders, collected institutional data, reviewed past reports, and conducted town hall meetings.

The most visible and immediate outcome of the commission's work was a document released in September 2004 (19 months after the critical incident) with a report on diversity at the university and a set of recommendations from each subcommittee. The president assigned each recommendation to the relevant vice president with timelines for completion. The full report and all timelines were posted on the university's website. The report highlighted the need for systemic, university-wide initiatives to improve the recruitment of underrepresented faculty. The Board of Trustees, the president, and the provost concurred with the commission's findings and identified faculty diversity and new recruitment methods as among the top priorities.

The report also incorporated faculty diversity as a critical function of the Provost's office. The Board of Trustees voted to allocate funding to implement the commission's recommendations, including major funding for faculty recruitment.

The trajectory from crisis to introspection to report and metric-driven outcomes was an in-

stance in the institution's history where "accidental and purposive change" coincided. As Dill and Friedman (1979) point out in a still instructive article on innovation and change in higher education, "typing a change process as purposive suggests that alterations in organizational relationships are both rationally planned and determined. Any process of organizational change can be either purposive or accidental, or can have components of both" (p. 413). Caliber's process mapped quite closely to the initial phases Williams (2008) delineates in his Diversity Crisis Model.

Based on their own observations and on the literature, Williams and Clowney (2007; Williams, 2008) laid out what they call the "well choreographed process" of the diversity crisis model, a common path that institutions take toward diversity—a process that, the authors argue, infrequently leads to permanent change. Typically, this process is triggered by some type attack or instance of discrimination linked to race, gender, or sexuality, followed by internal and external stakeholder response, protest, and demand; a declaration of support for diversity; a commission or planning group; and deliberation and discussion, which results in a diversity plan.

According to Williams (2008), institutions that follow this path tend to fall prey to hurried planning and largely symbolic implementation instead of deep rooted change. He also states, however, that if the plan includes accountability and capacity building that allows people and units to identify and gain the expertise needed to enact change, encourages vision and buy-in from all constituencies, and provides resources, it may indeed lead to transformative change. Caliber's diversity plan was in response to a critical racial incident and mapped similarly to Williams' model. Caliber, however, did not rush to produce a plan but instead sought constituent buy-in, built accountability into their diversity plan, and committed resources to ensure a more comprehensive and long-term solution to the issues brought to light by the critical incident.

Part Two

Working With a Change Mandate for Faculty Diversity

Hired in the immediate aftermath of the critical incident as the Faculty Affairs Administra-

tor (FA-Admin) within the provost's office, the first author's task was to identify faculty recruitment methods likely to attract underrepresented candidates. As outlined above, she arrived in an environment that was poised for change. Yet translating institutional aspirations into concrete initiatives is a complex undertaking, especially in an institution with Caliber's history, geography, and large number of stakeholders in different roles. On the one hand, there were resources, opportunity, high expectations, and individual and organizational commitment, and on the other skepticism, intense scrutiny, a history of stalled faculty diversity efforts, and Caliber's recent national reputation as a place where people of color were unwelcome.

During the first months of her appointment, the FA-Admin met with search committee members and department chairs and addressed faculty councils to discuss a new approach to search committee work. She also introduced the FA-Admin's office as a point of connection, services, and resources for the faculty recruitment process.

Veteran proponents of diversity in higher education (Moody, 2004, 2007; Smith et al., 2004; Sturm, 2006; Turner, 2000) agree that to improve faculty diversity, normal procedures and mindsets must be interrupted. For the most part, they offer "best practice advice" on how to conduct searches, but their work also assumes that practice oriented shifts are predicated on broader cultural agreements about why such changes matter. In the wake of the critical incident at Caliber, normative patterns of faculty recruitment were being questioned at the same time that organizational learning about diversity became a priority. We believe this created an opening for new conversations about faculty recruitment practice and knowledge and how they could be improved to attract and recruit underrepresented applicants. There was a strong sense of optimism within the FA-Admin's office that the diversity commission report, the words and actions of the Board of Trustees, president, faculty, students, and staff had engaged the community in crafting "new agreements" about institutional diversity and mission (Rendón, 2005a, 2005b) that would support Caliber's efforts to improve faculty diversity. At the same time, the new role of the FA-Admin provided a central office and individual who could "connect, coordinate, and convene peo-

ple, ideas and activities" at the "individual, group and system" levels (Freudenberger, Howard, Jauregui, & Sturm, 2009, p. 263). As Freudenberger et al. point out, effective institutional diversity initiatives often depend on individuals who are located centrally, yet able to work across the institution in the capacity of a trusted "organizational catalyst."

