Creating, Implementing, and Deploying a Diversity and Inclusion Style Guide
A Review of One Editor's Process at a Texas University and Strategies for Buy-In at your Institution

Jeanna Balreira, Texas Tech University, jeanna.balreira@ttu.edu

Abstract: This article focuses on the process of creating, implementing, and seeking buy-in for Trinity University's Diversity and Inclusion Communication Guide. This process a) authentically addresses sensitive topics, and b) "lives and breathes" in line with an editorial style guide that is "always in progress." Ideally, the guide and the article together provide insight into the research, creation, and deployment process I undertook, highlighting the strategies I employed for institutional buy-in. Hopefully, this work can also help technical communicators develop similar guides and deployment strategies for their institutions or organizations.

Keywords: style guide, communication guide, diversity communication, institutional buy-in, co-creation. co-editing

ORCID ID: 0009-0003-8642-1040

Author Bio: Jeanna Balreira is a strategic communications leader, researcher, and doctoral student at Texas Tech University focused on authenticity and trust in public-facing institutional narratives. Her work bridges education, philanthropy, and technical communication. She wrote this report while serving as Assistant Vice President and a first-year writing instructor at Trinity University.

Introduction

In March 2017, the Associated Press (AP) amended its style guide to accept the singular "they" (and all of its forms) as a gender-neutral pronoun. From a marketing communications perspective, it was a chance to put change into action. Trinity University, a small and private liberal arts institution in San Antonio, Texas, had long had members of its community using they/them pronouns with which to identify. But Trinity, which has used the AP Style Guide as the foundation for its own editorial style guide since the 1980s, had not yet created guidelines for non-binary pronouns or their use in marketing and communications. Thus, with AP Style's change, Trinity University realized its need for a change, too[1].

Upholding Trinity's value of intentional inclusion can look and sound like infinitely many things, but for me, the assistant vice president in the university's office of strategic communications and marketing, it meant aligning language practices with broader institutional goals around diversity, inclusion, and belonging. So, in 2018, I undertook the creation of a Diversity and Inclusion Communication Guide for Trinity. Seeing a gap between the university's value of intentional inclusion[2] and the way the university codified this value in its content creation, I embarked on a collaborative effort across multiple departments and programs to create a set of guidelines to address core values of diversity and inclusion in editorial style. I would aim for this style guide to ensure that all university communicators contribute to intentional inclusion through their content creation.

I knew early on this could not solely be a product owned by the university strategic communications office; instead, it needed universal (and inclusive) advocacy and guidance from student affairs, academic affairs, enrollment, alumni relations, and more. I began my process by seeking input from across campus to:

1. **research** best practices to ensure sound and accurate content;
2. **conceptualize** a framework for establishing, creating, and maintaining a usable and accessible document;
3. **collaborate** with subject matter experts and campus users to hear as many voices as possible; and
4. **deploy** the guide as a living document with institutional buy-in.

Surprisingly, getting from research through to collaboration was the easy part. There was a general desire for this type of language guide from the campus departments that create the majority of the institution's internal and external communications. The biggest challenge came with deployment: This document, pulled together by an empathetic group of advocates and volunteers, needs regular, consistent maintenance — something not written into any one of those

---

[1] Since the March 2017 addition from AP Style and the 2018–19 undertaking of Trinity's style guide creation, AP Style has adopted several other related changes to its guide book, including the 2020 decisions to capitalize "B" in Black and the "P" in "Pride;" and the 2021 decision to add "Q" and a "+" to the LGBTQ+ acronym. As of the time of writing this article, the AP Style Guide still does not recognize Latinx as an acceptable noun or adjective to describe a person from, or whose ancestors were from, a Spanish-speaking land or culture or from Latin America.
[2] Trinity University Mission and Values: www.trinity.edu/about/mission-values

volunteers' job descriptions. The guide's deployment as a living document meant advocating for dedicated time and resources from university staff to keep it up-to-date.

Here's how Trinity University did it, and how I hope you can find the opportunity at your institution to do it, too.

Research: Literature and Peer Review

Research in modern newsrooms and journalism classrooms shows a desire for inclusive language and understanding of the relevance of inclusivity issues. At the same time, content creators are unsure of the roles they play in the generation or editing of this language and the roles their organizations play in standardizing language practices (Bodinger-de Uriarte & Valgeirsson, 2015). The advent of "people first" language and its alignment with political correctness further complicated writers' adoption of language intended to be rooted in equity and inclusion (Halmari, 2011).

