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The continuing U.S. demographic shifts provide a substantial rationale for a corresponding transformation in the culture and climate of academic departments in higher education. In part, the response to the change is to increase the representation of people of color and others who have been historically absent from professional areas fed by the Kinesiology pipeline. However, the greater challenge is to understand and therefore, alter the internal culture. An intentional effort toward a culture of inclusion and full participation provides a working platform to transform existing practices and to cultivate policies from which emerging practices will offer opportunities for success. The understanding of the multiple identities of those within Kinesiology and the society served, the portals and gaps within the systemic architecture, and the methods of creating a multicultural organization—all play significant roles in contributing to change and transformation. Enlightened catalytic change agents must adopt new inclusive paradigms to prepare 21st century professionals with adaptive ideologies and behaviors for resolving future issues and challenges.

As the U.S. becomes more racially diverse there will be a need to ensure that the student body population in institutions of higher education does the same. These significant changes in the demographics will have a significant effect on the educational needs in higher education. This need could potentially have a lasting impact on the future of our nation (Murdock, 1995; Murdock et al., 1997). The changing demographics and student enrollment patterns pose new challenges for higher education. Thirty years ago, the majority of college students were White. In the 1970s, only 16% of postsecondary students were student of color (Anderson, 2003). For the purposes of this manuscript, students and faculty of color will be used to describe individuals who are African Americans, American Indians, Alaska Natives, Asian/Pacific Islanders, and Hispanics (American Psychological Association, 2010; Hodge, Kozub, Robinson, & Hersman, 2007).

From 1976–1999, the enrollment numbers for students of color in postsecondary school increased by 137% while the increase in White students was only 13% (Anderson, 2003). This exponential growth in students of color during the postsecondary students was largely attributed to Asian American and Hispanic students (Anderson, 2003). Projections suggest that the percentage of White students in college will decline from 79% to 57% as the percentage of Hispanic students will increase from 6% to 17%, while the percentage of African Americans will increase from 10% to 13% (Murdock & Hoque, 2003).

With the current trends and projections, by 2050 only 47.6% of all students will be White, thus a majority of students would be persons of color. Students of color represent a major source of expansion in terms of admissions for higher education and higher education must be proactive as it relates to the recruitment and retention of students of color along with the faculty and administrators to teach and lead this diverse student population. Although the prevalence of faculty of color in the U.S. institutions of higher education have increased to 17%, faculty members of color at all accredited degree-granting colleges and universities, only make up 21.5% of the faculty body (Ryu, 2010; Snyder & Dillow, 2012). Regardless of this growth, the demand and need is still present. Institutions of higher education must educate and train students from diverse backgrounds to meet the needs of the changing demographics of our society. An essential component to this training means that department(s) across the nation, specifically in the case of departments in Kinesiology or Kinesiology-related disciplines must recruit and retain faculty from diverse backgrounds to meet the needs of their students.

Historical and Current Context of Diversity in Kinesiology

Although institutions of higher education are changing dramatically as it relates to the diversity seen in the student body enrollment, the data indicates that strides are still needed as it relates to the recruitment and retention
of diverse faculty and students in Kinesiology. Thus, it is imperative for Kinesiology or Kinesiology-related departments to self-reflect and ask if they are addressing the needs regarding the recruitment and retention of students (e.g., undergraduate and graduate) and faculty of color. It is difficult to draw specific conclusions as it relates to the plight of diversity within Kinesiology, simply because there is little to no empirical evidence indicating the prevalence of racial/ethnic minorities represented in the student body, faculty, administration, and staff in this discipline.

But we do know that there is a low representation of students and faculty of color in Kinesiology programs in Predominantly White Institutions (PWIs). The problem is that the faculty representation will not improve in terms of demographics if the student body does not change. Due to the low representation of students of color in Kinesiology programs there will be a limited pool of diverse faculty from which to recruit and hire (Hodge et al., 2004), thus it will continue to be a vicious and “negative cycle of diversity.” Simply put, it is impossible to have more faculty of color on university campuses if Kinesiology programs are unable to recruit, retain, and matriculate students of color. Nevertheless, it is also imperative for Kinesiology departments to hire, retain, tenure, and promote faculty of color. With this being said, some studies have been conducted to examine the demographics of race and ethnicity of the student body population within Kinesiology departments (Synder, Dillow, & Hoffman, 2009).