The search committee as locus of change. There are many reasons why a focus on search committees is central to institutional efforts to diversify the faculty. Search committees shape the faculty—and therefore the university—for years to come. A recent paper by Burgan (2005), former General Secretary of the American Association of University Professors, revealed the close correlation between faculty hiring and promotion and tenure procedures; they share the normative framework of peer review, in which faculty who are experts in their discipline are seen as the primary arbiters of who gains entry. Disciplinary knowledge is not sufficient to the task of cultivating and recruiting a diverse applicant pool and as Smith et al. suggest, normative search processes may reproduce practices that prematurely focus on excluding and filtering out applicants (2004, p. 136). Working with rather than supplanting peer review necessitates finding ways to infuse diversity and recruitment best practices into the search process. For example, the University of Michigan's success at recruiting more women faculty in the sciences resulted from a coordinated set of strategies centered on "conceptual and practical support" to those involved in the recruitment process, including faculty search committees (Sturm, 2006).

Another important reason to focus change initiatives at the faculty search committee level derives from the work of Tuitt, Sagaria, & Turner (2007) on signaling theory in the faculty hiring process. They theorize that variables in the hiring environment send signals to the candidate about whether an organization is a "right fit for them." Change initiatives to improve the diversity expertise of faculty recruitment processes multiply the signaling effect, because they:

> not only reflect the larger institutional commitment to diversity but also serve as important signals to current and future job applicants. Institutional core values are projected by such processes. In other words, the way searches are conducted conveys institutional values and signals the institution's commitments and interests

. . . . This extends far beyond a single search and is not confined to those candidates interviewed (Tuitt et al., 2007, p. 525).

Signaling the university's intention to improve access and inclusion requires rigorous assessment of the recruitment process. We would further suggest that the process of not only informing and supporting, but learning from faculty involved in the search process broadcasts the institution's intention to increase diversity, to both internal and external audiences. Finally, diversity is a common theme in the recent emphasis, in practitioner and scholarly literature, on overall best practices for the faculty search process (Hochel & Wilson, 2007; Moody, 2004, 2007; Smith et al., 2004; Sturm, 2006; Turner, 2000).

At Caliber, the FA-Admin sought to invest in the recruitment process through knowledge exchange initiatives at the candidate cultivation stage, throughout the search committee process, and during the "getting to agreement stage," when offers are proffered. These initiatives relied on three insights: (1) that faculty are continuously engaged in learning, and it would be valuable to build on that; (2) that search committee work involves a set of skills that could be strengthened through training (especially the skills required to actively cultivate and recruit underrepresented candidates), and that these skills are somewhat different from discipline based competencies; and (3) that there was already faculty expertise at Caliber in how to compete for and attract diverse faculty, and that the challenge would be to identify modes of sharing, reflecting on, making explicit, putting into practice, and valuing that knowledge (Hochel & Wilson, 2007; Moody, 2004, 2007; Smith et al., 2004; Sturm, 2006; Turner, 2000; van der Velden, 2002).

Knowledge exchange initiatives focused on sharing information about diversity recruitment at different levels of the system. For instance, questions from a first-time committee chair about how best to conduct a confidential and equitable search when there were internal candidates from underrepresented groups would be handled by a one-on-one consultation. Information about potential candidates who might be either recruited in current searches or cultivated for future openings would be passed on in a peer-to-peer exchange of information. Discussions about the challenges of and possible solutions for attracting diverse candidates were well suited to full-day workshops, where participants worked on mock cases in groups that could include deans, senior administrators, staff, and/or faculty. At other times, the FA-Admin and her Equal Opportunity Office colleagues jointly addressed search committees both prior to and during searches. Workshops and presentations to departments and deans shifted the collective conversation away from institutional limitations to one that spotlighted best practices and the processes that would raise Caliber's profile in the marketplace, reduce bias in evaluation of candidates, actively encourage candidates from underrepresented groups to apply for positions, and create a welcoming environment during campus visits. Presentations to the Board of Trustees and the president on faculty recruitment data and discussion of the initiative's progress and challenges also brought these issues to the forefront of the university's leadership agenda.

Between 2005 and 2008, an average of approximately 110 new faculty were hired each year at Caliber, with 500–700 faculty members serving on search committees annually. It was impossible, therefore, for one or two people to meet with every search committee. An assignment from the provost seemed to provide the answer to this dilemma—and so the FA-Admin made the development of the online faculty search tutorial suggested by the provost an early priority among her initiatives.

The provost had categorized errors or breakdowns in the conduct of searches as avoidable and detrimental to the university's ability to recruit diverse candidates. Indeed, in the FA-Admin's conversations with faculty, some recalled instances when an inappropriate comment, or the failure to keep search deliberations confidential, derailed a search or negotiations with a highly sought-after candidate. Such errors could be particularly damaging to recruitment efforts if candidates from underrepresented groups received negative signals that discouraged them from applying for or accepting positions. Additionally, misinformation about the legal impact on faculty hiring of the U.S. Supreme Court Grutter-Gratz student admissions case had begun to surface (Selingo, 2005). Some faculty members were under the mistaken impression that they were legally prohibited from actively recruiting ethnically and racially

diverse faculty candidates. Such misconceptions could stifle those inclined to cultivate these candidates; they could also justify inaction on the part of search committee members for whom diversity was a low or nonexistent priority. Whatever the specific concern, the view that Caliber could get better at recruiting underrepresented faculty by improving the search process struck an important chord for the provost and faculty. This is what we would refer to as the signification or criticality dimension of the critical incident: the aspects of the event that have a high level of salience for participants.

