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In this brief editorial the editor provides (a) a commentary on advancing the scholarship on diversity in higher education, (b) an acknowledgment of the outstanding work of the inaugural editor and editorial board, and (c) a vision for the growth and advancement of the Journal of Diversity in Higher Education (JDHE). An abbreviated content analysis of the first 4 volumes of JDHE is provided, along with suggested focal areas of future research on diversity in higher education.
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Initiatives designed to promote diversity, inclusion, and equity have rapidly become some of the most complex areas of policy and practice in higher education, and there are ongoing shifts and challenges on the horizon (Anderson, 2008; Antonio & Clark, 2011; Smith, 2009). In fact, over the course of the past decade, there has been a significant paradigm shift in higher education diversity efforts (Chang & Ledesma, 2011; Epperson, 2011; Zamani-Gallaher, Green, Brown, & Stovall, 2009). The diversity paradigm shift is the result of five central, converging factors:

1. ongoing disparities in educational attainment within the United States among racial–ethnic, gender, and socioeconomic groups, as well as between the United States and other developed countries (Phillips, 2011; Smith, 2009; Worthington, Hart, & Khairallah, 2010);

2. recent state referenda, and executive, legislative and judicial interventions (Darling-Hammond, 2011; Epperson, 2011; Zamani-Gallaher et al., 2009);

3. ongoing pressure from U.S. business interests on colleges and universities to help prepare a competitive and multiculturally competent workforce (Goldin & Katz, 2008; Jayakumar, 2008);

4. substantial evidence that diversity is integral to how institutions achieve their educational and intellectual missions (Antonio, 2001; Chang, 1996; Gottfredson et al., 2008; Gurin, 1999; Hurtado, 2001; Jayakumar, 2008; Smith & Associates, 1997); and

5. rapid shifts in population demographics that are increasing the numbers of underrepresented racial–ethnic group members in higher education (Smith, 2009; Worthington et al., 2010).

Significant new challenges have arisen from a combination of new pressures for higher education accountability, along with economic conditions resulting in dramatic increases in the costs of higher education, and national demands for increased human capital to meet growing economic competition from abroad (Darling-Hammond, 2011; Goldin & Katz, 2008; Smith, 2009). As a result of these multiple shifts in context, chief diversity officers (CDOs) have become some of the most rapidly growing administrative positions.
in higher education, with intensifying levels of professional specialization and expertise (Williams & Wade-Golden, 2008).

Diversity in higher education is becoming disentangled from an exclusive focus on affirmative action based on race (antonio & Clark, 2011; Epperson, 2011), and it increasingly focuses on a broad set of identity characteristics, focal constituent groups, and institutional initiatives. Figure 1 provides a three-dimensional model of higher education diversity based on (a) identity characteristics, (b) core areas of institutional initiatives, and (c) focal groups associated with institutions. Definitions of diversity, although difficult to achieve consensus (Anderson, 2008; Chang & Ledesma, 2011), have gradually expanded in scope across decades to include institutional communities that reflect human differences on a variety of identity characteristics, including but not limited to race, ethnicity, age, gender, sexual orientation, religion, disability, national and geographic origin, language use, socioeconomic status, first generation college status, veteran and military status, and political ideology (Cuyjet, Howard-Hamilton, & Cooper, 2011; Smith, 2009; Stulberg & Weinberg, 2011). Furthermore, higher education stakeholders typically include students, faculty, staff, and administrators, along with a wide range of other groups such as alumni, parents, donors, regents–curators–trustees, and local–regional community members (Cuyjet et al., 2011; D. G. Smith, 2009; Stulberg & Weinberg, 2011; Worthington et al., 2010). Finally, higher education diversity initiatives generally focus on 10 core areas: (a) recruitment and retention of students, faculty, staff, and administrators; (b) campus climate; (c) curriculum and instruction; (d) research and inquiry; (e) intergroup relations and discourse; (f) student/faculty/staff/leadership development and success; (g) nondiscrimination; (h) institutional advancement; (i) external relations; and (j) strategic planning and accountability (Anderson, 2008; Clayton-Pederson, Parker, Smith, Moreno, & Teraguchi, 2007; Cooper, Howard-Hamilton, & Cuyjet, 2011; Epperson, 2011; Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pederson, & Allen, 1998; Maxwell, Nagda, & Thompson, 2011; Smith, 2009; Worthington et al., 2010; Zamani-Gallaher et al., 2009).