In 2007, 218 terminal degrees (Ph.D. /Ed.D.) in Kinesiology were awarded and only 14.7% of those degrees were awarded to African American, Hispanic, and/or Asian-Pacific Islander students (i.e., African American (5.5%), Hispanic (3.2%), Asian/Pacific Islander (6.0%); Snyder et al., 2009); 23.9% of the 218 terminal degrees were awarded to international/non-US citizen students (Synder, Dillow, & Hoffman, 2009). The racial/ethnic disparities also existed as it relates to the percentage of degrees awarded at both the Bachelor’s and Master’s level. Specifically, 27,430 bachelors and 4,110 masters Kinesiology degrees were awarded in the same year (Synder et al., 2009). Only 20% [African American (9.3%), Hispanic (6.7%), Asian/Pacific Islander (3.1%), American Indian/Alaska Natives (0.9%)] and 15.8% [African American (9.1%), Hispanic (3.3%), Asian/Pacific Islander (2.7%), American Indian/Alaska Natives (0.7%)] of these degrees were awarded to students of color at the Bachelor’s and Master’s, respectively (Synder et al., 2009). International students were awarded 1.8% and 5.6% of Bachelor’s and Master’s, accordingly (Synder et al., 2009).

Thus, with the current statistics of students of color obtaining terminal degrees in Kinesiology, it is not a surprise when job searches and hiring cycles begin there are very few if any diverse candidates in the applicant pool or hired thus making it difficult to change the institutional culture within Kinesiology departments (DiversityWorks, 2003). This culminating determinant contributes to Kinesiology administration suggesting that the “academic pipeline to create a sufficient pool of qualified candidates from which to expand the racial diversity of their faculties” (Cross & Slater, 2002, p. 99) limits their ability to create an inclusive culture and climate that supports excellence in Kinesiology.

### Institutional Climate Versus an Institutional Culture

As the U.S. population becomes more diverse, institutions of higher education are face with the challenge to increase the proportion of underrepresented groups among their faculty. Faculty of color have an essential role as it relates to serving as role models and mentors to prospective students of color. However, faculty along with students from racial and ethnic groups might not be satisfied with the world of academia due to ethnic harassment or racial/ethnic bias.

But what is needed is an institutional culture that supports—a ‘climate of diversity.’ Often institutions attempt to create a climate for diversity without a clear differentiation between culture and climate. According to the Institute of Medicine (2004), ‘climate’ is defined as the perceptions, attitudes, and expectations that define the institution, particularly as seen from the perspectives of individuals of different racial or ethnic backgrounds. ‘Culture’ is a complex whole that includes knowledge, beliefs, arts, morals, laws, customs, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by [a human] as a member of society (Seymour-Smith, 1986). However, we are firm believers that a ‘culture that supports diversity’ is needed to seek the change in the institutional environment that will support the recruitment, retention, and progression of both faculty and students of color and others who have been historically marginalized. For the purposes of this paper, historically marginalized refers to all of those who have been marginalized including but not limited to race, ethnicity, sex, gender, sexual orientation, disability, etc.

To provide further discernment between culture and climate—and clearly both may need to shift to create a more inclusive institution—metaphorically consider culture as a geographic location and changes in weather as the climate. Often used synonymously, it is the ability to articulate the differences that will contribute significantly to the capacity to use functional system change strategies effectively. Climate is linked to the social identities within the population. The relationship between those identities and the educational environmental conditions cannot be ignored, but rather valued by faculty and students with their multiple social identities (Denison, 1996). The foundation of this belief is that every socially constructed group has made substantial contributions to social, economic, and cultural values of our society. When those values guide actions within systems, groups and individuals are able to fully engage and participate.
According to Dr. John M. Dunn, Western Michigan University President, “... truly great universities must be diverse. They must be inclusive and there must be programs committed to recruiting and supporting others who may feel excluded” (Dunn, 2009, p. 272). He insists that universities “... must have a greater presence of individuals who come from underrepresented communities in our professional ranks as faculty members, scholars, and researchers” (p. 275). For Kinesiology departments in particular, and others across American campuses, a culture with embedded tenants of diversity and inclusion can be integrated by a) increasing the self-awareness of attitudes and behaviors, b) having individuals in leadership roles making diversity and inclusion a priority, c) increasing diversity in leadership—both representationally and strategically, d) increasing diversity among faculty and staff, and e) increasing the diversity within the student body.