Role definition in content creation is not new. The institutional style guide has, for decades, been a crucial tool for content creators to make content and communication decisions rooted in consistency, alignment, and organizational standards and values (Washington, 1993). Writers implement stylistic decisions according to their institution's style guide, and editors embody principles of the guide when finalizing reader-ready content.

In addition, style guides have long been associated with saving an organization time and money (Allen, 1995; Bright, 2005; Washington, 1993). Allen's 1996 survey on "User Attitudes Toward Corporate Style Guides" suggested economic benefit as a driving factor for the creation of organizational style guides. Yet Allen admits questions remained about the usage of style guides by members of organizations other than employees, and about who in the organizational community should contribute to a guide's creation and implementation.

Through the *Diversity Style Guide*, Rachele Kanigel offers this role clarity. Kanigel claims that while no one person or organization can determine the correct usage of one word, a collective understanding of the context, nuance, and rhetorical situation of specific language usage can be beneficial for writers and their organizations to adopt and to share broadly (Kanigel, 2019). For content creators mindful of the delicate dynamics when writing about people, communities, and experiences different from their own, style guides (such as Kanigel's own) can provide a baseline for language choice guided by cultural, political, and linguistic meanings.

But what happens when your baseline is, well, basic? While AP Style provides connotative definitions and rules for grammatical usage of inclusive terminology, it does not give guidance on how to employ situational sensitivity to topics, subjects, and issues that may benefit from a contextual approach. Not wanting to uproot Trinity's entire editorial guideline system, I sought instead to evaluate the addition of a style guide to the institution's existing set. Supplemental style guides can be used as additional resources when base or foundational guides are lacking information or are in conflict with community guidance (Durazzi, 2022) — and community-authored guides can mitigate this potential conflict. So, I stepped in and asked: Could the Trinity University community build a diversity and inclusion style guide, *together*?

Not one to enjoy starting with a "blank slate" — and one who quite enjoys giving credit where credit is due — I first explored Trinity's possibilities through examples given to me by campus partners who had used or reviewed similar documents: Brown University's [Diversity & Inclusion Toolkit](), a living document (and one with noticeable changes from my initial consultation in 2018 and my revisit for this article in 2023) from a private institution; and California State University's (CSU) [Diversity/Inclusivity Style Guide]() (called the Diversity Style Guide in 2019), a living artifact from a large public institution. And while the documents from Brown and CSU differ greatly, both contributed significantly to what would become my developmental and organizational approaches.

Brown's Diversity & Inclusion Toolkit is rooted in Brown's institutional goals and objectives[3]. The Toolkit boasts "guidelines for demonstrating an understanding of compliance, cultural awareness, respect for differences, and coaching for positive change towards inclusive practices for all identities" — all guidelines outside the traditional confines of an institutional style guide.

Organized around these guidelines, Brown outlines the "why" behind the guidelines and the effect those guidelines will have on their university community when properly implemented. The document contains anchor links to guideline headers but features no table of contents or section summaries; it reads more like a practice to be understood as a whole, rather than a document to revisit. Furthermore, Brown provides one-click access in the page's main navigation to request a consultation or training on these guidelines. With this structure, Brown emphasizes the role of the community members in ***why*** they should adopt and practice these guidelines. (Plus, the guidelines won't be very useful to the university if its community can't [or won't] use them!)

On the other hand, the first thing one might notice about CSU's Diversity/Inclusivity Style Guide is the in-text table of contents. CSU notes they base many of their editorial decisions on the AP Style Guide, the same guide Trinity University references as well. When CSU disagrees with AP Style, or notes that other terminology is inappropriate or outdated, their Guide uses a "Terms to Avoid" section within each subheader to indicate language that may broach dangerous or stereotypical usage. Additionally, CSU displays an "updated on" date for each section, clearly notifying users that the Guide may likely have been edited since the user's last interaction. Any user accessing this guide — once, twice, or frequently — is able to quickly find out ***how*** to communicate with diversity and inclusivity at the forefront.

