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The 2003 CIC Diversity Forum, held April 6-8, 2003 on the campus of the University of Illinois, Urbana/Champaign, was an opportunity for over 80 colleagues from the CIC institutions to renew their commitment to the changing world of higher education. Visitors and guests were welcomed to the campus with a tour of the Spurlock Museum of World Culture, and a keynote address sparked with enthusiasm and vigor by Dr. Nancy Cantor, Chancellor of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, as she addressed the urgency of race relations in America. Laying out the critical interests of America today, Dr. Cantor spoke to the need to create “tolerant, cohesive, multiracial society,” “creating the social mobility that can close existing racial disparities in income, health, and employment,” and “training a diverse group of leaders prepared to think critically and productively in a complex world.”

Some of the highlights of the conference included a Provosts’ Panel on Diversity, with Richard Herman, Provost of The University of Illinois, Urbana/Champaign, and Rod Erickson, Executive Vice-President and Provost of Pennsylvania State University; concurrent conference sessions which addressed the issues of faculty retention, salary equity, the current climate for international students, recruitment and retention of underrepresented graduate students, and responses to the issues of racism; a specially commissioned theatre performance by the University of Michigan’s Center for Research on Learning and Teaching (CRLT), under the direction of Jeffrey Steiger; and “Best Practices Information Exchange,” where institutions showcased their successes in programs and initiatives that address diversity. And conference goers had the opportunity to hear from students in varying fields on their perspective and experiences of diversity and the campus community.

Coordinated in a joint effort by the CIC and the Chancellor’s Office of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the 2003 CIC Diversity Forum took a close look at current issues affecting our campuses, and sought to create channels and bridges of support. Monica Fortune, Program Coordinator for Graduate Multicultural Collaboration for the CIC said, “The 2003 CIC Diversity Forum inspired and challenged us to continue our commitment to diversity with all the resources and opportunities afford us. We have come quite far, but we still have a long way to go. Working together, we can do more. It is one of the rich benefits of the consortium.”
LESSONS LEARNED: WHAT WORKS AND WHAT HURTS

Nancy Cantor, Chancellor, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Spurlock Museum
7 p.m., April 6, 2003

In *Brown v Board of Education* and in *Regents of the University of California v Bakke*, the Supreme Court held that the nation has a compelling interest in ending segregation and in creating an integrated society of learners. *Bakke* laid out the principles for the narrow tailoring of acceptable affirmative action programs.

Both Supreme Court cases told stories specifically and powerfully about race in America, arguing not only for bringing individuals of color to the table—that is, for “affirmative access,” as President Bush calls it—but also for bringing race in America to the table in order to create a truly integrated society of learners.

Chief Justice Warren wrote in *Brown* that separating black schoolchildren “from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone.” In taking note of these images and feelings, the *Brown* decision gave us the task of building a positive story of race in America; a story in which integration is the venue for building opportunity and social mobility – that is, access to the American dream – for all Americans.

*Bakke* closed the *Brown* circle 14 years later by focusing on the compelling governmental interest in achieving diversity in higher education, viewing this as an opportunity for Americans to live and work in an integrated community of scholars. Students who could live and learn together across “the color line” could continue this way of life in communities and workplaces across the nation.

Citing the Court’s decision in the 1967 case, *Keyishian v Board of Regents*, Justice Powell wrote “it is not too much to say that the ‘nation’s future depends upon leaders trained through wide exposure’ to the ideas and mores of students as diverse as this Nation of many peoples.” (*Bakke*, 438 U.S., Powell, IV, D)

In arguing for the right to select those students who would contribute the most to the ‘robust exchange of ideas,’ Justice Powell wrote, the University of California was seeking “a goal that is of paramount importance in the fulfillment of its mission.” (*ibid.*)

In both *Brown* and *Bakke*, intelligence and excellence are seen from a fundamentally social perspective—namely, that education and achievement are socially shared activities that depend in large part on the quality and effectiveness of the mix of people and ideas in the environment. It is an insight that offers us, as educators, enormous possibilities.