Within Kinesiology the historical legacy of the inclusion or exclusion is influenced by the presence of faculty and students of color, the department’s structural diversity, the psychological climate created within the department, and the behaviors and actions that are demonstrated by administrators, faculty, staff, and students. For Kinesiology programs to be effective, structural barriers that negatively impact recruitment and retention of faculty and students of color must be eliminated. The absence of an inclusive organization contributes to barriers such as poor retention efforts, lack of mentorship, and cultural homogeneity that hinders success and professional satisfaction for recruited faculty and students of color. In addition, the lack of role models or mentors from diverse backgrounds is perceived as a major barrier to the persistence of students because it limits the number of visible faculty with whom they can identify with regard to multiple sociocultural identities and associated issues (Hodge & Stroot, 1997; King, 1994; King & Chepyator-Thomson, 1996). Leadership within Kinesiology departments must strive to engage ALL faculty and students in sometimes difficult discussions. During these discussions, perspectives can be shared, learning can be enhanced, and innovative approaches to achieve full participation can be developed. These conversations are needed to take an active role and commitment toward creating an inclusive Kinesiology department.

An Active Role and Commitment to an Inclusive Organization

To create an inclusive or multicultural organization, leadership in all its forms—both positional and nonpositional, must be the responsibility of everyone throughout all levels of the organization and this is particularly true in academe. A student-centered institution, irrespective of its Carnegie determination (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2008), is dependent on all members of the campus community to produce society-ready graduates both those with and without privileges. While it might be presumed that the educational process of today’s college students is the express responsibility of faculty, the reality is or should be that all within the academic community contribute not only to the knowledge accrued while pursuing the undergraduate or graduate degree but also the accumulated behavioral experiences in the residence halls, laboratories, field placements, and classrooms. All who have had the shared experience of walking across a campus, or studying in a library or study room late into the evening, or engaging cafeteria staff know of individuals who provide encouragement and support for success and achievement. These individuals, along with faculty, advisors, and administrators contribute to creating tomorrow’s leaders in ways that sustain the self-worth of this population at critical stages of personal identity development.

There is a need for diverse communities to serve diverse student enrollments. One of the most significant generally “un”-acknowledgments of those within the academic community is the weight that “class” imposes strident differentiation among its members. The construction of “haves and have-nots” is acerbated alone by titles and positions (i.e., the vice presidents or provost, assistant, associate, executive, the full versus the assistant or associate professor, the lecturer versus the tenure stream appointment, undergraduates versus graduate students, academic versus staff “side” of the house, etc.). Interestingly, in this case, the privileges afforded are those not of birth but are earned. Nevertheless, members of targeted social groups (not members of the dominate identity group and therefore without privilege) can feel “less than” when the system has not put forth effort to become multicultural and inclusive. When the will to change a culture operates both from top down and bottom up, particularly around issues of inclusion and full participation, the progress made to create a climate of success for all stakeholders is expedited; institutional metric outcomes better reflect potential and capacity; and, an endeared sense of membership in the community is achieved. When full membership and participation is realized, outcomes are enhanced.

An inclusive climate requires inclusive leadership; respect for the multiple identities of the full community; an understanding of the value of the collective demographics; and a willingness and commitment to engaging in the educational process of learning about self, others, and the system in which the community exist. It is essential to gain a broader perspective by which to understand the campus environment; learn how to use the institutional mission to expand the agenda; identify personal learning edges and how to use them as guideposts; and gain a greater understanding about multicultural alliance building. The inclusive leader understands that strong, responsive organizations encourage the anticipation of everyone in that community by recognizing the value
of multiple perspectives, successfully tapping into the skills and talents present, and striving to create socially just environments.

However, the inclusive leader must also recognize that their own interpretation of inclusion is influenced significantly by their own set of identities, characteristics and experiences. To illustrate, if one identifies as White, male, middle class, Christian, heterosexual, and from the US east coast—to identify only a few characteristics, then the lenses through which the world is interpreted originates from the associated experiences of each as well as compounded traits. It is interesting to note that frequently geography of and class at birth and youth development are as likely to frame our behavior throughout life as membership in social groups such as race (Awokoya, 2012; Nieto, 1994; Weis & Fine, 2012). The White male born and raised from the west coast has certainly experienced “others” differently than one from the southeast. Conversely, “others,” through their lens, have treated or reacted to these men differently.

