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The Power of Faculty: Transformative Agents of Change for the Profession

Abstract
The lack of racial diversity in the profession is problematic for the families we aim to serve. The goal of this paper is to address some of the ways in which CSD departments can contribute to increasing the number of speech-language pathologists and audiologists of color. This manuscript proposes that faculty are a source of fundamental change and progress toward anti-racism in CSD profession. We will (a) describe strategies for creating equity within the course syllabi, content and classroom interactions (b) offer suggestions on next steps beyond the classroom and (c) highlight ways to maximize success through departmental initiatives.
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Introduction

Racial and ethnic minorities will be the majority of the population in the United States in 2043 (Bernstein, 2012). Research shows that racial and ethnic disparities in health and education negatively impact people of color (Gao et al., 2018; Hudley & Mallinson, 2008). To add to these disparities and related negative consequences is the underrepresentation of people of color in health care professions and implicit bias in health care professionals (Crowe et al., 2020; Fitzgerald & Hurst, 2017). One contributing factor to these issues is the underrepresentation of students of color (SOC) in health care fields. This is especially true in the field of communication sciences and disorders (CSD). The number of underrepresented minorities identified as certified speech-language pathologists (i.e., approximately 8%) and audiologists (i.e., approximately 1-3%) are minimal as compared to the U.S. population (American Speech-Language-Hearing Association [ASHA], 2019). Recent institutional data confirms educational programs have not addressed these disparities, hence the minimal representation of CSD professionals (CSD Education Survey National Aggregate Data Report [CSD], 2018-2019). Of the 301 institutions reporting (total 327; 92% response rate) to the 2018-2019 CSD Education Survey, 20% of students admitted into master’s degree programs in speech-language pathology or doctoral programs in audiology were from underrepresented minorities.

One factor related to the recruitment and retention of SOC is the density of faculty of color in degree-granting postsecondary institutions. The National Center for Education Statistics (US Department of Education, NCES 2020) reports that only about 15% of full-time faculty in Fall 2018 consisted of persons of color. Blacks/African Americans comprised 6%, Hispanic/Latinx comprised 6%, and Asian/Pacific Islander Americans comprised 12%. Those who were American Indians/Alaska Native and those who reported two or more races each made up 1% or fewer of full-time faculty. In CSD, with 92% of professionals identifying as White, the percentage of faculty of color in higher education can be assumed to be even smaller (American Speech-Language-Hearing Association [ASHA], 2019). This is an issue in light of reports that SOC experience greater feelings of connection, understanding, and appreciation when relating to faculty of color (Neville & Parker, 2017; Pieterse et al., 2016). There is some evidence that SOC view faculty of color as significantly more culturally competent, trustworthy, and more supportive than their White professor counterparts (Sedlacek, 1999). Additionally, when SOC share the same racial background with faculty, it may improve perceived openness, common values, trust, availability, and commitment (Alcocer & Martinez, 2018; Rudolph et al, 2015). Given the shortage of faculty of color, it is imperative for White faculty to engage in practices that create welcoming environments that facilitate a sense of belonging for SOC.

There is a call for education interventions in CSD to address these disparities. Research indicates that most interventions rely on programming that targets cultural diversity, competence, and responsiveness (Tripp & Collier, 2019). Certainly, these are critical components of teaching and learning in CSD programs (Anderson, 2016; Tripp & Collier, 2019). However, racial and ethnic disparities in access to education, healthcare, and positions of authority are linked to systemic racism (Farrigan, 2020; Levine et al., 2020; Mathew, 2015).

Do the educational interventions that target cultural diversity, responsivity, and competence constitute anti-racism practices? Are these interventions sufficient for the necessary change
required to decrease the racial disparity and promote change in the CSD profession? It does not appear so, based on the dearth of CSD professionals of color. To address racism as the crux of the disparity, interventions must be designed to specifically target the cause (Preis, 2013). Interventions must progress beyond training related to cultural diversity and cultural competence and should include formal programming about racism and strategies to promote anti-racism policy and procedures (Boykin et al., 2020). Unfortunately, faculty and professionals fail to acknowledge the significance of race and avoid discussions of racial issues (Broder-Fingert et al., 2020; Hird et al., 2004). To create a new professional climate, a cultural shift is needed in which past and ongoing racism within organizations is openly discussed and racist actions and policies are challenged (Kendi, 2019).