An online tutorial would create a common foundation of knowledge across the institution, serve as a baseline introduction to best practices for recruiting diverse faculty, and reference the literature; it would also allow for easy access to and dissemination and exchange of information throughout the university.

As Smith, Wolf, and Busenberg (1996) and Maher and Tetreault (2006) have pointed out, there is an enduring myth within academia that the slow progress in faculty diversity is largely due to factors inherent in the candidates themselves. The virtue of the tutorial, beyond the objective of improving search procedures, is that it focuses attention on developing excellence internally throughout the recruitment and search process—that is, signaling change from within the institution rather than enumerating deficits in the talent pool. This was a subtle but important shift.

Drawing on local expertise. Rather than present off-the-shelf solutions, we assumed a stance of learning and problem solving specific to faculty recruitment concerns at Caliber that would determine the tutorial's scope and content. An early cue about the culture at Caliber provided insight into the wisdom of this approach: Whether a particular practice had proved effective at institutions such as UCLA or Duke seemed to carry little weight at Caliber; such comparisons, we realized, could impede our progress. This perspective has been described as the "not invented here" phenomenon in studies of why people in organizations may resist adopting new ideas, processes, or techniques (Hayes & Clark, 1985).

A similar situation occurred at the University of Michigan, where project leaders on the National Science Foundation ADVANCE grant (to advance the status of women academics in science, math, information technology, and engineering) discovered that information about gender bias was more readily received when scholars from within the institution addressed their colleagues; *who* delivered knowledge was as important as its content or validity (Sturm, 2006, p. 289). Whether this bias represents a preference for locally derived knowledge or simply its delivery by esteemed insiders, it is important to recognize the situated nature of knowledge and its production, and how the institution prefers that it be disseminated. We decided, therefore, to use interviews to discern the best practices for recruitment of underrepresented faculty currently or recently in use at Caliber (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

We identified local experts and, using "snowball sampling" (Miles & Huberman, 1994), asked them what had helped them recruit underrepresented faculty. With snowball sampling, an internal expert provides information and is then asked to generate a list of others who participate in or have knowledge on the subject. The individuals so identified are interviewed and also asked to name other experts. This process works well when little is known about the population being studied or about a specific feature of the relevant social environment (Bernard, 2000; Browne, 2005; Miles & Huberman, 1994). Of those identified, 15 campus faculty "experts" who had served on a total of about 150 search committees were interviewed by either the FA-Admin or a graduate intern.

Against the backdrop of the critical incident and commission recommendations, we asked interviewees to reflect on the reasons for their success and solicited their advice as to the tutorial's content. This format allowed other issues, whether deemed important by the interviewees or not, to emerge. Content analysis of these interviews yielded a series of overlapping themes that provided guideposts for developing the tutorial.

Somewhat surprisingly, interviewees rarely referred to themselves as experts or what they knew as constituting expertise. This was not so much a marker of modesty, we concluded, as evidence that some aspects of expertise in recruiting may well be experienced as implicit, rather than explicit, skills and practices. Such elements as sound judgment, knowledge based on previous experience in hiring underrepresented faculty, savvy, personal beliefs, intro-

spection, intuition, and perseverance fit the con-
cept of tacit knowledge variously described in a
range of disciplines (Gerholm, 1990; Lam,
2000; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Schön, 1983,
1987; Sternberg et al., 2000). When asked to
elaborate on what they meant by "knowing
how," interviewees reflected on specific skills,
actions, and problem-solving approaches that
they used and offered advice on what the uni-
versity could do better organizationally and
what the FA-Admin needed to implement. In
this sense, to use Schön's terminology (1983),
they reflected on practice even as they described
the broader gestalt that had led to their success-
ful efforts in recruiting diverse faculty.

We determined that the "know-how" ability
of these experts helped them hire underrepre-
sented faculty even when, in their view, the
university's level of support or recognition for
their efforts was less than optimal and the odds
were stacked against success. They were able to
uncover organizational possibilities, while
keeping a clear eye on the challenges and lim-
itations—in other words—these experts be-
lieved in the art of the possible.