The literature is replete with definitions of various identities and the distinctions made of those which are visible and not (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). Just as organizations have a culture, individuals within the organization bring with them a set of cultural norms based on their identities. In Lynch & Hanson’s (1998) text, Developing Cross Cultural Competence, they defined individual culture as “akin to being the person observed through a one-way mirror; everything we see is from our own perspective. It is only when we join the observed on the other side that it is possible to see ourselves and others clearly—but getting to the other side of the glass presents many challenges” (p. 50.) While work from Susan Sturm provides several succinct outlines and perspective of how to initiate and advance a system that strives to achieve organizational capacity to be aware of various levels of difference (Sturm, 2006). Sturm (2006) uses an architectural metaphor that places multidimensionality at the center of programs and describes how structure and problems of exclusion and marginalization affects human interactions, the value of hierarchies, information flow, and institutional policies.

Nevertheless in the context of inclusive leadership and institutional change, one must operate within a context that discriminates between the individual identity and the degree to which the individual (with multiple identities) identifies with the organizational culture inclusive of values, practices, symbols, history, power, and control (Senior, 2002). If the articulated mission or vision of an institution purports diversity and yet the symbols throughout the institution—the printed materials, the lack of diversity commentary from the senior leadership during public speeches, or the pictures on the walls representing only dominant groups—depict no diversity, then the incongruence will have an adverse impact on how well individuals within the organization feel their contributions will be valued.

What Is Privilege in Higher Education?

In preparation for the faculty demographic shift to support and retain a more diverse faculty, the existing leadership must intentionally prepare for what will be a long term transition. The embedded culture (to be discussed further below) cannot and will not simply become a welcoming sustaining environment without a recognition that both the formal and informal assumptions, policies and practices are centered within a climate that has been structured by the membership of a dominant demographic group. The reflection of the dominance can be critically and systematically examined in the context of ways in which routine interactions do not take into account differences among individuals based on backgrounds and experiences.

For example, it may be accepted practice to participate in a discussion by simply interrupting a speaker to raise a question by the dominant group. Individuals not of the dominant group (target or oppressed groups) may wait to be recognized by the “chair” or the speaker before making comments, because customs and traditions established within their own cultural group dictate that “interrupt” is a demonstration of incivility or rudeness. In addition, if as members of targeted groups and if interrupted, it may be viewed as being disrespected or that their contributions are devalued.

Members of dominate groups are said to have “privilege” based on a particular characteristic or identity or multiple identities and in most instances are unearned. This kind of privilege is generally a product of birth. Privilege can be defined as “a special advantage, immunity, permission, right or benefit granted to or enjoyed by an individual, class, or caste” (Johnson, 2001), and by default becomes the norm. For the purpose of this discussion and by example, “male privilege” would suggest that individuals who define their gender as male have accrued to them by society (as a social construct) certain accommodations and advantages not afforded to women. Similarly, individuals who identify themselves as being White within the U.S. are said to enjoy race privilege.

To be the recipient of race privilege by birth designation means that others are positioned to not have access to the same benefits. The dominance of race, gender, class, sexual orientation, or religion to name a few, also means that one may have privilege based on one identity and be denied or discriminated against base on another or others.

To further clarify, different privileges bestow certain common characteristics (e.g., membership in the norm, the ability to choose whether to object to the power system, and the invisibility of its benefit), the form of a privilege may vary according to the power relationship that produces it. Male privilege and heterosexuality privilege result from the gender hierarchy. Class privilege derives from an economic, wealth-based hierarchy (McIntosh, 1998). Acts of privilege are often played out
in a monocultural engaged organization where those with power and privilege rule. When inclusive, all voices have a contribution and those with power and privilege use it to leverage the system to be more inclusive. When inclusive or multicultural, organizations excel.

Shifting Toward a Multicultural Organization

Lowrie and Campus Women Lead (2006) support that an inclusive leadership model is needed in higher education and the initial steps toward engaging a system is to shift to a more multicultural organization. The tripartite principles are to understand self, others, and systems. The first two are necessary before embarking on the third; however, each set of lenses sees or interacts with the system differently because of its complexity and the complexity of the multiple social identities. It is extraordinarily difficult to grasp the nuances of behavior or response to environment of others if you have not embarked on the personal “work” on self. Self-examination and reflection is the first step of system’s change. To do this, the following is suggested.