These decisions set the stage for institutions in higher education, the military, and the corporate world to pursue not only “affirmative access” but also “affirmative integration.”
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It is absolutely critical that higher education take on both the task outlined in Brown – that is, to use integration to ensure opportunity for all Americans – and the task outlined in Bakke – that is, to use educational opportunity to ensure integration in American society.

There are few types of “institutions” in American society, short of the military, that can simultaneously address three critical tasks of compelling national interest today:

- Creating the social mobility that can close existing racial disparities in income, health, and employment
- Training a diverse group of leaders prepared to think critically and productively in a complex world; and
- Paving the way for a tolerant, empathetic, cohesive multiracial democracy.

These tasks are urgent. We need to generate a new story of race and race relations in America, a story based on the ability of all its citizens to live and work together.

The Historical and Precipitating Contexts of Segregation

Just 35 years ago, in March, 1968, a month before the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., was assassinated, a commission chaired by Governor Otto Kerner of Illinois examined racial disturbances in a single summer in 150 American cities and concluded, “Our nation is moving toward two societies, one black, one white —separate and unequal. Discrimination and segregation have long permeated much of American life; they now threaten the future of every American.” (Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, Bantam Books, p. 1)

The commission found that

- 31% of nonwhite families of two or more were living in poverty, compared to 9 percent of whites. (Ibid., p. 259)
- While 27% of whites held professional, technical, or managerial jobs, only 9% of non-whites did. (Ibid., p. 254)
- In 1960, housing in 207 American cities was so segregated that, to integrate them, 86% of all black families would have had to move. (Ibid., p.p. 246-247.)

That was the situation at home. In Vietnam, African-American enlisted men found themselves serving under an officer corps that was only 1.6 percent black at the beginning of the war and 3 percent black at the end. (Grutter, Consolidated Amicus brief of Lt. Gen. Julius W. Becton Jr., et al), pp. 11, 17)

By 1973, according to an amicus brief filed in the University of Michigan case by former Generals and Admirals, the military recognized that its race problem was “so critical that it was on the verge of self-destruction.” (Ibid., p. 16, citing C. Moskos & J. Butler, All That We Can Be: Black Leadership and Racial Integration the Army Way (1966))

At home and abroad, America was not profiting from the talents of all Americans, nor were Americans living and working together in harmony across the lines of color. Neither productivity nor security was ensured.
Why We Still Need to Pursue the Integration Project

What is our situation now, and why do we still need to work on access and on integration, as we were tasked to do in Brown and in Bakke?

Today, as we look at the faces of the soldiers who are fighting in Iraq, or as we look across our own campus, we see faces of every hue, and we may feel, rightly, a sense of pride at how far we have come in providing access.

At the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, where there were only 30 African-American cadets in 1968, (Grutter and Gratz, Consolidated Amicus brief of Lt. Gen. Julius W. Becton Jr., et. al., p. 19), with a successful affirmative action program, there are more than 300 today. (Ibid., p. 19) Minorities now make up 19% of the officer corps in the armed forces generally—and 8.8% of all officers are African-Americans. (Ibid., p. 17) Similar, although not dramatic, progress has been made in diversifying university classes and government offices.

But we have still not come very far at all in eradicating racial disparities in vital areas of life: employment, health, housing, education, and the criminal justice system. (Before considering these race disparities, let me make a general statement about data by racial groupings—although many of the national databases from which I will draw examples, focus on African-Americans or Latinos, there are numerous individual studies that report clear disparities between the educational, health, and employment status of Native Americans and whites. Further, though Asian-Americans are frequently found not to suffer as clearly from disparate opportunities and treatment as are Blacks, Latinos or Native Americans, there is increasing evidence of such gaps when the data for Asian-Americans are disaggregated by nation of origin or recency of immigration.)