Interviewees described Caliber's culture as
an informal, entrepreneurial, flying-under-the-
radar environment where individuals could
launch relatively successful work without being
blocked by formal rules or structures, although
some regretted the absence of institutional sup-
port. Caliber's organizational style, they be-
lieved, allowed faculty to use their expertise to
identify and encourage underrepresented fac-
ulty to apply for positions and to present them
as strong, viable candidates to their colleagues.
On the negative side, although these experts
worked on behalf of institutional diversity, their
expertise and know-how received only lacklus-
ter support from the institution; there was seem-
ingly little desire to disseminate (or even ac-
knowledge) that information. Some seemed to
prefer working independently and may even
have considered this necessary for success
given Caliber's culture. Others said that the way
forward would require heightened institutional
attention to faculty diversity at all organiza-
tional levels. As one woman from the humani-
ties noted, Caliber's leadership had to begin to
"walk the talk," and from the sciences, one male
faculty member said, "One has to make a deci-
sion that this issue of diversity matters and pay
attention."

Those interviewees who were most successful
in hiring diverse faculty engaged in long term
cultivation of likely candidates and encouraged
them to apply for open faculty positions. By far
the most commonly held belief was that the
successful hire of underrepresented candidates
depends largely on a good committee chair who
has excellent skills in decision making and col-
laboration, possesses political acumen, and is
able to sustain the interest of desirable candi-
dates throughout the search process. Such a
chair models good judgment and unbiased eval-
uation by subjecting unsupported claims about
candidates to scrutiny and discussion. A good
chair was also able to draw on expertise outside
the committee to ensure that diverse candidates
were recruited.

We envisaged the online tutorial as one of
many channels that would explain these ele-
ments of successful recruitment and search
practices to search committee members. It
would be a repository for successful strategies
at Caliber, and would synthesize the research
and practice literature on the subject. We bor-
rowed the toolkit metaphor from the University
of Washington' *Faculty Recruitment Toolkit*
(Lange & Yen, 2005) to demonstrate that when
done well, search committee work requires a
heterogeneity of skills, strategies, resources,
competencies, and people; the tutorial, there-
fore, was but a single tool.

Tutorial implementation.   The main goals
of the tutorial were to (1) highlight the necessity
for and various ways of recruiting underrepre-
sented candidates before, during, and after the
search process; (2) dispel misunderstandings
about legalities of recruiting these candidates;
(3) encourage individual and committee discus-
sion of the negative effects of evaluation that is
based on gender, race, or ethnicity and provide
strategies to counter it; and (4) demonstrate that
successful searches require skills and compe-
tencies, but also attention to procedural matters
that extend beyond discipline-specific knowl-
edge. The tutorial would not only refer to "what
the literature says" but also to "what colleagues
at Caliber say and do," thus contravening the
"not invented here" response. It would draw on
evidence based best practices from scholarly
literature and organizational practice. The tuto-
rial would have to be concise, yet designed for
a faculty audience. Finally, due to costs and
feasibility factors, we decided on a technologi-

cally straightforward design that used a mixed format of case vignettes and forced choice questions. Each question included an introduction, a multiple-choice test, a rationale for the correct answer, and resources and references keyed to each question's topic to encourage further study.

We tested the beta version of the online tutorial with faculty members who had served on search committees and a group of administrators. In addition we met with the Provost's Leadership Team, as well as deans and associate deans (the school administrators who generally have responsibility for faculty recruitment) to elicit their comments and suggestions, and shared the tutorial with several other key leaders as well as seeking legal review and advice from the university's General Counsel.

Although it originated in the FA-Admin's office, the tutorial became a team effort that included Information Technology, Human Resources, and the Equal Opportunity Office. The second author, who was hired as a writer, researcher, and tutorial project manager, played the main role in assembling this team. The sense of joint commitment removed many of the barriers often inherent in working across institutional sectors, functional areas, and roles, and the president, who was enthusiastic about both the tutorial's concept and content, urged an aggressive implementation strategy. Furthermore, the tutorial promoted the idea that each search committee member would be expected to share responsibility for candidate outreach and an equitable search process. At this point in the process, the president mandated that all members of search committees seeking tenured or tenure-track faculty must take the tutorial prior to the beginning of the search.

A foundation of cooperation and transparency had been established during beta testing, and we stepped up our efforts by making presentations to the Faculty Senate and to faculty in individual schools in which we marketed the tutorial as, among other things, a launching pad for discussion at the first search committee meeting. Although there were some criticisms, questions, and pockets of skepticism, for the most part faculty seemed to accept it. In the majority of literature on change initiatives, the importance of leadership support and buy-in is emphasized (Keup, Walker, Astin, & Lindholm, 2001; Kezar & Eckel, 2000, 2002; Lueddeke, 1999; Williams & Clowney, 2007); the explicit endorsement by the president and provost proved that leadership were committed to this initiative. Among its other benefits, the tutorial served as evidence of leadership and organizational engagement.