We propose that this cultural shift begin in the classroom with faculty who are empowered by their status in the teaching and learning environment to be transformative agents of change for the profession. SOC are more likely to engage when educators in the classroom are inviting and employ inclusive teaching with a focus on difference in race, ethnicity, and gender (Dewsbury & Brame, 2019). The classroom is the introductory point from which students interact with faculty and is the precursor for engagement in other departmental learning and professional activities (e.g., leadership in student research, participation in mentoring programs) (Crosling et al., 2009). This manuscript addresses ways in which faculty may be instrumental in creating classrooms that are inviting and intentional in anti-racist practices. Below, we describe strategies for creating equity within the course syllabi, content, and classroom interactions. We offer suggestions on next steps beyond the classroom and highlight how to maximize success through departmental initiatives.

**Syllabi development.** Creating an anti-racist classroom begins with the syllabus because the syllabus is the first introduction to the course and the instructor. Most courses are developed on learning management platforms, so the syllabus may be reviewed in advance of meeting the instructor or engaging in the classroom context. An anti-racist syllabus is the foundation from which subsequent student in-class relationships develop (Taylor et al., 2019). Fundamentally, the syllabus serves as a contract between the instructor and student, as well as a learning tool for the student. For example, the syllabus lists the class policies and schedule of content, assignments, and assessment. This offers opportunities for students to develop self-management skills (Parkes & Harris, 2002). Beyond the frank purposes, the syllabus is a genre of writing that conveys the stance of the instructor through structural and linguistic features. The choices an instructor makes in syllabus development can either promote or discourage anti-racism (Afros & Schryer, 2009). A student-learning focused syllabus in which students are viewed as active partners in the learning process (e.g., Eberly et al., 2001) can be extended to address anti-racism through the use of inclusive language as well as anti-racist learning objectives, content, and assessment methods.

**Inclusive language.** Inclusive language refers to language that is free from words, phrases, and tones that reflect discriminatory beliefs. Inclusive language helps build supports and create a sense of belonging for SOC (Parent et al., 2016). In a syllabus, rhetorical devices, such as a welcoming tone provide inclusive language (Thompson, 2007). Additionally, use of personal pronouns can serve an inclusive linguistic function. Baecker (1998) suggests that using ‘we’ is a rhetorical device that points toward relationships with students, but it also indicates implicit power. Baecker points out that using the term ‘we’ draws the listeners to participate and could implicate them in hostile learning environments. Instead, syllabi should have explicit statements of both student and
instructor responsibilities through an equitable use of the pronouns ‘you’ and ‘I.’ The power is explicit, yet both parties have shared responsibilities toward student outcomes. Finally, Veri et al. (2019) suggests that modal verbs that are compulsory (e.g., must, will) and imperative mood (e.g., “Come to class prepared”; “You will not be late”) result in terse communication that focuses on the negative. A more inclusive statement would be, “Because our discussions focus on assigned readings, success in the course is maximized when you read in advance of the class.” Consequently, the power of the teacher is diminished, and the student has an opportunity to understand their role in the learning process.

**Anti-racist objectives, content, and formative assessment.** When developing syllabi, topics related to race or people of color should be integrated throughout the curriculum to legitimize discussions (Kishimoto, 2018). In CSD professions, including topics across the curriculum with objectives, content, and assessment related to cultural diversity and competence is a natural fit and mandated by CAA-ASHA standards (ASHA, 2020). However, the integration of such components should be thoughtfully designed and explicitly state what the student will learn as it relates to anti-racism. Examining the historic, social and political contexts of racism can help students understand racism in the profession (Kishimoto, 2018). A course objective could state, “Students will understand dialectal differences and the impact of racism on perceptions of dialect.” Using readings to openly discuss the historical perspectives of African American English (e.g., Stockman, 2010) can address this objective. Additionally, an objective in a course could state, “Students will understand changes in policy and legislation as it relates to the profession.” The use of a timeline can highlight historic moments that help students make the connection between history and legislation that has led to action from ASHA (see Horton-Ikard et al., 2009). Another example would be creating an objective that states, “Students will learn about how European colonialism and Manifest Destiny led to the social and health disparities of Native Americans” (Gillispie, 2016). The use of podcasts, video material and/or documentaries may provide appropriate background.