Understanding and Engaging Self

• Identify and validate your own social/cultural identities
• Use your identities as leadership strengths for your cultural toolkit
• Recognize your multifaceted leadership capacity
• Identify and strengthen your inclusive leadership skills
• Recognize your own capacity to lead from where you are in the institutions
• Take responsibility for your own privilege and learn to leverage its power to advocate for—and be an ally to—change.

As a change agent you begin with understanding your own leadership style and have the capacity to describe it. How does your gender/racial/class or other social identity influence or inform your leadership style? Does your style change in different contexts? Which aspects of your gender/racial/class or other social identities do you embrace or use as leadership strengths? Does your current position give you access to formal power? How can you lead from where you are in the institution, even if you do not have access to formal power? What aspects of your gender/race/class or other social identities provide you with privilege and access to social power? How do you use your position, privilege, and power to create access for inclusion and advocate for change?

As the self-reflective “work” progresses, attention to “others” becomes better defined, becomes more meaningful, and includes:

Understanding and Engaging Others

• Recognize the multiple social and cultural identities in others and their possible impact on leadership styles and strengths
• Recognize the different pathways to leadership for those from different social and cultural groups and who have been historically absent or denied access
• Develop alliances among different communities inside and outside of the institution to create greater inclusion and equity.

Thus, it is essential to ask the following: Which gender/race/class or other social groups may be most affected by and concerned with the issues you are addressing? Have people from these groups—especially those most adversely affected—been informed, meaningfully involved, and authentically represented in addressing the issue and development of change efforts? Who may be missing and how can they be engaged?

Interdependent with understanding self and others is a progressive recognition of the complexity of the system in which you are engaged. Each component has an impact on the other which suggest that no one component can be absent from the change process. For example, as faculty, there is a tendency to direct the focus on teaching, research and service. The core functions within the institutional units are rarely considered, like grounds, human resources, residence hall, planning and budgets, etc.—as if these operational functions have no impact on the educational enterprise. However, if an inclusive customer service oriented practice is not executed when that faculty member must interact with benefits—most likely housed in human resources, the perspective of a welcoming treatment is altered—and therefore, it is an impact on retention.

As a consequence, practices of inclusion to create an inclusive culture must include understanding and engaging system.

Understanding and Engaging Systems

• Recognize that systems of higher education have visible and hidden aspects that are important to understand to navigate the system safely
• Learn to develop a variety of strategies to transform systems
• Build collegial connections and create visions of inclusive excellence
• Create formal and informal spaces and networks that can provide those, who have been historically under-represented in leadership roles, ways to navigate the system effectively, to cross boundaries, and to create new means of making change
• Understand the connections between inclusion and excellence.
How does the system (i.e., organizational culture, formal structures, policies, and practices) perpetuate gender/race/class or other inequities? What factors may be producing and perpetuating gender/racial or other inequities associated with this issue? How did the inequities arise? Are they expanding or narrowing? Which gender/race/class or other social groups are currently most advantaged and most disadvantaged by the issue you are addressing? How are they affected differently? What quantitative and qualitative evidence of inequality exists? What evidence is missing or needed?

The Multicultural Organization Development (MCOD) Framework is a constructive mechanism to initiate a process of inclusion.

The MCOD is an organization that has within its mission, goals, values, and operating system explicit policies and practices that prohibits anyone from being excluded or unjustly treated because of social identity or status. A multicultural organization not only supports social justice within the organization; it advocates these values in interactions within the local, regional, national, and global communities, with its vendors, customers, and peer organizations. This type of organization also appreciates all forms of social diversity and understands the strengths and advantages that social diversity brings to the local, regional, national, and global communities. (Jackson, 2006; pp. 142)

Evidence of the degree to which MCOD is observable within systems is described in stages in Table 1.