Starting with perhaps the bleakest statistics, analyses of the criminal justice system bring contemporary disadvantages, lack of opportunity, lack of hope, into sharp relief. In 1998 the Advisory Board to the President’s Initiative on Race reported that African Americans compose approximately 50 percent of the state and federal prison population—four times their proportion in society. (Advisory Board to the President’s Initiative on Race, One America in the 21st Century: Forging a New Future, Advisory, Sept. 18, 1998, cited by National Criminal Justice Assn., http://www.ncja.org/policies/minorities.html)

The proportion of Hispanics in state and federal prison doubled from 1980 to 1993, rising from 7.7 percent of all inmates to 14.3 percent. (Ibid., also Mauer, Marc and Hurling, Tracy, Young Black Americans and the Criminal Justice System: Five Years Later (1995), The Sentencing Project 9070 http://www.sentencingproject.org/policy/9070smy.pdf)

People of color have not fared well in the criminal justice system. According to a 1995 report by the Sentencing Project, for example, African Americans constituted 13% of all monthly drug users that year, but they represented 35% of the arrests for drug possession, 55% of the convictions, and 75% of the prison sentences. (Ibid)

Moving to employment, we see racial disparities on every rung of the job ladder.

In their comprehensive review of recent literature, Joseph G. Altonji and Rebecca Blank reported that Black and Hispanic men earned about two-thirds of what White men earned in 1999, and this was true across the employment spectrum. (Blank, Rebecca and Altonji, J. “Gender and Race in the Labor Market,” In Handbook of Labor Economics, Volume 3C. Edited by Orley C. Ashenfelter and David Card. New York, NY: Elsevier Science Press (1999), p. 3146, cited in Amicus brief filed by the AFL-CIO in Grutter.) Studies of census data show “systematic evidence of discriminatory differentials affecting the wages of black, Native American, and men of Hispanic origin.” (Darity, Guilkey, &

At the top of the corporate ladder, The Federal Glass Ceiling Commission found in 1995 that 97% of senior managers at Fortune 1000 industrial and Fortune 500 service companies were white, while 0.5% were Black and 0.4%, Hispanic. (*Ibid.*, p. 8, cited in *Amicus* brief filed by AFL-CIO in *Grutter and Gratz*.)

Controlled studies by the Urban Institute in the 1990s, using matched pairs of applicants for entry-level positions, showed that African American and Hispanic job applicants with the same qualifications as white applicants were three times as likely to be turned down. (William A. Darity Jr., and Patrick L. Mason, *Evidence on Discrimination in Employment: Codes of Color, Codes of Gender*, 12 *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 63 (1998), p. 78-79.)

Differential treatment is shockingly pervasive in the health care arena. A report last year from the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences found, and I quote, that “racial and ethnic minorities tend to receive a lower quality health care than non-minorities, even when access-related factors, such as patients’ insurance status and income, are controlled.” (Brian D. Smedley, Brian D.: Stith, Adrienne Y.; and Nelson, Alan R.; editors, *Committee on Understanding and Eliminating Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Health Care*, Board on Health Sciences Policy, Institute of Medicine, *Unequal Treatment: Confronting Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Health Care*, Washington: The National Academies Press (2002), p. 1.)

The Institute’s report cited studies of treatment and patient outcomes which conclude that,

- Even when variations in such factors as insurance status, income, age, physical conditions, and symptoms are taken into account, African Americans and Hispanics were less likely than whites to receive appropriate cardiac medication or to undergo coronary artery bypass surgery. (*Ibid.*, p. 43.)
- African Americans and Hispanics with bone fractures were less likely than whites to receive pain medicine when they are seen in hospital emergency rooms. (*Ibid.*, p. 65)
- African American patients were 1.5 times more likely and Hispanics were 1.4 times more likely than whites to undergo amputation of their lower limbs instead of arterial reconstruction, even when conditions such as heart disease, behavioral risks such as smoking, and the geographical location of the hospital were similar. (*Ibid.*, p. 74)

The committee pointed to a study of clinical encounters conducted in the year 2000, in which researchers found that, even after patients’ income, education, and observable personal characteristics were taken into account, doctors rated black patients as less intelligent, less educated, more likely to abuse drugs and alcohol, more likely to fail to comply with medical advice, more likely to lack social support, and less likely to participate in cardiac rehabilitation than white patients. (*Ibid.*, p. 11.)

Clearly, we have not reversed the haunting patterns of stereotyping and prejudice that feed unequal treatment in American life and block access for people of color to the American dream. Nor, apparently, have we learned to live together.