Formative assessment activities provide students with immediate feedback and opportunities to improve. In particular, use of self-reflection provides opportunities for students and instructors to understand their own perspectives and engagement in racism (Jason & Epplen, 2016). For example, a reflection prompt for the objective and activity described above related to dialect could be, “How would you describe your dialect? How do you interpret others’ dialects? How has this reading expanded your thinking?” Consequently, students may develop an understanding of dialect and how negative perceptions of dialect can contribute to racial disparity in service delivery. A formative assessment activity for the other objectives described above may be to (a) require students to generate a timeline with a specific focus (e.g., school service provision); and (b) complete a paper on implications of health disparity in Native American populations in 2021. Overall, faculty can support SOC through a decreased reliance on a small number of high-stakes tests as primary contributors towards final course grades (i.e., mid-term exam and final) and instead incorporate frequent low-risk assessments throughout the semester (e.g., quizzes to assess students’ acquisition of knowledge across the semester).

In sum, objectives, content, and assessment activities should maximize opportunities to discuss how power and privilege have contributed to our views of ourselves and others. Creating a syllabus using these suggestions may facilitate trusting relationships between the instructor and student as they prepare to work together in a course. If the instructor is not aware of readings on the historic,
social, and political contexts they wish to address, cultural informants on campus may provide feedback on appropriate readings. Table 1 provides a list of readings within and outside of the CSD profession that may introduce the historic, social, and political contexts of racism to guide discussion. Additionally, when selecting readings, the instructor should take care to ensure researchers of color are represented. Table 2 presents several works by researchers of color across different areas of practice.

Table 1
Readings to Frame Historic, Social, and Political Contexts for Racism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/tlcsd/vol5/iss3/9
DOI: https://doi.org/10.30707/TLCSD5.3.1649037688.734156
Table 2
Scholars of Color Across the Big 9

**Speech Sound Production**

**Fluency and fluency disorders**

**Voice**

**Language**


**Hearing**

**Swallowing**
**Cognition**


**Social Aspects**


**Augmentative and alternative communication**
Fannin, D. K. (2016). The intersection of culture and ICF-CY personal and environmental factors for Alternative and Augmentative Communication. *Perspectives of the ASHA Special Interest Groups, 1*(12), 63-82. [https://doi.org/10.1044/persp1.SIG12.63](https://doi.org/10.1044/persp1.SIG12.63)


---

**Anti-racist classroom interactions**

Perceptions of credibility and trust toward an instructor and safety in the classroom are essential for SOC to feel open to learning (Dunn et al., 2014; Pieterse et al., 2016). Feelings of being understood and appreciated for their cultural uniqueness, coupled with an instructor’s ability to empathize with SOC, are important to students’ overall classroom experiences (Neville & Parker, 2017). Faculty have the power to create a positive classroom climate that helps students feel welcome, respected, and valued (Dewsbury & Brame, 2019).

**It's all in a name.** One way to set the stage for productive interactions is to learn students’ names and pronounce them correctly. Names are an important part of identity and cultural uniqueness. In her blog, Gonzalez describes the act of mispronouncing someone’s name as “a tiny act of bigotry” (Gonzalez, 2014, para. 14). An instructor can demonstrate respect for students by simply inviting students to introduce themselves, instead of calling roll and struggling through a pronunciation, shortening a name, or giving a nickname without permission. In subsequent interactions, the instructor may ask the student to correct their production or re-state their name. It is not initially about the correct pronunciation but the instructor’s attitude toward the students. Using the correct pronunciation of a name sets a foundation for active partnership with the student in the learning environment and helps to create an affirming space.

**The power of peer interactions.** Facilitating quality cross-cultural peer interactions is another way an instructor can facilitate anti-racist classroom interactions. White peers have caused SOC to withdraw from class participation, which leads the SOC to experience feelings of isolation, alienation, and misunderstanding (Macke et al., 2015; Seward, 2014). Interaction with peers from
different ethnic backgrounds influence the likelihood that SOC will experience rewarding interactions and establish a sense of belonging on campus (Ash & Schreiner, 2016; Hausmann et al., 2009; Strayhorn, 2012). One way to increase peer interaction is for an instructor to ask for multiple voices to respond to questions (Allen & Tanner, 2002). For example, an instructor may say, “I will not share my views until at least five students have answered.” This allows the faculty to call on students who typically answer less frequently. If SOC do not volunteer or are reluctant to answer, faculty can allow students to talk in pairs or small groups to decide what they would like to share with the larger group (Tanner, 2013).

Faculty assignment of small groups is another way to foster cross-cultural peer interaction. Because SOC are less likely to offer their ideas in a traditional didactic instruction, small group interactions increase the level of comfort for SOC (Lynn, 1988). As part of the course design, small groups or pair-share activities can be included throughout the semester. Literature suggests that faculty assignment of roles within the group helps maintain balanced interactions (Tanner et al., 2003). Faculty should be explicit with their instructions and make sure students understand the goal of the group work. The way small groups are structured has the potential to create a sense of community and collaboration for SOC who may otherwise feel isolated in a CSD class (Ginsberg, 2018b).