Combining these two approaches — the "why" of Brown University and the "how" of CSU — felt like the best bet for Trinity's guide: A tight-knit community of creative and curious individuals, Trinity students, faculty, and staff are just as apt to ask "why" before they ask "how," or to find out "how" to help them understand "why."

Concurrently to digging into Brown's and CSU's guides, I reviewed sources cited by those guides as well as other respected resources. I focused on nonprofit and media organizations with targeted input on topics such as race/ethnicity, LGBTQ and gender inclusivity, accessibility and disability rights, socioeconomic factors in higher education, and more. While each organization

---

[3] Brown University's Diversity & Inclusion Toolkit is a result of the university's Diversity and Inclusion Action plan, section "Resources and Training." https://diap.brown.edu/

or resource wasn't necessarily tooled for the higher education space, I was able to both compare and contrast ways in which these reputable organizations communicated sensitive topics.

Organization	Guide	Relevant Material for Project
Consortium of Higher Education	Suggested Best Practices for Asking Sexual Orientation and Gender on College Applications	Best practices emphasize using language that respects individual identity, offers inclusive response options for data collection, and ensures privacy and confidentiality.
Center for Integration and Improvement of Journalism, San Francisco State University	The Diversity Style Guide	This online resource and book helps content creators write about diverse communities with respect, accuracy, and sensitivity. While the guide provides more than 500 terms and their definitions, Trinity's guide limited the number of terms in favor of explaining best practices.
GLAAD	GLAAD Media Reference Guide	Instructions on fair, accurate, and inclusive coverage of the LGBTQ+ community. Both guides outline common missteps and stereotypes while highlighting the importance of pronoun usage and individual identity.
Association of LGBTQ+ Journalists (NLGJA)	Tip Sheets on LGBT Coverage	
Anastacia Kurylo (editor)	*Inter/Cultural Communication*	Exploration of specific complexities of intercultural communication to gain a better understanding of cultural communication frameworks.
National Center on Disability and Journalism (NCDJ)	Language Style Guide	Best practices for writing about people with disabilities, with tips for person-first language and ability representation. Both guides also provided important clarification on using outdated or stigmatizing terms.
National Disability Rights Network	Reporting and Writing About Disabilities	
United Nations	Gender Inclusive Language Guidelines	Trinity used this guide specifically to inform communication that fosters inclusivity in international and multicultural settings.

Of course, maintaining a living document also means staying intentionally updated with current research and conversation. This ideal resonated especially true when, in 2022, Trinity University received a Carnegie reclassification as a baccalaureate liberal arts and sciences institution. This

shifted Trinity from being a regional institution to being classified among national liberal arts colleges.

Continued research, then, included finding and reviewing inclusive language style guides from peer and aspirant institutions with the same Carnegie classification. Over time, this proved easier said than done: a search across the websites of peer and aspirant colleges[4] revealed less than a dozen inclusive language style guides; half of these had inclusive language guidelines woven into their existing editorial guides. Of the guides remaining, I opted to research and review the University of Richmond's Inclusive Language Guide, and Dickinson College's Inclusive Language Style Guide. These two guides cite many of the same reputable sources that Trinity's does; they also cover broad topics related to diversity and inclusion.

Conceptualize: **Creating by Community**

I have more than a decade of experience of "creating by committee," and can speak more often to the failures than the successes. To embark on an experience, instead, of "creating by community," I recognized the following as must-haves for the project:

1. *Trinity must be aligned to a common goal with a decided output.*

Along with my colleagues, I identified this common goal as seeking and codifying community contributions to communicating effectively about diverse and inclusive subjects, topics, and themes. Our decided output was a supplemental style and communication guide that would allow all members of the Trinity community to make content and communication decisions that uphold consistency, values, and foundational editorial style. Creating this guide as a living document meant communication could be crafted with creativity and flexibility as needed (Wieringa, 1996). And when "passions run strongest on the smallest issues?" Creators should ask themselves what matters the most to the reader or to the listener, and base decisions in the receiver's best interest (McKay, 1997). Mark Bright (2005) backs this up by attesting that style guide authors and editors must take into account the effect that each entry in the style guide has on the organization, and that fair and effective implementation comes with an ownership of the decision-making process.