In the years since the Kerner Commission, we have seen remarkable gains in the status and income of black professionals. But, as the sociologists Douglas Massey and Nancy Denton found in a survey of 30 metropolitan areas, no matter how much these black professionals earn, they still do not live in...
Our nation’s housing is segregated at all income levels. (Sugrue, Thomas J., *Expert Report of Thomas J. Sugue*, in *Gratz* and *Grutter*, Section VIII)

As Tom Sugrue testified: Residential segregation means that whites and nonwhites seldom talk across the fence, attend each other’s birthday parties, or engage in the social interactions that are the basis of friendships and community. (Ibid., Section VIII)

Segregation in our public schools, after dropping precipitously, continues to grow. A report from the Civil Rights Project at Harvard shows the proportion of black students in majority white schools decreased by 13 percent in the 1990s, to a level lower than any year since 1968. (Frankenberg, Erica; Lee, Chungmei; and Oldfield, Gary, “A Multiracial Society with Segregated Schools: Are We Losing the Dream?” The Civil Rights Project, Harvard University (January, 2003), p. 6.

Whites are the most segregated group in our public schools, attending schools where, on average, 80 percent of the students are white. Latino students are the most segregated minority group and have the highest high school drop out rate. Asians are the most integrated when taken as an aggregate, although subgroups based on national origin show important differences.

Tracking within our public schools is also highly racialized, with African-Americans, Hispanics, and Native American students, as well as students from low socioeconomic backgrounds, well over-represented in lower level tracks and in poorly-resourced classrooms. (Lucas, Samuel Roundfield. 1999. *Tracking Inequality: Stratification and Mobility in American High Schools.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press)

Even as we have systematically dismantled legal barriers to access and to participation, we have done little to change the face (or color) of success in America, nor have we moved far towards integration as Justice Powell hoped.

**What Works: The Critical Role of Higher Education**

There is still an urgent need for justice and for change, a compelling moral, societal and “business” case to be made for pursuing both access and integration, and for doing that with a straightforward consciousness of how much is at stake. As Cornell West wrote in the epilogue to his volume *Race Matters*, “We simply cannot enter the twenty-first century at each other’s throats… we either hang together by combating these forces that divide and degrade us or we hang separately.” (West, Race Matters, Vintage, 1994)

Our demographics show clearly that our nation is becoming multiracial. Two years after *Bakke* was decided, the 1980 census showed that African-Americans, Native Americans, Asian Americans, and Hispanics constituted 20 percent of the nation’s population. Today, the minority student enrollment in U.S. public schools is approaching 40%. (Civil Rights Project, p. 1) What is not clear is how or if we will hang together.

“Integration,” as Dr. King once wrote, “is creative, and is therefore more profound and far reaching” than desegregation. Integration takes hard work, especially when we have little other than collective fear, stereotypes, and sins upon which to build. We have to get to know each other if we are to profit individually and collectively from our diverse talents.

Where, we must ask, can this happen? Sadly, as things stand today, not in our primary or secondary schools, not in our churches, mosques, and synagogues, not at our birthday parties and funerals.

We can only get to know each other in the places we meet as peers, be it on college campuses, in professional degree programs, or in military boot camps. And, higher education institutions are prepared,
along with the military, to be the facilitators and the teachers. (see amicus briefs filed in Gratz and Grutter by higher education associations and by higher education institutions)

As those writing in an amicus brief on behalf of the AFL-CIO suggest, and I quote: “higher education represents a unique opportunity and, from the vantage point of the workplace, the last opportunity, to foster interaction between diverse individuals.” (amicus brief filed by the AFL-CIO in Grutter and Gratz, p.17)

Vast numbers of white students and many students of color come to college from segregated backgrounds. They are away from home, and this is their first opportunity to encounter diversity, and it happens at a critical time in their development. They are experimenting with new ideas, new roles, and new relationships. They are strongly influenced by their peers. They are open to new possibilities. (Gurin, Patricia, Expert Report of Patricia Gurin, in Gratz and Grutter)

At this point in their lives, experiences with diversity are likely to have profound, positive, and long-lasting effects. In addressing unfair and intractable stereotypes and in changing people’s lives we can say, without hesitation, that exposure to diversity is something that works. Countless studies of the positive effects of racial desegregation in public schools have shown just that. (Trent, William, Outcomes of School Desegregation: Findings from Longitudinal Research, cited in amicus brief filed by the AFL-CIO in Grutter and Gratz)