**Framing feedback.** SOC are very sensitive to lowered expectations, or what Steele (2010) describes as “softened” feedback, and do not trust it. One strategy faculty may use to counter this unconscious bias is to provide high-standard feedback to SOC. The rigorous feedback can be used to express confidence in the students’ ability to meet high expectations. Steele (2010) showed that this was helpful in renewing trust and motivated students to perform to their highest potential. Yeager et al. (2014) experimented with attaching a note when returning assignments and papers to express high standards and the belief that the student could meet the standards. Students who received the note showed significant improvement. This may be particularly important for SOC, who often experience self-doubt and a lack of a sense of belonging in academic settings (Kossman, 2009). Framing feedback in the context of high expectations and belief in the students’ success improves learning and increases academic self-concept among SOC (Cole, 2007; Schreiner, 2014). Feedback should also reinforce the need for SOC in CSD and that the struggles experienced by SOC are not linked to lack of intelligence or personal deficit (Ackerman-Barger et al., 2015).

**Talking about race: Rules of engagement.** Creating a climate for positive, trusting interactions sets the stage for talking about race and the racism that exists in the profession. Pulliam et al. (2019) noted that SOC identified a turning point in their trust of White instructors when faculty acknowledged and discussed racism including the faculty’s own, students’ in the classroom, and society’s. The instructor’s ability to call out racism reduces the burden on SOC to call it out and teach their White counterparts about the issue (Tuitt, 2012). In order to talk about race, faculty must make sure students understand the ground rules to ensure discussions are respectful, meaningful, useful, and contribute to the learning outcomes of the course.

Explicit discussions about classroom expectations during interactions provide a framework from which students can engage and learn (Horton-Ikard et al., 2009). These researchers provide ground rules for discussions in a multicultural course. Similarly, we suggest that faculty specifically detail rules of engagement at the beginning of each course so that all discussions are civil and contribute
to student learning. See Appendix A adapted from Horton-Ikard et al., (2009) for an example of rules that could be used in courses to frame discussions related to anti-racism. Prior to engaging in conversations about race and racism, faculty must decide their own rules of engagement and gauge their comfort level to enforce the rules. Classroom norms or expectations must be enforced with the expectation that all students will engage accordingly. These rules are essentially the instructors’ way of demonstrating a desire to ensure the classroom environment remains a safe place. As such, it is imperative the rules are followed. If they are not, faculty should intervene. We recommend that for certain topics (e.g., health disparities, school-to-prison, access to healthcare) faculty remind students at the beginning of class of the rules of engagement before beginning the day’s discussion.

**Talking about race: Class discussion format.** Once the rules of engagement are understood, class discussions are the next step. Initially, the instructor must connect with students to understand what students already know and heighten their awareness of the topic. One suggestion is to utilize discussion prompts related to anti-racism and other critical aspects of cultural diversity and competence. These prompts can serve several purposes, including learning about students and their views on anti-racism, assessing the degree to which they understand the impacts of racism on the profession, reinforcing to all students that this topic is important and relevant to the profession, and reinforcing that the faculty is committed to anti-racist work and self-exploration (Pulliam et al., 2019). Examples of prompts include the following:

- On a scale of 1 to 5, what is your comfort level with the concept of race and why?
- How do our social identities impact our role as SLPs?
- Why do you think it’s hard to talk about racism?
- What are the benefits of talking about racism?

We recommend that faculty include multiple prompts on a single day to limit the expectation that there is a right or wrong answer. Additionally, to reinforce that anti-racism work is intentional and ongoing, faculty may begin the discussion by answering a prompt before students answer the prompt followed by explaining that there is no right or wrong answer. Once the faculty and students explore broad issues of racism, specific topics related to the impact on the CSD profession may begin to happen organically and with greater depth.