2. *Trinity must take advantage of dynamic media.*

For many scholars, a style guide *is* a living document — it has moved from the concept of a printed, static document to a dynamic, living system of vocabulary, communication tools, and community input (Adhya, 2015; Bright, 2005; Hart, 2000) designed to bring out the authentic voice of the institution. Navigating a living guide means finding specific information that is helpful in creating and disseminating identity and narrative. With the dawn of digital style guides at the turn of the century, Geoff Hart (2000) suggested that dynamic organizational style and communication guides should "encompass the tools your authors use to write, and integrate it within the processes your organization uses to produce its communication." A decade later, Esha Adhya (2015) showed that organizations themselves value a guide that is frequently and

---

[4] In 2022, Trinity University was ranked No. 55 on the National Liberal Arts Colleges list. Trinity considers colleges ranked 60–48 as peer institutions, and 48 and above as aspirant institutions.

transparently revised — especially when those revisions are relatively easy to spot or access in a digital format that is often revisited.

> 3. *Finally, Trinity must not shy away from sticky subjects.*

Diversity and inclusion conversations come with a wide array of experiences, opinions, and perspectives, all of which are welcome at the creative table. Yet these topics aren't easy; in fact, our community may hesitate to engage in discussion or debate out of fear more than it encourages engagement out of curiosity (Butts et al., 2014). It's the point of a guide like this in the first place: giving our community the words to communicate topics that our community or its agents may not have personal experience with.

Collaborate: **Power in the Program**

Document Design

Before the Diversity and Inclusion Communication Guide could become a living document, it had to become, well, *a* document. To create this document, I took Bright's 2005 recommendation to actually create a comprehensive style guide program. I began this process by seeking qualitative input from across campus about document creation, maintenance, usage, and re-usage. Synthesizing partners' input, I determined the guide must be a document that:

1. Campus will **use;**
2. Campus will **contribute** to; and
3. Campus can give honest, timely **feedback** on.

Here, I define campus as students, faculty, staff, families and any other members of the Trinity University community who may find themselves communicating with, on behalf of, or amongst each other. Too broad? This is intentional: Above all, the guide must serve as a representation of the respect given to every member of our community, recognizing our perspectives and backgrounds as vital to our commitment to thoughtful inquiry, respectful disagreement, and empathetic conversation. (Why the liberal arts are the safest space to have our own biases challenged is, alas, the theme of a different article entirely.)

Partner input suggested that accessibility be the top document requirement, and partners noted that the document would only be successful if it was something all campus members could access and use. Trinity is a Google campus, and students and employees are familiar with navigating the institution's Google Drive systems and website for tools and resources. Because this system incorporates best practices with accessibility (Adhya, 2015) and user experience with a living-document interface tested by experts, developing a Google Doc quickly emerged as the best option for the style guide program. Updates can be made in real time (Goal 2), a history of updates can be kept by the system (Goals 2 & 3), and comments with feedback or changes can be made to the document directly (Goal 3).

None of these options were available with other formats I considered. A static digital document format, such as a PDF, would require strict versioning and potentially lead to outdated

downloaded copies living locally on campus machines. In addition, only a handful of Trinity employees are trained to use Acrobat to its fullest. A website, while dynamic, would require version control currently available to less than a dozen staff members, with no option for drafting or commenting. All comments and changes must be sent via email to the campus's web editors, and none of these comments or changes would be transparent outside of email until changes were written into a new, published version of the site.

Additionally, I vowed to not place the guide behind a login or on our campus portal; I wanted anyone in the world searching for a DEI communication guide to be able to find it, share it, and even borrow it for their institution (the more folks who use inclusive language at their institutions, the better we'll all be for it).

Creators, Editors, and Users

With the living document concept and system established for this style guide program, I turned my focus to community support. First, I identified two groups of people on campus who could help develop the guide into a comprehensive document from myriad perspectives. I gave these groups names common to agile technical frameworks to empower them within our communications team:

- **Power Users**, the advanced users of the guide's software and systems; and
- **Power Editors**, the contributors with administrative and situational expertise.

Power Users were the "frequent flyers" who would access the document again and again:

- communications and marketing staff in the offices of admissions, alumni, athletics, and career services;
- students engaged in DEI and community service work; and
- faculty frequently called on as media experts in DEI communications.

I charged this small group (over the year the guide was being developed, this was between 9 and 12 people) of Power Users to use the document, to provide feedback and recommendations on content, structure, and usability; and to contribute to content from the lenses of their expertise.