The model provided in Figure 1 served as the organizing framework for an abbreviated content analysis of the first four volumes of the Journal of Diversity in Higher Education (JDHE) and is also offered as a conceptual guide for those conducting diversity research and practice in higher education. Table 1 indi-
icates that articles are varied across the 10 core areas, with greater emphasis on issues of student and faculty recruitment, retention, development, and success (e.g., Aguayo, Herman, Ojeda, & Flores, 2011; Garriott, Love, & Tyler, 2008; Gottfredson et al., 2008; Majer, 2009; Spanierman, Neville, Liao, Hammer, & Wang, 2008; Todd, Spanierman, & Aber, 2010; Turner, González, & Wood, 2008); along with extensive coverage of campus climate and nondiscrimination (e.g., Clark, Spanierman, Reed, Sobie, & Cabana, 2011; Hart & Fellbaum, 2008; Hurtado, Griffin, Arellano, & Cuellar, 2008; Navarro, Worthington, Hart, & Khairallah, 2009; Worthington, Navarro, Loewy, & Hart, 2008); and some attention to curriculum, instruction, intergroup relations, and discourse (e.g., de Oliveira, Braun, Carlson, & de Oliveira, 2009; Elicker, Thompson, Snell, & O’Malley, 2009; Reid, 2010). Very limited attention has been given to the areas of diversity research, inquiry, leadership development, institutional advancement, external relations, and strategic planning. Table 2 indicates that articles appearing in the journal have focused primarily on students and faculty, especially with regard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core area</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment &amp; retention</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus climate</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum &amp; instruction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; inquiry</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergroup relations &amp; discourse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student–Faculty–Staff–Leadership development &amp; success</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondiscrimination</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional advancement</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External relations</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning &amp; accountability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( N = 81 \) articles. Totals sum to more than 81 because many articles addressed more than one core area, social group, or both.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity characteristic</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability status</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National &amp; geographic origin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language use</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic status</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st generation college status</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran &amp; military status</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political ideology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( N = 81 \) articles. Totals sum to more than 81 because many articles addressed more than one identity characteristic, focal group, or both.
to race/ethnicity and gender. Identity characteristics related to sexual orientation, disability, national and geographic origin, and socioeconomic status have received moderate consideration, whereas other areas have received more limited attention. It is worthwhile to note that a substantial number of the articles published in JDHE thus far have focused very broadly on diversity issues across the identity spectrum or attended to specific intersections of identity characteristics, most commonly race/ethnicity and gender. Finally, of the 81 articles published in the first 4 volumes of JDHE, 47 were quantitative; 15 were qualitative; 9 were mixed methods; and 10 were literature reviews, editorials, or conceptual articles, reflecting a reasonable level of methodological diversity.

As we look to the future, I would like to promote a greater variety of articles in areas that have not received extensive attention, while at the same time maintaining a focus on critical issues related to areas that have been traditional priorities in the higher education diversity literature (e.g., race, gender, students, faculty, recruitment, retention, nondiscrimination, campus climate). This expanded scope will require growth for JDHE (an issue I will return to below) so that traditional areas of concern can continue to be addressed fully, but I am also committed to publishing high-quality scholarship on a variety of other topics as well (e.g., sexual orientation, disability, socioeconomic status, etc.). The journal has already done well in addressing some of these issues, and my intent is to continue to broaden the scope in these areas; I have assembled a team of consulting editors with the expertise to assist in that process.

In addition, I am hopeful that the journal will attract manuscript submissions on the most pressing issues in the field of higher education diversity from established and emerging scholars. I believe there is a need to continue publishing the strongest research assessing the benefits of diversity and providing greater explanatory power regarding how, why, and what works in higher education diversity practices. For that reason, I will be particularly interested in manuscripts designed to address the quality and nature of intergroup dialogues and interactions, and their relations to important educational outcomes. In addition, I will be actively pursuing scholarship that is theoretically grounded or helps to build on the conceptual foundations within the field. I will be seeking brief manuscripts focused on the distribution of best practices (or promising new practices) that provide guidance for both research and policies in higher education diversity. In helping to organize and guide scholarship in the field, I will be seeking focused literature reviews, content analyses, and meta-analyses in established areas of diversity scholarship (e.g., Hart & Fellabaum, 2008; Hurtado et al., 2008; Rubin, 2012 [this issue]; Turner, González, & Wood, 2008).