Goodman (2001) explains that a lack of consciousness possessed by the privileged group regarding identities that privilege them is what maintains their power. In order to create an anti-racist classroom, we suggest helping students understand privilege and how it is used in the profession to oppress others, whether intentionally or unintentionally. The Matrix of Oppression or Matrix of Domination first introduced by Collins (1990) is a sociological theory that explains race, class, and gender as interlocking systems of oppression. Crenshaw (2017) has expanded upon Collins’ original work; however, the overall premise remains the same. Specifically, the Matrix of Oppression can be used as a tool to help people acknowledge privilege that they have in society based on their group memberships and how those memberships intersect. Faculty can help students to understand the connection between race and privilege and how those intersections impact service delivery for marginalized communities seeking services. Discussions could be centered around the practice implications of the limited racial, ethnic, and linguistic diversity in treatment research (e.g., Broder-Fingert et al., 2020). The message articulated is often that families ought to conform to standards created by mainstream America and/or treatments may lack cultural
grounding and are subsequently ineffective (Kremer-Sadlik, 2004; Yu, 2013). Discussions based on such readings can help students understand the underlying issues in service delivery driven by the oppression of certain populations and guide them through potential solutions.

Another strategy suggested by Frederick (1995) is to use quotes to objectively frame the race conversation by naming the issue and to start the discussion on what it is like to have dual identity or perception. For example, he used a quote from W.E.B. Du Bois’ (1903) passage on double-consciousness from The Soul of Black Folk:

It is a peculiar sensation, this double-consciousness, this sense of always looking at one’s self through the eyes of others, of measuring one’s soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity. One ever feels his twoness—an American, a negro; two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder. (p. 85)

This quote could be used by CSD faculty to frame conversations related to dialects in assessment and intervention. Faculty can select contemporary books (e.g., Oluo, 2019, So You Want to Talk About Race) to highlight aspects of race and racism.

Another strategy is to begin discussions of race using a five-stage overview of the history of an oppressed population (e.g., Frederick, 1995). This will allow for the instructor to help structure the interpretation of readings related to CSD, provide a common language, and provide a way to understand various points of view. Frederick (1995) argues that the primary benefit of using these stages is to help students get over their first responses to these difficult conversations or their expectations that they will be made to feel guilty about the oppression of underrepresented groups. The stages describe how scholarly interpretations of the African American experience have developed over time and provide some historical context. Using as an example from African American History, the stages are:

1. Invisibility: Black people were not present except as a stereotyped versions of White projections; 2. Contributions: singling out notable people (in the early days described as “credits to their race,”) such as George Washington Carver, Frederick Douglass, or Harriet Tubman; 3. Victimization: dealing with the experiences of many, though mostly as passive victims of White brutality and oppression; 4. Cultural identity and affirmation: despite degradation and oppression how Black people exerted agency and will, protesting their oppression and expressing their heritage in their own communities, beginning with the slave quarters. 5. Transformation: how the study of African American experiences raises fundamentally new questions about the study of American history itself. (p. 89)

Handling the growing pains: Teaching & learning

Strong emotions are often expressed during and after discussions of racism and explorations of anti-racism (Ahmed, 2004). This is the moment faculty fear – they fear that they will not be able to handle the conflict and emotions expressed by students. Additionally, they fear that their own emotions may be difficult to control at times (Wilkerson, 1992). We have an obligation to our students and the families we serve to push through and risk having these moments, because they reinforce that the journey is ongoing and empower students to find their own courage in these difficult conversations (Frederick, 1995). Faculty are called upon to confront and navigate through the emotional complexities of racial histories in their encounters with both themselves and their
students. Boler (1999) highlights that students’ feelings of discomfort may not only be unavoidable but necessary when educators teach about anti-racism. Feelings of discomfort should be acknowledged but should not be used to stunt the progress of the discussion or students’ growth (Berlak 2004; Razack 2007; Zembylas & Chubbuck 2009). Faculty must recognize the emotional undercurrents and foundations of race and racism. They must develop pedagogical strategies to handle these situations in the classroom in order to effect change and maintain a safe and productive learning environment.

Strategic empathy is a strategy to manage difficult conversations by empathizing with student responses that are troubling and discomforting (Zembylas, 2012). Students may express thoughts that are in direct opposition to the instructor’s viewpoint, and the instructor must be able to perspective shift and use the moment as a teachable moment. First, the instructor should pause and ‘press the reset button’ for themselves and for their students. Frederick (2000) proposes the instructor should hold steady, not showing emotion, and allow for time to determine the best response. The objective is to prevent feelings and emotions from threatening teaching and learning or circumventing the issue. Next, the instructor should circle back to the established rules of engagement and remind students how we use them to handle difficult conversations. When rules are not being followed, the instructor should remind all students of the rules by using statements to support the student who is speaking. If the student who is speaking is making a racist statement, the instructor can show support and allow other students to speak once that student has finished their comment. One way to handle this would be to say, “Many people think this way. Why do they hold such views?” Alternatively, in an effort to give students with opposing views the opportunity to speak, the instructor might ask, “Why do those who disagree hold other views?” This type of response allows for open discussion and allows the students to hear each other in a way that promotes learning and validates experiences.