My **Power Editors** were those who were most likely to make comments or suggestions based on current demographic climates, to keep the document truly "living":

- the director for Student Diversity and Inclusion (now called the director for Student Inclusion and Belonging);
- the president's special adviser for Inclusive Excellence;
- student leaders of campus cultural organizations;
- the university chaplain; and
- select members of Trinity's Roots Commission, a group of faculty and students examining racism and injustice in the University's history.

I charged the Power Editors with keeping me informed about changes to cultural zeitgeists and national and academic conversations — shifting language, outdated terminology, and reimagined communication practices.

Additionally, I created an online platform through Google Docs for the Power Users and the Power Editors to be in direct dialogue with one another throughout the program. If Power Users or Power Editors disagreed with comments or suggestions, each was given a chance to share their own thoughts before the change was implemented (or not). Healthy disagreement meant deeper conversation around the substance and structure, ultimately leading to a more thorough and thoughtful document and feedback process. (More on this in the last section, "Living What We Learn.")

Awareness Across Campus

To share the guide with the Trinity campus, I developed a communication plan to distribute the document through internal communication platforms. I also drafted a maintenance schedule to remind existing community members about (and introduce new ones to) the guide on a biannual basis (Adhya, 2015). These communications include information on:

1. Where to find the guide (on Trinity's website and searching in Google Drive);
2. How to contribute to the guide via comments or feedback; and
3. Who to contact for questions about the guide or requests for training.

Additionally, I check in twice a year with the Power Users and Power Editors to ask for feedback or talking points, rather than relying on them to remember to submit it.

Deploy: Developing Strategies for Institutional Buy-In

For Trinity University's Diversity and Inclusion Communication Guide, institutional buy-in didn't just mean getting our community to access and adopt the guidelines. It also meant advocating for the time and space it takes to keep a living document alive — the continued research, collaboration, and maintenance. This two-fold charge meant evincing a commitment to the university's value of intentional inclusion and to the empathy and engagement called for within that value; and to develop a lean maintenance system where the cost of frequent, small, distributed maintenance outweighs the cost of one or two large maintenance efforts by one owner.

Here's where the acknowledgement of my own privilege comes in: As a campus leader overseeing policies and guidelines for university communications, the buy-in I needed personally was a nod from my vice president to tackle development and commit to upkeep. I got that nod and was off to the races. For others, this buy-in is more of an uphill battle — if one you're legally[5] allowed to wage at all.

---

[5] Texas Tribune: "Texas lawmakers find consensus on bill banning diversity, equity and inclusion offices in public universities" https://www.texastribune.org/2023/05/27/texas-university-diversity-equity-inclusion-dei-bill-conference/

While DEI efforts and federal and state legislation continue to butt heads in higher education, some might push the concept of this style guide aside. I challenge, however, that higher education needs this work now more than ever in order to uphold its commitment to student and employee support. Should you feel a call to this challenge, I offer three strategies for seeking buy-in at your institution, especially at this critical time in our state and national conversations:

1. Get buy-in from institutional leadership
2. Get buy-in from your organization's community
3. Leverage existing style guide materials

Get Buy-in From Institutional Leadership

First, identify leaders at your institution who support DEI work. *Hint*: These aren't always going to be people with "DEI" in their titles. Maybe they're advocates in Human Resources or within Student Success offices; maybe they're staff or faculty who work tangentially to support your work; or maybe they're individuals who have been advocates for change and justice around issues in the past. (At my institution, I partnered with a vice president who advocated for implementing a staff parental leave policy for the first time at the university.)

Second, set a time and place to meet and discuss. Advocating for a guide like this isn't a "hallway conversation;" rather, it's a detailed discussion about the ins and outs of creation and maintenance. Do your research, and be upfront about what commitment looks like. Be prepared to come to the meeting with information about:

1. Cost of creation, and roles and responsibilities of the creator(s)
2. Cost of maintenance, and roles and responsibilities of the maintainers
3. Succession planning, should the guide need to be transferred from role to role within your organization
4. Resources needed from leadership, should you need this leader to serve as a vocal advocate, a behind-the-scenes advocate, a communicator, a connector, or any of the above.