Our administrative assistant provided us with a crucial understanding of the way things often worked at Caliber, saying that administrative assistants (the vast majority of whom are women) were often pivotal in the faculty search process yet were almost never included in discussions of how to improve the process. She proposed a training session on the mechanics and content of the tutorial for those assistants, which proved to be critical to the tutorial's success. To use Thaler and Sunstein's (2008) language, staff members became "choice architects" who helped increase faculty participation. They explained the procedures, encouraged faculty to take the tutorial prior to serving on a search committee, and actively sought to include the tutorial in early planning for searches.

To date, more than 1,400 people have taken the tutorial. Although most are faculty members preparing to serve on tenure track searches, a number of other units have encouraged their members to take the tutorial for non-tenure track and staff searches. In the voluntary and anonymous evaluation at the end of the tutorial, some faculty members have criticized its tone and point of view. One person stated, "I deeply resent the patronizing tone of these tutorials/tests. The effort is premised on the assumption that all faculty/staff are uninformed about and insensitive to the world's complexities and that they are ethical simpletons," and another characterized the tutorial as "mindless dribble [sic]." The preponderance of the feedback, however, has been positive: "I am a department chair and was pleasantly surprised that I did NOT know all the answers! I will be better prepared now to conduct and participate in future department searches." Another said, "Very nicely done—and thank you for letting us reason our way to the correct answers rather than perfunctorily looking for matching text!"

Improvements in Faculty Diversity: What We Have Learned

Has long term change—or, as Kezar and Eckel (2000) phrase it, "culture-based" transformative change—occurred at Caliber in the area

of faculty recruitment? There are indications that there has been a cultural shift, but we would not claim that it is institution wide. What we have learned from our experience with the search committee tutorial is that the engine for change is located in people and what they know. We need to respect that and take the time to see what in their tacit knowledge leads to success in cultivating and recruiting more diverse faculty. Our task as administrators is to do what we can on an organizational level to nurture these individuals and their work by using our creativity to magnify, improve on, and transmit their expertise to a steadily wider circle of colleagues.

Recently, in an offhand remark, a colleague asked the first author if she had a sense of when the university would complete the work of increasing diversity—when, so to speak, the job would be done. The question was startling because it seems obvious that it will require ongoing efforts to integrate diversity into the university's values and mission. Yet the question was a fair one, in that there needs to be a way to quantify improvement.

There are complex variables at play here. That is part of the difficulty in measuring which specific factors lead to transformative changes in recruiting diverse faculty—it is hard to pin down one-to-one correlations between interventions, even those generally accepted in the literature as best practices, and specific recruitment outcomes. The field is still in its infancy. Critical incidents can open the path to institutional inquiry, and to problem solving, around which questions are important regarding the relationship between recruitment outcomes and practice interventions.

One way to assess the impact of efforts to diversify faculty could be to look at national availability data by discipline for members of underrepresented groups (e.g., using the Survey of Earned Doctorates) for the periods before and after a critical incident or an intervention aimed at increasing faculty diversity. One could then look at increased availability by discipline to see if that offered another plausible explanation for the observed changes in recruitment numbers at a specific institution.

However, up until this point, Caliber has collected recruitment numbers by school rather than by discipline. Given data available at Caliber, one measure that can be utilized is percent change (see Table 1). Compared to the 6-year period prior to the critical incident and resulting demands for change (1998–2003), in the 4 years that followed (2004–2008), Caliber experienced a noteworthy increase in several categories of underrepresented faculty. Although the percentages were small, the largest increase was in Hispanic faculty, whose numbers had declined in the earlier period but increased by almost 86% in the later period. Growth was less dramatic for African-American faculty, but still striking; the number had increased only slightly during the earlier period, but grew by close to 40% from 2004 to 2008. The percentage of women also increased. The percentage of Asian faculty grew more or less steadily throughout the entire 10 years.

From an organizational culture perspective, recent successes in recruiting diverse faculty have challenged a commonplace assumption at Caliber that African Americans, Hispanics, or women candidates would not want to apply due to geography or the segregated history of the university. This awareness has helped bring about a shift away from a passive "there is nothing we can do" stance to a more proactive focus on efforts that work; it is an important part of Caliber's change narrative.

Freudenberger et al., (2009) propose a rubric for strategies likely to produce institutional

Table 1

Percent and Percent Change of Underrepresented Groups, Tenured/Tenure Track (TTT) Faculty

Under-represented group	Percent of total TTT faculty 1998	Percent of total TTT faculty 2003	Percent change 1998–2003	Percent of total TTT faculty 2004	Percent of total TTT faculty 2008	Percent change 2004–2008
Asian	4.5%	5.8%	31.7%	6.0%	7.4%	32.2%
Black	3.3%	3.4%	2.1%	3.2%	4.1%	39.1%
Hispanic	1.3%	1.1%	−11.1%	1.0%	1.7%	85.7%
Women	21.2%	22.2%	6.4%	23.5%	25.9%	17.6%

change on matters of diversity, all of which have been or will be adopted at Caliber. The first strategy promotes the idea of "organizational catalysts who can bring stakeholders together across hierarchical and functional positions . . . to help figure out what to do . . . and maintain the [change] momentum" (pp. 266–267). Caliber's new FA-Admin position and the online tutorial are examples of this type of cross-domain problem solving. Other positions have since been created at Caliber, including a Vice President for Diversity, a university-wide Director of Graduate Diversity, and associate deans for diversity in a number of schools. In addition, acting independently, students organized a Student Council diversity committee charged with holding senior administrators accountable for implementing the diversity commission's recommendations and keeping these issues visible to the community. Finally, the Board of Trustee's Special Committee on Diversity continues to meet on a regular basis and plays an important role in sustaining the university's commitment to diversity.