There will be instances when the instructor may need to intervene. For example, the instructor may recast the student’s statement (Souza, 2018). Sometimes if a student realizes their response was problematic, they may reframe it. For example, the instructor may say, “I want to make sure I understand what you said, could you repeat that?” or, “I want to make sure I understand what you said, are you saying that…?” Another strategy proposed by Souza (2018) is for the instructor to frame their response as curiosity as opposed to judgment (e.g., Can you help me understand what you mean by that?) or explain the potential impact of their response (e.g., The word x is a label that’s often offensive to x because… or I can see how that metaphor would feel like an insult to classmates who…). Along those lines, the instructor could ask the student to describe the potential impact of their comment on others (e.g., What do you think people will think when they hear that type of comment?). Souza (2018) proposes that instructors should share their thoughts and feelings about the impact. For example, an instructor may say, “In my experience, that comment can perpetuate negative stereotypes and assumptions about … I would like to think that is not your intent.” Then the instructor can request an appropriate action on the part of the student (e.g., I’d appreciate it if you would consider using a different term because it is inconsistent with our course rules regarding…).

If the instructor pauses and presses the reset button and it is clear the class is not ready for ongoing discussion, the instructor should allow students to write about the statement or talk in small groups prior to resuming the large group discussion. This reflection time may de-escalate emotions. It
may help students understand the communication difficulties when different belief systems or experiences with explicit racism are at work, the reasons for those difficulties, and possible ways to bridge the gaps. Reflections can also be a way to help students learn more about themselves. For example, during a reflection, an instructor may prompt students to consider reasons for their defensiveness or why a statement was hurtful. Another prompt for written work or small group discussion would be to ask students to explain the other perspective presented. An instructor may ask students to reflect on the competing perspective and come up with clarifying questions they would want to ask. Once the larger group reconvenes, students can be encouraged to talk through the disagreement. The instructor can provide guidance as needed related to the topic.

As a final note, it is critical that instructors take responsibility to ensure that discussions are always connected to the course goals, content, and outcomes (Horton-Ikard et al., 2009). Instructors should consider how course materials or readings inform the discussion related to anti-racism.

**Faculty biases, assumptions, and growth**

Engagement in discussions of race and racism within CSD classrooms will impact the growth of the instructor as much as the students. Instructors may themselves feel some of the same emotions that students are feeling. Consequently, it is critical that faculty cultivate respect and appreciation for SOC independent of classroom interactions. To be effective in managing difficult conversation about racism, instructors must have sufficient background knowledge or experiences in the history, culture, and traditions of those students and be aware of historic inequities SOC have faced (Howard, 1999; Nadal et al., 2014; Sue et al., 2007). This suggests that the impetus is on faculty, particularly White faculty, to engage in reflection on their own bias and privilege and how it shapes their interactions with SOC (Foronda, et al., 2016; Kohnert, 2013). It is critical that faculty engage in self-exploration of cultural biases and assumptions and examine how their biases and assumptions perpetuate systematic inequalities. Explicit awareness of biases creates a basis from which to engage in anti-racist actions and to be intentional in anti-racist thought and work. Instructors can reflect on their beliefs and opinions about racial identity and the race of others. They can consider how those beliefs and experiences shape the way they talk to, engage with, and interact with SOC. Self-awareness about cultural bias and assumptions is the first step to behavioral change (Mindrup et al., 2011; Spanierman et al., 2008).

Regardless of faculty intentions, without understanding their own biases and assumptions, the impact to SOC can be devastating and counterproductive to the efforts of the profession to increase racial diversity. When faculty are aware of how their biases and assumptions may negatively impact SOC, they are in a better position to recognize when it is happening and decrease these biases. This may decrease the occurrence of microaggressions, which are brief everyday exchanges in which marginalized individuals are denigrated whether intentional or not (Sue & Sue, 2013). One frequently occurring microaggression that SOC are often exposed to is the belief that SOC are intellectually inferior to White students, lack the ability to be successful, and should seek a field of study other than CSD (Ginsberg, 2018a). Microaggressions lead to stereotype threat, which is a disruptive psychological state that people experience when they feel at risk for confirming a negative stereotype associated with their social identity (Aronson et al., 2013). Many students who experience stereotype threat are not unmotivated or incapable of succeeding. Often, these are students who are deeply concerned about their success (Steele, 2010). Several studies have shown
that stereotype threat can negatively affect academic performance (Aronson et al., 2013; Fischer, 2010; Steele, 2010). To experience stereotype threat, students do not necessarily have to believe the negative stereotype about their group; they only need to be aware that faculty believe it (Fischer, 2010; Steele, 2010). Another source of stereotype threat for SOC is when faculty make a SOC a representative for the entire race, which creates discomfort and undue pressure on SOC (Ginsberg, 2018a).