Third, be prepared to have this conversation multiple times with multiple stakeholders. Often, buy-in from one leader isn't enough, and there's a chance you'll need to pitch this guide to others in your institution. Take your time and do your research to prepare presentations that address other leaders' roles in the institution, and take into account the creation, maintenance, planning, and resources needed from those leaders' teams.

Fourth, be willing to compromise — your project, not your position. Be open to feedback and mindful of the perspectives leaders bring to the project. Can you work in additional or different ideas? Can you work through sticky places together? Taking a collaborative approach to develop your final project will likely lead to broader adoption within your organization.

Get Buy-in From Your Organization's Community

Just as important as buy-in from the top, buy-in from the community may more quickly lead to adoption and advocacy.

First, make an open call for support. Find ways in your community to share that you're tackling this effort, ask others if they'd like to join you, and make a list of those who have said "Yes![6]"

Second, ensure your community knows their roles and responsibilities. Because "join" may mean different things to different people, work with your supporters to understand:

1. How would you like to support? Consider offering responsibilities such as listening, contributing, and editing.
2. How often would you like to support? Help your supporters commit to a regular schedule that works with their existing commitments and their role on the project.
3. What gifts and talents do you bring to the project? For some, this may include research, perspective, and background on specific topics. For others, this may include providing boots-on-the-ground perspectives from those less comfortable speaking up.
4. For how long would you like to commit to the project? Some may want to commit to short-term support in getting the project off the ground. Others may seek a more long-term commitment that lends to maintenance efforts.

Identifying roles and responsibilities, along with a timeline for these responsibilities, ensures supporters a clear lens into the project, helping them assess their capacity and capability for continued commitment. For Trinity University, the "Power User" and "Power Editor" model worked well to distinguish those whose responsibility it is to provide feedback to the guide, and those whose responsibility it is to research that feedback and create edits.

Leverage Existing Style Guide Materials

For those at institutions who cannot legally create or maintain a style guide specific to diversity and inclusion, seek ways to include guidelines within existing materials. Many organizations have existing editorial style guides or communication guides, and these guides are often based upon a nationally recognized style guide as a foundation (Trinity bases its editorial style guide on AP Style; others may include the Chicago Manual of Style or APA Style). How can these existing materials be edited to include the body of work that might normally be separated out as a diversity and inclusion communication guide?

First, seek entry points in existing materials. Are there places where your institution's guide already provides basic information about style choices related to race, class, gender, religion, etc.? These could be ideal entry points for more descriptive guidelines around these topics, made as carefully crafted edits.

---

[6] Future-you may want to also make a list of dissenters. Their perspectives may offer important ways of viewing your project, or open your eyes to challenges or obstacles you may not have foreseen.

Second, seek entry points in foundational materials. Are there places where a foundational guide, such as AP or APA Style, directly address guidelines you'd like to make sure are present within your institution's guide? If so:

1. Take wording (even verbatim) from your institution's foundational guide and place it intentionally in your existing guide. This ensures users of your existing guide will not need to access the foundational guide in order to access the specific guidelines you want to make sure are present.
2. Use foundational guidelines as anchors with which to dive deeper into your institution's perspective. Carefully craft and attach details or specifics to foundational language.

Third, consider a process of transforming your standard style guidelines into living guidelines. As foundational style guides change (most are updated annually), so should your existing institutional style guide. Pay close attention to the ways foundational guides shift around topics in the national conversation, and use these shifts to shift your own. If possible, develop and implement a review process in line with the release of annual updates to foundational style guides, and advocate for resources to best work these updates directly into your institutional guide.

In Conclusion: Living What We Learn

It's one thing to complete a massive project like this; it's another to maintain it with a regular cadence in a meaningful way. By the time the Trinity University Diversity and Inclusion Communication Guide was completed in its first form, it was obvious that, unless it was actively maintained and constantly advocated for, the guide would become another piece of digital dead weight in our guideline system. In summary? If you're in it, be in it for the long haul.

Since its launch in April 2019, Trinity University has made significant changes[7] to the guide nine times, including its most recent and major addition: a new section on religious identity and spiritual practice. These updates have included 13 additions or revisions suggested by Power Editors, and 2 updates from Power Users. And these changes were only possible with the support of a team of technical communicators and community members working in tandem.