The second strategy in Freudenberger et al.'s rubric is knowledge mobilization to: (1) shed light on systemic institutional data and the qualitative experience of insiders; (2) identify areas in need of improvement; and (3) employ best practices in a relevant manner through the influence of "key decision-makers" (2009, p. 270). The information exchange initiatives in the FA-Admin's office are premised on this strategy. The FA-Admin has incorporated new tracking and assessment tools into university routines in addition to the tutorial; these include the collection of data on annual recruitment from each school for presentation to the president and Board of Trustees and as a part of each dean's report to the provost; annual exit surveys to understand how and why faculty leave the university; and a questionnaire for candidates who were offered employment but declined.

It is important to note that the problem-solving process, which included a highly structured commission and an appeal to the community for greater civility and respect, drew on conventions of rationality and goal oriented change strategies. However, appeals to moral values and the desire to do what was right also spurred change. Without both, the result could have been even more distrust, given the racial context of the assault and the perception that previous plans for change had been allowed to languish.

In our search for a way to categorize the overall change process in Caliber's engagement with issues of race, ethnicity, bias inclusion, access, and equity, we found Harshbarger's discussion of organizational commitment to be valuable: Even in the presence of other goals and interests, there was a shift toward considering diversity vital to the university's goals and mission. This commitment to diversity had the essential components identified in Harshbarger's research, "belief in the organization's goals and values" and "willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization" (1989, p. 30).

To summarize, the critical incident triggered a commitment to diversity, engaged senior leadership, linked issues of values to specific priorities for improvement—including faculty diversity—allocated resources, and identified the personnel responsible for developing and implementing change initiatives.

Critical Incident Technique does not "automatically provide solutions to problems" (Flanagan, 1954), but it does provide a lens through which organizations can view critical incidents as well as the immediate and longer term repercussions. Davis (2006) recommends monitoring intervention strategies and evaluating input from relevant parties as the final stage of CIT.

Memories of the actual incident and the immediate aftermath faded as students graduated and new issues arose. However, the incident spurred self-examination, commitment, and action that has transformed the landscape and created momentum to recruit diverse faculty and thereby enrich the entire university.

References

Angelides, P. (2001). The development of an efficient technique for collecting and analysing qualitative data: The analysis of critical incidents. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 14,* 429–442.

Barceló, N., Dickson, S., Fraser, G., & O'Rourke, S. (2007). Promoting faculty diversity from the provost's office. Plenary session at the Keeping Our Faculties of Color Symposium IV, University of Minnesota, April 12–14.

Bernard, H. R. (2000). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches.* London: Sage.

Brown, M. (1999). The *Quest to Define Collegiate Desegregation: Black Colleges, Title VI Compliance, and Post-Adams Litigation.* Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Browne, K. (2005). Snowball sampling: Using social networks to research non-heterosexual women. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 8,* 47–60.

Brown-Glaude, W. R. (Ed.) (2009). *Doing diversity in higher education: Faculty leaders share challenges and strategies.* Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Burgan, M. (2005). Superstars and rookies of the year: Faculty hiring practices in the postmodern age. Research and Occasional Paper Series, Center for Studies of Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, CSHE. 10.05.

Butterfield, L. D., Borgen, W. A., Amundson, N. E., & Maglio, A.-S. T. (2005). Fifty years of the critical incident technique: 1954–2004 and beyond. *Qualitative Research, 5,* 475–497.

Cain, R. A. (1981). Critical incidents and critical requirements in mentoring. *Innovative Higher Education, 6,* 111–127.

Chell, E. (1998). Critical incident technique. In G. Symon, & C. Cassell (Eds.), *Qualitative methods and analysis in organizational research: A practical guide* (pp. 51–72). London: Sage.

Chell, E. (2004). Critical incident technique. In G. Symon, & C. Cassell (Eds.), *Qualitative methods and analysis in organizational research: A practical guide* (pp. 45–60). London: Sage.

Clamp, C., Gough, S., & Land, L. (2004). *Resources for nursing research: An annotated bibliography* (4th ed.). London: Sage.

Cope, J., & Watts, G. (2000). Learning by doing—An exploration of experience, critical incidents and reflection in entrepreneurial learning. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research, 6,* 104–124.