Self-awareness of their own biases and assumptions may help instructors be effective in managing difficult conversations about racism. Additionally, faculty’s self-awareness could help to decrease the occurrence of microaggressions and the perpetuation of stereotype threat. This also allows instructors to be instrumental in providing support for SOC when they experience microaggressions, thereby increasing the trust of SOC. The Equitable Classroom Observation Checklist (Louisiana State Personnel Development Grant, 2011) is a checklist that can be used by faculty as a self-evaluation tool to increase awareness of their own level of culturally responsive teaching behaviors.

**Next steps: Beyond the classroom**

One of the many reasons cited for creating an anti-racist classroom is related to SOC trusting the faculty (Rudolph et al, 2015; Seward, 2014). Once trust is built through anti-racist practices and discussions in the classroom, SOC may begin to trust faculty in activities beyond the classroom such as student research and participation in student-faculty mentoring programs (Pulliam et al., 2019). Faculty can create opportunities to engage with and learn about SOC outside of the classroom (Ginsberg, 2018a; Ginsberg, 2018b; Knouse & Moody, 2013). For example, faculty can create safe spaces where students feel they can engage in dialogue about various topics (e.g., anti-racism, microaggressions, study skills, time management, faculty journey to success). These informal interactions establish rapport with SOC and cultivate a sense of community, which has a positive impact in psychosocial factors underlying academic performance (Phinney et al., 2011).

Faculty can have guest lectures from professionals of color in the community and provide additional avenues for SOC to see themselves as successful CSD professionals. Faculty can promote professional opportunities through local, state, and national organizations and help students identify financial resources that would help them to participate. For example, faculty may encourage SOC to participate in state and national student organizations as officers or student representatives. Additionally, faculty can encourage SOC to participate in summer research opportunities within their home university or at other institutions. Faculty may also introduce students to professional organizations and opportunities where one of the primary focuses is to increase racial diversity in the professions. These may include ASHA organizations such as The National Black Association for Speech, Language, Hearing, Asian Indian Caucus, Asian Pacific Islander Caucus, Haitian Caucus, Hispanic Caucus, Native American Caucus, Student to Empowered Professional Mentoring Program and Minority Student Leadership Program. Another way that faculty may show commitment to the success of SOC is by serving as advisors for campus organizations with specific missions that impact SOC (e.g., Latinx Caucus, African American Caucus).
Finally, deliberate and systematic mentoring impacts overall SOC retention rates and pursuit of CSD professions (Alcocer & Martinez, 2017; Bellon-Harn & Weinbaum, 2017). However, some White faculty may feel uncomfortable interacting with culturally diverse students in this way because they are insecure about their interactions with SOC (Marthers, 1999). Increasing trusting student-faculty relationships within the classroom may increase the opportunity and success of faculty-student mentoring relationships, with a focus on professional and/or research activities.

**Maximizing success through departmental initiatives.** The context and culture in which faculty work influence how they embed new initiatives in their student relationships and classrooms. Academic departments must support faculty as they adopt new practices to enhance the quality of the learning environment for SOC (Van Schalkwyk, 2015). An initial initiative is to develop departmental goals targeting anti-racism. Departments can utilize models for strategic planning that facilitate the development of goals and motivate specific, consistent strategies (Reeves, 2009). Strategic planning allows departments to develop a shared vision and coordinate all faculty members. Such coordination is critical in advancing social change and ensuring the burden of the work is not disproportionately assigned to faculty of color (Jayakumar et al., 2009). Anti-racist department goals can target the transformation of the classroom context. Flexibility is key to the development of goals and outcome measures so that all faculty can engage in strategies regardless of where they are in their professional learning related to anti-racist practices.