In addition, toward the goal of enhancing the quality of scholarship, I will be seeking manuscripts that help to advance and improve methodological approaches to research (both qualitative and quantitative), especially on research best practices and measurement–scale development (cf. Worthington, 2008; Worthington & Whittaker, 2006). Finally, with the emergence of the CDO as one of the most rapidly growing administrative leadership positions in higher education, I will be seeking manuscripts written by and about CDOs, and the impact of their work in institutions of higher education.

**Appreciation**

It is a great honor to be appointed as the second editor of JDHE. Inaugural editor, Michael R. Stevenson, worked with the board of directors of the National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education (NADOHE) to develop the vision for JDHE and establish the successful partnership with the American Psychological Association (APA). I greatly respect and applaud Dr. Stevenson’s hard work in building a journal that has been recognized by our publisher, APA Journals, as one of the highest performing new journals in their history. Indeed, JDHE has functioned similarly to a “mature journal” in terms of manuscript submissions, acceptance–rejection ratio, and subscriptions. It was clear from the outset that JDHE filled a void in higher education publications when the first year netted more than 115 manuscript submissions to fill 256 journal pages in only four issues per year, resulting in an 82% rejection rate. These numbers have held relatively steady throughout the first four volumes, contributing to the decision by the Institute for Scientific Information (ISI) to es-
A Vision for Growth

As I take on the work as the new editor, I have two central tasks ahead of me: (a) the Journal has been passed to me in great shape, try not to break it; and (b) work closely with the new editorial board, APA Journals, NADOHE, and other partners to advance JDHE to the next level of higher education scholarship. As the new editor, I plan to work very hard to build on the successes achieved by the founding editorial team. My first steps toward the advancement of the journal were to increase the size of the editorial board and to appoint an associate editor. Jeni Hart is currently serving as associate editor for a 1-year term (renewable) and brings strong expertise in the areas of qualitative research methods as well as a broad understanding of diversity in higher education, including gender issues, feminism, and campus climate. I am grateful to the returning members of the editorial board: Katherine Conway-Turner, Daryl G. Smith, John W. Tippeconnic III, and Caroline Sotello Viernes Turner. I am very pleased to appoint 18 new members to the editorial board: Denise A. Battles, Estela Mara Bensimon, Lauren Bowen, Mitchell J. Chang, Trude Cooke Turner, Frank R. Dillon, Marybeth Gasman, John M. Majer, Charles Martinez, Juan Sanchez Munoz, Landon D. Reid, Kristen A. Renn, Amy Reynolds, Anneliese Singh, Lisa Beth Spanierman, Christine A. Stanley, Robert Teranishi, and Daniel Hiroyuki Teraguchi. I am also tremendously grateful to Michael Stevenson for agreeing to serve as a member of the board after completing his term as editor. There are currently two vacant slots on the editorial board and seven board members with terms ending in 2012 (renewable); thus, I will be accepting nominations immediately to fill slots that are (or will become) vacant. In addition, I will be continuously seeking new members to serve among our pool of ad hoc reviewers (self-nominations are welcome). New editorial board members will be selected based on overall scholarly record (e.g., publications plus editorial experience), along with publications in and/or service as an ad hoc reviewer for JDHE. With this group of expert scholars serving the journal, my efforts will be geared toward increasing the visibility of JDHE, thereby increasing both the readership and manuscript submissions. As subscriptions and submissions increase, a case can be made for increasing the number of pages in the journal, beginning with an increase in the number of pages per issue and later expanding the number of issues per volume. Ultimately, the expanded number of pages will open the door to the opportunity to offer topical special sections and special issues on a regular basis. I envision these goals will take 3 to 6 years to accomplish.

JDHE is fortunate to have such a distinguished group of scholars serving on the editorial board. The broad base of expertise among board members will enable the journal to handle the expanded scope of topics and methods in the articles we publish. In addition, this team is dedicated to providing timely and high-quality reviews to authors, so that regardless of whether manuscripts are accepted or rejected, authors will receive useful feedback with a rapid turnaround time. The current average lag time is approximately 42 days (6 weeks) between submission and editorial decision. This is very good, but we hope to improve on this record over the next 3 years, especially in terms of reducing the number of delays among “outliers” so that every manuscript receives an action letter in less than 70 days (10 weeks). Although we are currently accepting only about 10–20% of the manuscripts that are submitted to JDHE, we want the journal to be author friendly, so that all submissions are given thorough, thoughtful, and constructive reviews that facilitate the advancement of scholarship on diversity in higher education.

Within that context, our goal is for JDHE to be the premiere journal on diversity in higher education.
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