Davidson, M., & Proudford, K. L. (2008). Cycles of resistance: How dominants and subordinants collude to undermine diversity efforts in organizations. In K. M. Thomas (Ed.), *Diversity Resistance in Organizations* (pp. 249–272). New York: Erlbaum.

Davis, P. J. (2006). Critical incident technique as a qualitative research method. *Development and Learning in Organizations, 20,* 13–16.

Dill, D. D., & Friedman, C. P. (1979). An analysis of frameworks for research on innovation and change in higher education. *Review of Educational Research, 49,* 411–435.

Douglas, J., McLelland, R., & Davies, J. (2008). The development of a conceptual model of student satisfaction with their experience in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Higher Education, 16,* 19–35.

Easterby-Smith, M., & Lyles, M. A. (2005). *The Blackwell handbook of organizational learning and knowledge management.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Eckel, P., Hill, B., & Green, M. (1998). *En route to transformation*: *On change.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Faculty recruitment toolkit. University of Washington. Retrieved from http://www.washington.edu/diversity/avpfa/Recruitment_Toolkit/index.html

Fivars, G., & Fitzpatrick, R. (2001). Critical incident technique bibliography. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. Retrieved from http://www.apa.org/PsycINFO/critical.html

Flanagan, J. C. (1954). The critical incident technique. *Psychological Bulletin, 51,* 327–358.

Freudenberger, E., Howard, J. E., Jauregui, E., & Sturm, S. (2009). The faculty-led diversity initiative at Columbia University. In W. R. Brown-Glaude (Ed.), *Doing diversity in higher education: Faculty leaders share challenges and strategies* (pp. 249–276). Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Gerholm, T. (1990). On tacit knowledge in academia. *European Journal of Education, 25,* 263–271.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* Chicago: Aldine.

Harshbarger, B. (1989). Faculty commitment to the university: Influences and issues. *The Review of Higher Education, 13,* 29–45.

Hayes, R. H., & Clark, K. B. (1985). Exploring the sources of productivity differences at the factory level. In K. B. Clark, R. H. Hayes, & C. Lorenz (Eds.), *The uneasy alliance: Managing the productivity-technology dilemma* (pp. 151–158). Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Hearn, J. C. (1996). Transforming U.S. higher education: An organizational perspective. *Innovative Higher Education, 21,* 141–154.

Hettlage, R., & Steinlin, M. (2006). *The critical incident technique in knowledge management-related contexts.* Zürich: Ingenious People's Knowledge.

Hochel, S., & Wilson, C. E. (2007). *Hiring right: Conducting successful searches in higher education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Jaakson, K. (2006). Exploring university core values with the critical incident technique: An example of students' perceptions at the University of Tartu. In M. Vadi, A. Reino, & G. Hämmal (Eds.), *National and international aspects of organizational culture* (pp. 49–85). Tartu, Estonia: Tartu University Press.

Kain, D. L. (2004). Focus groups: More than a method of qualitative inquiry. In K. deMarrais & S. D. Lapan (Eds.), *Foundations for research: Methods of inquiry in education and the social sciences* (pp. 69–86). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kashner, J. B. (1990). Changing the corporate culture. *New Directions for Higher Education, 71,* 19–28.

Kaulio, M. A. (2003). Initial conditions or process of development? Critical incidents in the early stages of new ventures. *R & D Management, 33,* 165–175.

Keup, J. R., Walker, A. A., Astin, H. S., & Lindholm, J. A. (2001). Organizational culture and institutional transformation. ERIC Digest. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.

Kezar, A., & Eckel, P. (2000). The effect of institutional culture on change strategies in higher education: Universal principles or culturally responsive concepts? Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.

Kezar, A., & Eckel, P. (2002). Examining the institutional transformation process: The importance of sensemaking, interrelated strategies, and balance. *Research in Higher Education, 43,* 295–328.

Lam, A. (2000). Tacit knowledge, organizational learning and societal institutions: An integrated framework. *Organization Studies, 21,* 487–513.

Lange, S. E., & Yen, J. (2005). Toolkits for retention and recruitment: Utilization and outcomes. Presentation at 2005 Annual Conference, American Society for Engineering Education Retrieved from http://soa.asee.org/paper/conference/paper-view.cfm?id=20905

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation.* Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press.

Lines, R. (2005). How social accounts and participation during change affect organizational learning. *Journal of Workplace Learning, 17,* 157–177.

Lueddeke, G. R. (1999). Toward a constructivist framework for guiding change and innovation in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education, 70,* 235–260.

MacFarlane, B. (2003). Tales from the front-line: Examining the potential for critical incident vignettes. *Teaching Business Ethics, 7,* 55–67.

Maher, F. A., & Tetreault, M. K. T. (2006). *Privilege and diversity in the academy.* New York: Rutledge.