If and when the organization begins to embrace inclusion within the rubric of the MCOD model as a key to excellence, full participation at all stages in the development of strategies and policies contributes to exemplary outcomes. According to Jackson and Holvino (1988), the organizational architecture values the contributions and interests of all employees and volunteers. Employees and volunteers reflect diverse social and cultural groups throughout all levels of the organization and are full participants in decisions that shape the organization. The organization acts to eliminate all forms of oppression within based on race, ethnicity, gender identity and gender expression, sexual orientation, age, hierarchical level, nationality, language, economic class, educational level, religion, ability/disability, marital/parental status, size/appearance, etc. Finally, the organization follows through on broader social and environmental responsibilities. Notably, within any system’s change, there will be champions, but the work of champions is not sustainable without the synergy produced through the development of allies. While there are many forms of relationships within systems to accomplish team change agendas (i.e., collaborations, partnerships, coalitions, networks) it is ally development that has the most sustainability and outcomes within a culture that yield subsequent potential climate change.

Not to be confused with “friends,” an ally is someone who

- Addresses an issue, not just an incident
- Mobilizes and organizes to respond to the issue without prompting from the target group member
- Is willing to take risks that may affect one’s place, position, and authority in own dominant group
- Is willing to make public mistakes in front of targets (the oppressed or members of marginalized groups) and agents (the oppressors)
- Is visible, active, vigilant, and public (even when the target person is not in the room). (Lau, 2007)

Multicultural Allies are individuals from a dominant social identity group (can be simultaneously from a marginalized identity group) who supports marginalized, silenced, or less privileged groups without actually being a member of those groups (Lau, 2007). This person directly and proactively confronts and challenges discrimination and works proactively on behalf of social justice and against systemic oppression. According to Lau (2007), a multicultural ally is willing to recognize the inherent privilege and power of being a member of the dominant group and

- recognizes that privilege is ascribed by and benefits from systemic traditions and informal norms where value has accumulated over time
- recognizes these are unearned privileges. They weren’t asked for, and may not even be wanted
- views membership in the dominant group as an opportunity to bring about change
- is continually conscious about social-political location and strategies and acts.

It is important to know that allies to people and allies to issues are to be differentiated. While one can be both, in the context of social justice and institutional change, allies must be clear that the ultimate outcome must be to create a system of full participation through diversity and inclusion. Allies to issues of social justice and inclusive excellence are consistent in actions. They “walk the talk.” Their positional stance is reliable—not because it politically correct, but because they understand the stakes—the stakes of educating future generations of students who must serve as well as lead a multi-demographic society. Key allies and themselves stakeholders are the president, dean or chairperson of a unit—all who must work systemically and vigilantly to rid their institutions of any prevailing chilly climates that may impede change.

Multicultural allies are people who recognize that unlearning prejudice and oppressive behaviors is a life-long process and engage in every opportunity to learn more. They are willing to take risks, try new thoughts and behaviors, and act in spite of fear or resistance from others. Therefore, we advocate for multicultural allies
### Table 1 Stages of Multicultural Organization Development (MCOD) Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Stage 1: The Exclusionary Organization** | • Openly maintains the dominant group’s power and privilege  
• Deliberately restricts membership  
• Intentionally designed to maintain dominance of one group over others  
• Overt discriminatory, exclusionary, and harassing actions go unaddressed  
• Unsafe and dangerous environment for subordinated group members  
• Monocultural organization |
| **Stage 2: “The Club”** | • Maintains privilege of those who have traditionally held power and influence  
• Monocultural norms, policies, and procedures of dominant culture viewed as the only “right” way: “business as usual”  
• Dominant culture institutionalized in policies, procedures, services, etc.  
• Limited number of “token” members from other social identity groups allowed in if they have the “right” credentials, attitudes, behaviors, etc.  
• Engages issues of diversity and social justice only on club member’s terms and within their comfort zone |
| **Stage 3: The Compliance Organization** | • Committed to removing some of the discrimination inherent in the Club organization  
• Provides some access to some members of previously excluded groups  
• Token placements in staff positions: Must be “team players” and “qualified”  
• Must assimilate into organizational culture  
• Must not challenge the system or “rock the boat”  
• Must not raise issues of sexism, racism, classism, heterosexism . . . |
| **Stage 4: The Affirming Organization** | • Committed to eliminating discriminatory practices and inherent advantages  
• Actively recruits and promotes members of groups that have been historically denied access and opportunity  
• Provides support and career development opportunities to increase success and mobility  
• Employees encouraged to be nonoppressive ~ awareness trainings  
• Employees must assimilate to organizational culture |
| **Stage 5: The Redefining Organization** | • In transition  
• Moving beyond “nondiscriminatory,” “non-oppressive”  
• Working to create environment that “values and capitalizes on diversity”  
• Working to ensure full inclusion of multicultural workforce to enhance growth and success of organization  
• Begins to question limitations of organizational culture: mission, policies, structures, operations, services, management practices, climate, etc.  
• Actively works toward developing a multicultural organization  
• Committed to redesigning and implementing policies and practices to redistribute power, and ensure the inclusion, participation, and empowerment of all members |
| **Stage 6: The Multicultural Organization** | • Mission, values, operations, and services reflect the contributions and interests of the wide diversity of cultural and social identity groups  
• Leaders and members act on the organizational commitment to eradicate all forms of oppression within the organization  
• Members across all identity groups are full participants in decision-making  
• Actively works in larger communities (regional, national, global) to eliminate all forms of oppression and to create multicultural organizations |
to act against social injustice out of a belief that it is in their own self-interest to do so rather than out of pity or to “help” others. They are willing to make mistakes, learn from them, try again, and are open to being confronted about his/her own behaviors and attitudes. These individuals consider change and growth without being defensive and in denial. They work to see and understand the connections between all forms of oppression. Above all, these are people who believe they can make a difference by speaking out against all forms of oppression, whether they are directly affected and part of the group being oppressed, and are constantly looking to build strong support and relationships with other allies to make a positive difference.

