

**Online supplementary material for the manuscript titled,
“How Diversity Fails: An Empirical Investigation of Organizational Status and Policy Implementation
on Three College Campuses”**

Explanatory Note: This document supplements the manuscript entitled, “How Diversity Fails: An Empirical Investigation of Organizational Status and Policy Implementation on Three College Campuses”

A. Table S1 introduces relevant organizational information across the three campuses in the collective case study.

B. Table S2 summarizes the various data sources upon which this collective case study is based.

C. Table S3 provides an overview of the campus positions of potential respondents who were the focus of recruitment efforts for this collective case study.

D. Table S4 presents details the number and anonymized campus position of respondents who were interviewed for this collective case study.

Table S1. Summary Campus Data

| Characteristic | Ashby University | Bradford University | Clearfield College |
|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Campus type | Research University | Master’s University | Baccalaureate College |
| Budget | \$2-3B | ~\$250M | ~\$100M |
| Enrollment | 30,000 undergraduates | 12,000 undergraduates | 5,000 undergraduates |
| SRM* | ~<10% | ~10% | ~25% |
| Selectivity | 50% admit rate | 85% admit rate | 80% admit rate |
| Tuition & fees^ | \$10K/\$30K | \$7K/\$15K | \$7K/\$15K |
| 6-yr grad. | 80%, 65% SRM* | 50%, 40% SRM* | 30%, <30% SRM*° |

Note: Data in this table were drawn from national college and university information sites, institutional and System reports, and other institutional documents and websites.

* SRM = Students from racially marginalized groups. The includes students who identify as Native American, Hispanic/Latino, Black or Southeast Asian.

^ Tuition and fees data presented: in-state/out-of-state.

° Some sub-group numbers are so small, that Clearfield does not represent them as percentages. As a result, the final grad rate cannot be reported for some groups. The range is 15% for Black students and 36% for Latino/Hispanic students.

Table S2. Data Collection and Generation Matrix

| Data Source | Description |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Semi-structured interviews | With respondents who are/were directly involved with EFA and other diversity activities as well as chancellors, administrators, and staff working in recruitment and admissions, student and academic affairs, advising, campus equity and diversity positions, and multicultural student services at focal and contextual institutions (See Appendix C for sample semi-structured interview protocols.) |
| Institutional documents and artifacts | Includes archival and contemporary institutional documents (e.g., strategic plans, policy statements, promotional materials)—particularly those that relate to relevant diversity efforts and concerns—in addition to artifacts like websites, meeting notes, newspapers and newsletters (i.e. student, campus, community), emails, and photos that add context to each case and offer insight into local policy development and adaptation in focal and contextual institutions |
| Direct observation | Time on campus and observation of meetings and events that will help contextualize and expand upon other data |
| Institutional and administrative data | Publicly and institutionally available reports on demographics and outcomes of students in the focal state and institutions, disaggregated by race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status (to the extent this is possible) |
| Researcher artifacts | Ethnographic fieldnotes and research journal: detailed reflections on research events (e.g., interviews, observations) and research and analytic processes |

Table S3. Study Recruitment by Generalized Campus Function and Position

| Function | Position(s)* |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Institutional leadership | President |
| Academic affairs | Provost, other senior administrators, deans, director(s) |
| Institutional research | Senior administrator, director |
| Recruitment and admissions | Senior administrator, director |
| Student affairs | Senior administrators, deans |
| Multicultural student services | Senior administrators, deans, directors |
| Office of Diversity | Senior administrator(s), director(s), manager/coordinator |
| Undergraduate advising | Director |
| Campus diversity activities | EFA and/or other diversity committee(s), range of respondents |

Note: While I did not explicitly seek out faculty based on their primary role as educators, I recruited and interviewed several faculty members who also held other institutional positions (e.g., administrative roles) or who were involved in EFA and other diversity-related efforts on campus (e.g., based on their membership on a diversity committee).

Table S4. Study Respondents by Function and Position, by Campus

| Function | Ashby | Bradford | Clearfield |
|---|-------|----------|------------|
| President | x | x | x |
| Academic affairs, Provost | -- ^ | x | x |
| Academic affairs, other | x | x | x |
| Institutional research | x | x | x |
| Multicultural student services | x | x | x |
| Office of Diversity ~ | x | -- ^ | x |
| EFA/diversity committee members* | x | x | x |
| Recruitment and admissions | -- ^ | x | x |
| Student affairs, Dean of students | x | x | x |
| Student affairs, Other | x | x | x |
| Undergraduate advising | x | x | x |
| Total number of campus respondents interviewed (54) | 18 | 19 | 17 |

Notes: An “x” indicates that I was able to interview at least one respondent in the specified position. ^ indicates missed interviews. Potential respondents in these positions declined my interview request at Ashby University. There was no one in this area at Bradford University during my primary period of interview-based data collection.

* At a minimum, I interviewed the chairs of these committees, but sought out additional members of EFA and diversity committees.

~ While each institution had an office that could be anonymized to Office of Diversity, all the offices do not all perform the same function. One office focuses on affirmative action and related compliance (Bradford), another provides institutional leadership related to campus diversity efforts (Clearfield), and the third combines these functions (Ashby).