Another initiative is the use of educational committees that create dialogue about racial diversity and anti-racism among groups (Chun & Evans, 2018). For example, peer-teaching mentor groups among faculty may support creation of anti-racist classrooms and provide opportunities for related discussion. In another example, departments can utilize a multiple mentor model (Wright-Harp & Cole, 2008), which includes dialogue coordinated by both academic and clinical faculty for transforming other learning spaces. This type of initiative creates small groups of faculty members working together to build trust and discussing sensitive issues, such as managing classroom situations and conversations that do not go according to plan. Additionally, faculty members could select teaching goals and enlist guidance from other faculty members. For example, a faculty member who wants to develop a course reading list may find another has already engaged in similar work. Alternatively, a faculty member may wish to develop in-class group activities but want support on how to ensure equitable contribution across group members. A different instructor who has a history of utilizing these practices may serve as a resource. If training to create anti-racist classrooms is necessary, departmental leadership can allocate dedicated resources for training or advocate for training through their university’s centers for teaching and learning.

Often, efforts for diversity are not formally recognized or rewarded. As such, department leadership should employ reward strategies that support, recognize, and reward faculty who actively engage in designated anti-racist work (Whitaker & Montgomery, 2014). Retention, as well as tenure and promotion guidelines, should reflect the importance of anti-racist work. This can be built into annual review and promotion processes. Faculty can be encouraged during their annual goal planning with departmental leadership to determine how it can be strategically integrated into their teaching. If a faculty member develops a goal related to anti-racism that requires substantive shifts in workload (e.g., re-alignment of all courses and content toward anti-racist practices), value of their initiative can be expressed through workload balance to ensure an equitable evaluation.
Additionally, departmental leadership should consider that initially, emphasizing anti-racism or diversity, equity, and inclusion in courses may lead to unpredictable student evaluations.

**Conclusion**

The question of whether the profession has done enough to decrease the disparity and promote anti-racist change remains. As faculty move toward classroom transformation and engage students beyond the walls of the classroom, departments must employ metrics to capture the change. This may be done within courses and across the curriculum using surveys of graduate and undergraduate students. Additionally, focus groups and interviews with SOC and White students to gain insight into departmental practices (See Appendix B for an example survey). Data regarding the number of SOC students retained and attending graduate programs may be helpful. Other data, such as the number of students seeking faculty for professional or research mentorship and the number of students engaged in leadership opportunities beyond the classroom, may provide clear documentation. Nevertheless, faculty are the beginning point for the change that needs to happen. Faculty engagement in the classroom should provide the foundation for change in other anti-racist programming, including recruitment, admissions, retention, and clinical instruction.
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Appendix A

Expectations and Ground Rules for Class Discussions

- Treat each other respectfully and maintain confidentiality on any personal issues or opinions shared during class.
- During class discussions, try to speak from your own experiences and perspectives and not on behalf of others or the group.
- Listen to hear and better understand the experiences and perspectives of others, not to judge or to respond. Avoid personal attacks on someone else’s beliefs and values.
- Avoid revising, advising, or correcting statements made by others.
- Respectfully ask any questions and make comments in class that will help you better understand the material. If you are uncomfortable doing this in class, send me an email, or come see me in my office.
- Stay engaged. It’s okay to feel frustrated, but don’t drop out.
- Try to find opportunities to participate in the discussion.
- If something is said that hurts or offends you, acknowledge that the comment (not the person) hurt your feelings and explain why.
- It is okay to have diverging opinions on controversial topics, but always respond critically and analytically to the literature and readings assigned to the course.
- Please monitor your body language and nonverbal responses, as they may convey disrespect in the same manner that words can.

Appendix B  
Student Survey

Students would respond with agree or disagree and are also given the opportunity to provide additional comments.

- This department shows that racial/ethnic diversity is important through its actions.
- This department is committed to racial/ethnic diversity.
- This department respects individuals from different races and values their differences.
- This department is making progress with anti-racist initiatives.
- Students who are not white are treated fairly in this department.
- In this department faculty and staff appreciate students whose race/ethnicity is different from their own.
- I have personally witnessed racial discrimination in this department.
- I have been the victim of racial discrimination in this department.
- My experiences with this department have led me to become more understanding of racial/ethnic differences.
- Getting to know students with racial/ethnic backgrounds different from my own has been easy in this department.
- The department’s policies or procedures discourage racial discrimination.
- I believe the department will take appropriate action in response to incidents of racial discrimination.
- Racial and/or ethnic jokes or negative comments are not tolerated in this department.
- This department provides an environment for the free and open expression of ideas, opinions and beliefs.
- My experiences with faculty and staff show they are committed to and support anti-racism.
- This department has done a good job providing programs that promote anti-racist practices and behaviors.
- In group activities, I feel respected and listened to by my peers.
- In informal social networking, I feel included by my peers.
- My peers isolate me from groups due to my race.
- My experience with peers shows they are committed to and support anti-racist initiatives.