Mallak, L. A., Lyth, D. M., Olson, S. D., Ulshafer, S. M., & Sardone, F. J. (2003). Diagnosing culture in health-care organizations using critical incidents. *International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance, 16,* 180–190.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Moody, J. (2004). *Faculty diversity: Problems and solutions.* New York: Routledge.

Moody, J. (2007). *Rising above cognitive errors: Guidelines for search, tenure review, and other evaluation committees.* Retrieved from http://www.DiversityOnCampus.com

Moreno, J. F., Smith, D. G., Clayton-Pederson, A. R., Parker, S., & Teraguchi, D. H. (2006). *The revolving door for underrepresented minority faculty in higher education.* Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Oaklief, C. R. (1976). The critical incident technique: Research applications in the administration of adult and continuing education [Abstract]. Paper presented at the Adult Education Research Conference, Toronto, Ontario. AskERIC Service for Educators (Search ERIC database, ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED123388). http://askeric.org/Eric [CH No. CE007124].

Radford, M. L. (2006). The critical incident technique and the qualitative evaluation of the Connecting Libraries and Schools Project. *Library Trends, 55,* 46–64.

Rendón, L. (2005a). Realizing a transformed pedagogical dreamfield: Recasting agreements for teaching and learning. *Spirituality in Higher Education Newsletter, 2,* 1–13.

Rendón, L. (2005b). Recasting agreements that govern teaching and learning: An intellectual and spiritual framework for transformation. *Journal of Religion and Education, 32,* 79–108.

Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner.* New York: Basic Books.

Schön, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Selingo, J. (2005). Michigan: Who really won? Colleges' cautious reaction to the Supreme Court's affirmative-action decisions may have snatched defeat from the jaws of victory. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 51,* A21–A23.

Smith, D. G., Wolf, L. E., & Busenberg, B. E. (1996). *Achieving faculty diversity: Debunking the myths.* Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Smith, D., Turner, C. S. V., Osei-Kofi, N., & Richards, S. (2004). Interrupting the usual: Successful strategies for hiring diverse faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education, 75,* 133–160.

Sternberg, R. J., Forsythe, G. B., Hedlund, J., Horvath, J. A., Wagner, R. K., Williams, W. M., Snook, S. A., & Grigorenko, E. (2000). *Practical intelligence in everyday life.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sturm, S. P. (2006). The architecture of inclusion: Advancing workplace equity in higher education. *Harvard Journal of Law and Gender, 29,* 247–334.

Swenk, J. (1999). Planning failures: Decision cultural clashes. *The Review of Higher Education, 23,* 1–21.

Thaler, R. H., & Sunstein, C. R. (2008). *Nudge: Improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Tierney, W. G. (2000). Developing the high performance organization: Impediments to change and innovation in colleges and universities. Retrieved from www.usc.edu/dept/chepa/documents/papers/ Tierney.doc

Tigelaar, D. E. H., Dolmans, D. H. J. M., Wolfhagen, I. H. A. P., & van der Vleuten, C. P. M. (2004). The development and validation of a framework for teaching competencies in higher education. *Higher Education, 48,* 253–268.

Trower, C. A., & Chait, R. P. (2002). Faculty diversity: Too little for too long. *Harvard Magazine, March-April, 98,* 33–37.

Tuitt, F. A., Sagaria, M. A. D., & Turner, C. S. V. (2007). Signals and strategies in hiring faculty of color. *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research, 22,* 497–535.

Turner, C. S. V. (2000). *Diversifying the faculty: A guide for search committees.* Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Urquhart, C. A. L., Thomas, R., Barker, A., Yeoman, A., Cooper, J., Armstrong, C., Fenton, R., Londsale, R., & Spink, S. (2003). Critical incident technique and explicitation interviewing in studies of information behavior. *Journal of Library and Information Science Research, 25,* 63–88.

van der Velden, M. (2002). Knowledge facts, knowledge fiction: The role of ICTs in knowledge management for development. *Journal of International Development, 14,* 25–37.

Van de Ven, A. H. (2007). *Engaged scholarship: A guide for organizational and social research.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Walters, E. (2007). Institutional commitment to diversity and multiculturalism through institutional transformation: A case study of Olivet College. In A. Seidman (Ed.), *Minority student retention: The best of the Journal of College Student Retention: Research Theory and Practice* (pp. 213–230). Amityville, NY: Baywood Publishing Company.

Wasserman, I. C., Gallegos, P. V., & Ferdman, B. M. (2008). Dancing with resistance: Leadership challenges in fostering a culture of inclusion. In K. M. Thomas (Ed.), *Diversity resistance in organizations* (pp. 175–200). New York: Erlbaum.

Williams, D. A. (2008). Beyond the diversity crisis model: Decentralized diversity planning and implementation. *Planning for Higher Education, 36,* 27–41.

Williams, D. A., & Clowney, C. (2007). Strategic Planning for diversity and organizational change. *Effective Practices for Academic Leaders, 2,* 1–16.