More than four years later, I hope what I learned at Trinity can help you implement a guide like this at your organization. Work for it, and make it work:

- **Listen to your institution.** Find your supporters, include their perspectives, and form a community committed to change.
- **Listen to the national conversation.** There's no time like the present to listen, and there's no time like the immediate future to speak back. When the conversation shifts, shift with it. Use sincere empathy and passionate creativity to implement change.

---

[7] Perhaps the most significant chance: Since this experience report was written, the guide has been updated and renamed as the university's Community and Belonging Communication Guide to better comply with institutional priorities. In addition, the section on religion and spirituality was expanded along with several smaller edits. These updates reflect the University's commitment to the document being living guideline, and to the importance of continuing to listen to campus communities after a resource is published.

Future Research: Coalitions for Change

After three full academic years of the Diversity and Inclusion Communication Guide in regular use by Trinity's communities, I have pinpointed a growth area that deserves further research, testing, and possible implementation: regular maintenance despite staff turnover. While Power Users and Power Editors continue to play crucial roles in the maintenance process, these sets of community members were initially built for specific *people* (individuals who were vocal advocates and supporters of the program), not for specific *roles*. Further research — specifically *Technical Communication After the Social Justice Turn: Building Coalitions for Action* by Rebecca Walton, Kristen Moore, and Natasha Jones (2023) — may prompt additional questions about maintaining these *groups* while also maintaining the style guide program as a whole. There is potential for role-based coalitions that bring together people in roles which demand diverse perspectives. This may aid in prioritizing collective buy-in, promoting accountability, and empowering voices the campus may not typically hear from, further addressing roots of systemic inequities. A coalition framework may also increase the likelihood of organizational alignment around the importance of role-based feedback and maintenance, from administration through to faculty, staff, and students.

References

Adhya, E. (2015). Key elements of an effective style guide in the new age. *Technical Communication*, *62*(3), 183–92. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26464421

Allen, P. R. (1995). Save money with a corporate style guide. *Technical Communication*, *42*(2), 284–89. https://www.jstor.org/stable/43087898

Allen, P. R. (1996). User attitudes toward corporate style guides: A survey. *Technical Communication*, *43*(3), 237–43. https://www.jstor.org/stable/43088063

Bodinger-de Uriarte, C., & Valgeirsson, G. (2015). Institutional disconnects as obstacles to diversity in journalism in the United States. *Journalism Practice*, *9*(3), 399–417. https://doi.org/10.1080/17512786.2014.963367

Bright, M. R. (2005). Creating, implementing, and maintaining corporate style guides in an age of technology. *Technical Communication*, *52*(1), 42–51. https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A129165919/AONE?u=anon~22a6439&sid=googleScholar&xid=962aeed1

Butts, C. C., Parks, K. M., Daniels, L. F., & Sanz, E. (2014). Inclusion in higher education: A case study. In M. Snider (Ed.), *Cultural Diversity* (pp. 69–79). Nova Science Publishers.

Durazzi, A. (2022). Extended abstract: The case for supplemental style guides. In *2022 IEEE International Professional Communication Conference (ProComm)* (pp. 406–08). https://doi.org/10.1109/ProComm53155.2022.00081

Halmari, H. (2011). Political correctness, euphemism, and language change: The case of "people first." *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*(3), 828–40. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.09.016

Hart, G. J. (2000, March). The style guide is "dead": Long live the dynamic style guide! *Intercom*, 12–17. https://www.geoff-hart.com/articles/2000/dynamicstyle.htm

Kanigel, R. (2019). *The diversity style guide*. Wiley.

McKay, P. D. (1997). Establishing a corporate style guide: A bibliographic essay. *Technical Communication*, *44*(3), 244+. https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A20159547/AONE?u=anon~7bbb1f39&sid=googleScholar&xid=410b0848

Rude, C. D., & Eaton, A. (2011). *Technical editing* (5th ed.). Longman.

Washington, D. A. (1991). Developing a corporate style guide: Pitfalls and panaceas. *Technical Communication*, *38*(4), 553–55. https://www.jstor.org/stable/43095834

Washington, D. A. (1993). Creating the corporate style guide: Process and product. *Technical Communication*, *40*(3), 505–10. https://www.jstor.org/stable/43091035

Wieringa, D. (1996). Developing a style guide in the real world. In *Proceedings of the 43rd Society for Technical Communication Annual Conference* (pp. 530–32). *Society for Technical Communication*.