Studies done by Patricia Gurin and colleagues at the University of Michigan, marshalling data collected from nearly 200 colleges and universities, showed that white students who attended colleges with 25 per cent or more minority enrollment were much more likely to have diverse friendships after leaving college, to live in diverse neighborhoods, and to work in settings where co-workers were diverse. (Gurin, Patricia, Expert Report of Patricia Gurin, in Gratz and Grutter, Table 1 and Figure 2)

They also found that interacting with diverse peers produces a learning environment of disequilibrium that requires students to think deeply, not just to rely on learned patterns that have become routine and fairly mindless during their school years. Exposed to a diverse educational environment, students learn to think more and to think in deeper, more complex ways. (Ibid., Tables C1, M1)

Data collected at UCLA’s Higher Education Research Institute show that interactions across the color line reduce stereotypes, override fears, and promote acceptance of people of other races and cultures. These attitudes and behaviors persist into the workplace. (Hurtado, Sylvia, Linking Diversity and Educational Purpose: How Diversity Affects the Classroom Environment and Student Development, cited in amicus brief filed by the AFL-CIO in Grutter and Gratz)

Universities are also safe havens for inter-group dialogue, the civil airing of conflict among students who, as peers, perceive each other as equals. This develops their capacity for participating in democracy, for integration, and for social harmony. No one thinks this happens easily or automatically – after all, most of these students, like most of us, have precious little experience airing differences in integrated settings, and both students of color and white students naturally would prefer the ease and comfort afforded by familiarity and similarity. But it does happen, and even one or two such experiences can set a course for life. (Pettigrew, Thomas & Tropp, Linda, Does Inter-group Contact Reduce Prejudice? Recent Meta-analytic Findings, in Reducing Prejudice and Discrimination, Oskamp ed., 2000, cited in amicus brief filed on behalf of the American Sociological Association in Grutter; Stephan, W. G. & Stephan, C. G., Intergroup Dialogues, Improving Intergroup Relations, 2001, Sage Publications)
Narrow Tailoring, Access, and Integration: Bakke’s Plus-Factor Approach

Turning now to the means by which affirmative action can be narrowly tailored to accomplish its goals, it is helpful to look closely at the suggestions provided by Justice Powell in *Bakke*.

Powell set forth a procedural approach to narrow tailoring—using race as a plus factor, one among many, in evaluating admissions—that was decidedly race conscious, but not race exclusive. In other words, race took its place alongside other factors, such as socioeconomic disadvantage, legacy advantage, geography, artistic or athletic talent, that supplement in valuable ways the standard information about academic performance at the center of any admissions decision. Race was to be considered in a straightforward but integrated manner, with all applicants competing for all seats, as compared, for example, to separate systems with fixed quotas.

This is a critically important approach because it ensures both individual opportunity, providing access only to qualified individuals, and programmatic success, in building a vibrant educational environment with a mix of life experiences at the table. It also values race as a central feature of life in America, worthy of building upon in an integrated society of learners.

The alternative, race-neutral, approaches suggested, for example, by the Bush Administration, use proxies for race which do none of the above. They neither ensure personal success nor build educational richness. They place no expressed value on achieving racial integration: They pretend that race in America does not exist.

The percentage plans, admitting a certain percent of the highest performing graduates of each high school to public universities in a state, have emerged as alternatives to affirmative action for undergraduate admissions in Texas, California, and Florida.

But recent research shows it is incorrect to attribute any significant increase in campus diversity to a percent plan alone. And even with additional outreach, recruitment, financial aid, and support programs, flagship institutions in these states have not been successful in maintaining racially and ethnically diverse campuses. (Catherine L. Horn and Stella Flores, *Percent Plans in College Admission: A Comparative Analysis of Three States’ Experiences 38-39* available at http://www.civilrightsproject.harvard.edu)

These plans narrow the factors addressed in admissions, reifying class rank, ignoring indicators of preparation (such as curricular accomplishments), and avoiding the task of composing a richly diverse class with different backgrounds and talents.

They also do not expressly value integration: their success as tools of “affirmative access” depends on the racial segregation of neighborhoods and school districts.