Preserving the Distinction While Infusing Inclusion

Leaders, who aspire to execute a vision of inclusiveness, assume that there is at the minimum a shared agreement that with inclusion in every aspect of the institution, productivity, quality, and performance is enhanced. There is also an expectation that the intersections of social identities, individual roles aligned across segmented connections of the institution, and how these connections impact the mission and values of the institution will lead to excellence. As one embarks on building a multicultural organization, it is important to assess an authentic appreciation of the challenges that reduce effectiveness. Leaders must know how individuals with their multiple identities—working also as collectives, create opportunities for different outcomes—moving from a monocultural organization to one that is multicultural.

Through assessment and other methods of “reading the landscape,” preparation for systems’ change requires that, the aspects of the formal and informal rules, policies, and practices be critically scrutinized to determine the degree to which there is a disparate impact on those without various types of unearned and earned privilege. An additional component of the assessment must be the identification of areas of resistance and how that resistance “shows up.” However, through multicultural alliances, it is the role of individuals with privilege and associated “powers” to leverage the system to promote transformation and to influence the removal of any resistance. Systems that not only permit but also do not challenge both overt and subtle forms of inequity or imbalance of access are destined to misuse talent, abilities, expertise, competence, and perspectives. The perspectives and competencies are generated by broader experiences that result from the multiple identities of both the workforce and/or student body. The misuse or waste stunts the advancement of an institution to excellence.

The work, by Susan Sturm and colleagues at the Center for Institutional and Social Change at Columbia Law School provide a useful lexicon for articulating what is necessary to initiate and sustain institutional transformation in the context of inclusion and full participation. Sturm (2009) identifies the following “roles” as necessary for “multi-level systems change towards full participation:

- Developing shared vision, agendas, institutional change strategies, and language
- Providing for learning and reflection about success and failure, including developing a shared research agenda
- Pooling knowledge and serving as carriers of ideas across organizational fields
- Developing metrics and generating, sharing and comparing data about institutional transformation
- Identifying and researching “positive deviants” examples of innovation and effective practice
- Building information and collaboration networks among people with similar roles, interests, or concerns
- Developing roles for and capabilities of organizational catalysts and transformative leaders
- Validating and supporting those involved in this work
- Creating occasions for participation and mobilization by community members, thus bringing them to the table and enhancing their social capital
- Creating occasions for comparing performance and creating benchmarks and robust best practices, thus leveraging innovation and best practices to create pressure for change among member institutions.