Further, those who claim to worry that race-conscious procedures are stigmatizing should be even more worried about these percentage plans, as such approaches are bound to result in the admission of students from extremely poorly-resourced schools who are highly unlikely to be in a position to succeed.

By contrast, the race-conscious approaches rely on individualized assessments of academic qualifications and preparation and have been demonstrated to be good predictors of success at the most selective colleges and universities in the country. (Bowen, William and Bok, Derek, *Shape of the River*, 1998).

Other proxy systems, such as those that count on gaining diversity via a focus on socioeconomic disadvantage, have been deemed ineffective in providing for a racially diverse class of admits at selec-
tive colleges and universities. As economist Thomas J. Kane summarizes, based on his analyses of samples of students drawn from over 1,000 public and private high schools: the “idea that nonracial criteria could substitute for race-based policies is simply an illusion.” (Thomas J. Kane, *Misconceptions in the Debate over Affirmative Action in College Admissions*, in *Chilling Admissions: The Affirmative Action Crisis and the Search for Alternatives* 17,28 (Gary Orfield & Edward Miller eds., 1998)

Certainly, socioeconomic diversity is a valued asset in composing a student body. In fact, in its undergraduate admissions program, the University of Michigan awards the same 20 points (out of 150 points) to socioeconomic disadvantage as it does to race.

But race, in and of itself, should also be a valued asset in composing a class. The experiences of a person of color in America, as mentioned earlier, are nowhere near perfectly aligned with class, nor are our stereotypes confined to any particular income bracket.

Some alternatives do try to be race-blind while still measuring a student’s experience of racial discrimination or “cultural disadvantage.” (Daria Roithmayr, Direct Measures: An alternative form of affirmative action, *Michigan Journal of Race and Law*, 7, 2001) These approaches, because they do not explicitly rely on a racial classification of individuals, carry the advantage of easily comporting with the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment.

But these alternatives do not set a standard of positively valuing race as an asset in admissions. To the extent that they use measures of discrimination and disadvantage as proxies for race, they focus on one side of the story of race in America.

To be sure, it is a side that we must address. But we also want students to develop positive feelings about race that can override existing fears and debunk stereotypes with a strong desire to interact with and learn from minority peers who come with a wide range of personal experiences to share.

In admissions, we clearly should value having students of color from all walks of life at the table. If we can do so for athletes, why can’t we do it for race?

**Why Race Conscious Affirmative Action is Critical to Progress**

Perhaps because we have used race as a weapon of discrimination for so long, we have a hard time being straightforward in assigning it positive value. Without question, there are good legal cautions in the equal protection clause against the direct consideration of race.

But that is why Justice Powell expressly wrote his opinion in *Bakke* with full adherence to a “strict scrutiny” test of compelling interest and narrow tailoring to minimize the burden on majority applicants. In fact, he parted company with Justice Brennan who favored “intermediate scrutiny” to remediate racial discrimination, even including a separate track system as compared to Powell's “plus-factor” approach. (Angelo N. Ancheta, Briefing Paper, The Civil Rights Project, Harvard University, March 2003)

As a social psychologist, I believe we will never counter the pernicious and automatic activation of stereotypes and inter-group fears—and the prejudice and discrimination that follow—unless we can directly and persistently talk about race. Proxies are not useful in this highly charged and contested arena.

It is time for educators to lay their values out directly, to rewrite the American imagination about
race. One way to begin is to send a powerful message in college and university admissions that we, as educators, value the contributions of students of color and we are therefore willing to use scarce resources (seats in a class) to invite them to join us.

**What Hurts: The Risks to the Role of Higher Education**

I am optimistic that the Supreme Court sees the compelling interest of race-conscious admissions and the narrow tailoring of approaches that comport with *Bakke*. However, if the Court were to rule against Michigan, and do so in a way that either reverses *Bakke* or leaves open questions about what is permissible under *Bakke*, I believe that there will be a sadly retrograde refocusing of institutional attention only on access, and we will risk taking a step backwards from promoting diversity as a force for integration. Colleges and universities, especially public institutions, will have to spend considerable energy on creating proxy systems for admissions and recruitment and financial aid.

Moreover, in the current context of a public infatuated with high-stakes testing, we can expect a push for reductionist definitions of ability/achievement that will make effective proxy systems more difficult to devise. The creativity and the intellectual and social vibrancy of the students and the communities of scholars in our institutions would be in jeopardy. In the light of how far our universities have come and how far we hope to go, this would be a tragedy.

And if, as institutions and as faculties, we take a reductionist turn and jettison a preference for composing broadly talented communities at every level in the institution, there will be reverberations beyond admissions.

Faculty hiring and promotions are immensely vulnerable, as these are areas in which it has been more difficult to get endorsement of the principle that race is a plus-factor. I also fear for the recruitment of graduate students, where very little progress has been made in some areas in creating a diverse pool from which to draw the faculty of the future.

We will also see a further division between diversity goals and programmatic and curricular initiatives such as cultural programs and ethnic studies and comparative curricula. These will not be seen as critical parts of everyone’s education and intellectual life. When we build new departments or centers or programs, diversity will return to being an afterthought, and faculty of color will be further marginalized from the center of institutional power. The message of the intertwining of diversity and excellence will be muted. Civic engagement will lose some of its appeal, and civil debate will wane.

Three features of our national life could make diversity even more difficult to pursue. One of these is the high-stakes testing environment already mentioned. The second lies in the increasing number of high school graduates, who see a premium on access to higher education even as they experience a downturn in the economy. And the third is our national mood of protectionism and isolationism, our fear of differences, intensified by the events of September 11th and our fear of terrorism within our borders, and now by the war in Iraq.

The high-stakes testing environment will refocus attention on narrow definitions of quality that do not serve us well in composing a diverse class. As Bill Bowen once commented, it is hardly appealing to imagine our student body composed only of valedictorians. The increasing numbers of baby-boomers’ babies desirous of access to the returns to higher education in a knowledge-based economy
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will only exacerbate this pressure to narrow the focus in admissions.

The economic down-turn will add to the premium placed on faculty recruitment and promotion and graduate training, placing a subtle pressure to jettison any commitment to diversity when it is seen as “taking up a scarce resource,” such as FTEs or fellowships.

Finally, and perhaps most pernicious in my mind, a national mood of fear of difference and insecurity will set the stage for legitimizing a turn away from programs and curricula and informal contexts in which students and faculty engage in inter-group dialogues, comparative analyses, and discussions that engage differences. This work is hard enough to do against a backdrop of discrimination, separation, and ignorance – adding threat and insularity to that picture does not bode well for campus climate.

Maintaining the Emphasis on Integration

For now, we need to redouble our efforts to build environments on campuses and between campuses and communities that encourage boundary crossing and a vibrant exchange of people and ideas.

We may need to be opportunistic in this current environment – engaging scholars and students in projects that are embedded in cultures of difference and diversity, even though they may not ostensibly be constituted as such. At Illinois, for example, we are enhancing our intergroup dialogues program, forging campus-community engagements such as digital cultural libraries and an urban exchange center jointly established with the Urban League, creating in LAS a program in Global Literacy, and supporting ten new cross-campus initiatives on subjects likely to engage questions of race in America, such as aging, family resilience, globalization, and national and international policy. At the same time, we are pushing ahead in some areas more explicitly identified with the study of race in America, including a new Native Studies program and a new Center on Multiracial Democracy, as well as a year-long, campus-wide commemoration of the 50th anniversary of Brown. We must also promote faculty diversity, especially in new departments and areas of growth, and build new pipelines of diversity in graduate and professional education.

We need to pay particular attention to building intellectual and social environments that are suffused with perceptions of our common fate and our shared tasks and aspirations. We will need to work on building a positive story of race in America.
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Introduction
American higher education is unarguably the best in the world. With more than 3600 institutions (public and private, two-year and four-year) and 14 million students, it is a $250 billion enterprise. In spite of its recognized and respected excellence and the enormous contributions it has made not only to this nation but also to the world, the overall quality and performance of America’s network of higher education institutions can only be described as uneven. This unevenness is reflected in many ways. It can be seen not only in the wide variation in academic quality that can be found from institution to institution but also in the different ways in which various racial, ethnic and cultural groups may be valued and educated.