In this *American Kinesiology Association Diversity Issues* special edition entitled *Kinesiology Review*—that could serve as a guide to assist your department. Specifically, it is imperative that Kinesiology department provide a curriculum that support intercultural communication. Kinesiology coursework must integrate the changing demographics of our society while promoting communication that promotes diversity of thought and leads students to ask why? Another approach that is imperative includes pipeline development for student, faculty, and staff of color. Kinesiology programs must find ways to promote diversity within their undergraduate program. The undergraduate program is the start of this pipeline. If we do not have students of color receiving undergraduate Kinesiology degrees, the prevalence of students of color that enter and complete Ph.D./Ed.D. Kinesiology programs will be significantly affected; thus, leading Kinesiology departments to have a shortage of faculty of color to hire. Other effective strategies as it relates to promoting diversity include interuniversity partnerships and/or pregraduate school training programs with
Historically Black Colleges and Universities. Successful examples of these approaches are found in the two following papers. By ensuring that Kinesiology departments and universities have an inclusive culture and climate the support diversity will aid in the retention of faculty, staff, and students of color. Other key items that Kinesiology departments should consider include outreach, research, and community partnerships. It is essential of faculty members within Kinesiology department to address research questions that align with the health and performance needs of our society along with working with diverse and inclusive populations. It is also essential for Kinesiology departments to connect and provide a service to the community that it serves. Specifically, they should engage in outreach and development partnerships with various community entities. These entities include health care systems (e.g., hospitals, physical therapy clinics, sports training centers), educational systems (preschools, public schools, community colleges and universities), providing health and wellness programs/clinics that address the health concerns and needs within the community, while connecting with other businesses and nonprofit organizations. These are some examples as it relates to promoting an intercultural climate for education, engagement, and research in Kinesiology, but the possibilities for your department are endless.

**Conclusion**

Key to this discussion is a reaffirmation that although the system’s change narrative tends to capture the major share of focus, the reality is that the outcome objective is institutional transformation—not just change but to be transformed. It is not sufficient to introduce concepts of inclusion, or increase student enrollment, or faculty and staff demographic representation, or expand the curriculum to be diversity inclusive, or change the “pictures on the wall.” Institutional communities must change the thinking and the thought processes; the talk and the construction of the lexicon; the walk and the practice of ambulation or the alternative for movement and action; the policies and the policies that shape governance; the governance that both addresses the issues and includes the voices of others; all of which ultimately produces the next generation of change agents who will sustain notable evidence of a transformational agenda.

---

**Figure 1** — Intercultural Climate for Education, Engagement, and Research in Kinesiology
As systems navigate for change, Senge et al. (1999) describes that it is unproductive to begin discussions without a reaffirmation of institutional or department “purpose, vision, values, and guiding principles.” While the specific metaphor he uses is one of what is necessary to keep an aircraft in flight and is presented in his writing to described effective shared governance, it is also applicable to this narrative—as leadership (broadly defined) attempts an organizational transformative conversion. If one considers the parts of a plane as shared aspirations, accountabilities for results, supported by resources and competencies, with incentives to sustain champions, and mechanisms in place to support thrust, drag, lift, and the ability to account for weight, flight (i.e., progress toward inclusion) may be sustained. In addition, if each component had a directional arrow—all pointing forward with shared interest, values, and purpose, not the special interest of one group over another, then these indicators (arrows) depict direction. In this instance, the progress defined is a transformed organization, stimulated by innovation, and achieving excellence. If the arrows on board this craft were all pointing in different directions and therefore, not aligned, peril might be predicted and safety might be threatened.

As Kathryn Campbell (2013) reminds us that tremendous disparities still exist in higher education, this manuscript focused on advancing diversity and inclusion through an institutional change framework. We must recall that the futures of our students are at stake. As Campbell states, “with focused and intentional efforts, higher education can play its part in deepening the hues of the Opportunity Index (i.e., an indicators at the county and state levels that contribute to economic opportunity and mobility; www.opportunityindex.org) across the nation, building a map—sic our institutions as vibrant as the communities it (they) represents.” The illumination of a set considerations for creating change that leads to the transformed institution (or system) with inclusion and full participation at its core has been attempted here. Within a historical demographic and institutional privilege context, the status quo is described and without intervention, the disenfranchisement of segments of society will continue. Change theories, frameworks, practices and leadership throughout the organization are required. Leaders of the organization—defined throughout this narrative—must recognize what allows their vision to exclude; they must set a course to understand others; they must hone, refine and polish their skills in observing; and, discern through an inclusive lens the various segmented issues of and events within the institution that interdependently create change. Both the role of culture and climate were discussed and the utilization of multicultural allies to influence change is key to reading the landscape and leveraging power.

Embarking on this path to full participation and inclusive excellence also recognizes that diversity is an intellectual and structural asset. It does not mean that the disciplinary richness and history of Kinesiology should be discarded. These assets are additive and should be adopted by and adapted to Kinesiology for the establishment of a “new normal” and a model for other disciplines to follow.
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