Above all, it must be recognized that American higher education is a microcosm of American society. It possesses all the strengths and possibilities as well as all the weaknesses and pathologies of our nation. Just as America continues to be a “work in progress”, higher education is evolving as well. It is this evolution that must be guided and nurtured by those who understand the essential role that our colleges and universities play in improving our society. Racism, sexism, homophobia and discrimination against the physically impaired and the nontraditional student—overt or unintentional—exist in our colleges and universities. Concerted efforts toward the eradication of these maladies on our campuses will enhance our ability to ultimately eliminate them in the larger society. These are issues concerning the diversity of faces, voices and ideas on our campuses and the nature, extent and quality of their inclusion in the life of the institutions. An increasingly important question relates to the means available to our colleges and universities, such as affirmative action and other race-, gender-, and culture-sensitive admissions and employment practices, to achieve meaningful levels of diversity and pluralism.

Today, I propose to discuss diversity on our college and university campuses and explain why it is important to higher education and to the nation. I will attempt to point out that the presence of diversity can sometimes be mistaken for the existence of inclusiveness and equal opportunity and, furthermore, that diversity in the absence of equity is meaningless or, at best, of questionable value. I will also argue that diversity among the student population, while necessary, is not sufficient to conclude that the institution is diverse and inclusive. True diversity requires going beyond the composition of the students enrolled. It requires diversity at all levels: students, faculty, staff, administrators, governing board and, ultimately, alumni. Furthermore, diversity should not be seen as the goal; it should be seen as the means to achieving equity and pluralism. As a goal, given the resources and intellectual capacity at our disposal, it falls short of what we are capable of achieving. Finally, I will discuss what I believe to
be the single-most important ingredient needed to move beyond mere diversity to the creation and sustenance of a learning community that possesses both excellence and equity. And that element is the presence of a diverse, student-focused faculty (and administrative staff) whose contributions to teaching, learning, and scholarly inquiry are honored and respected throughout the institution.

Diversity in Higher Education

Before World War II most of America’s colleges and universities (not just those in the South where de facto segregation held sway) had few, if any, students of color. African American students attended institutions that comprised the network of the nation’s historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs). Virtually all African Americans who were college and university faculty members taught at those same institutions, as well. After the war, with the support of the GI Bill, large numbers of students, many of them racial minorities, enrolled and studied at institutions across the country. A decade later, with the U.S. Supreme Court decision on *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* and the civil rights movement as stimuli, many predominantly white colleges and universities began to drop the barriers to access that had prevented larger numbers of racial minorities from attendance.

The period from 1945 to the mid-1970s was a time of explosive growth in higher education. In order to accommodate the accelerating demand and, in some cases, rectify past practices of exclusion and discrimination, many colleges and universities, particularly those in the southeastern United States, opened their doors to students of all races, ethnicities, and nationalities; many selective eastern universities dropped restrictive quotas that had limited the enrollment of Jews and racial minorities. The easing of discrimination in enrollment and hiring of racial and ethnic minorities in higher education, both de jure and de facto, was the result of a long and bitter battle. Progress was not easily achieved. Many adults can remember when Autherine Lucy at the University of Alabama, Charlayne Hunter and Hamilton Holmes at the University of Georgia and James Meredith at the University of Mississippi were the first black undergraduates at those southern institutions. For none of these four—nor for many more at similarly disposed institutions—was their entry unchallenged, legally or otherwise. Even in some northern and western cities and towns, local housing codes and a variety of restrictive covenants made it difficult for persons of color and many non-Christians to experience full acceptance as students or faculty members in a collegial community well into the 1970s and beyond.

In response to executive orders from the administrations of Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon, most colleges and universities adopted some form of affirmative action with respect to admissions policies. But it was not until 1978, when the Supreme Court decided the case, *University of California Regents v. Bakke*, that the matter of racial and ethnic diversity in higher education came to the forefront and became instilled in the nation’s consciousness. The court ruled that the quota system used by the university was unconstitutional but Justice Lewis Powell, the swing vote on the case, postulated that “obtaining the educational benefits of an ethnically diverse student body” justified taking race and ethnicity into consideration for college admissions. This was, perhaps, the most significant public statement about the educational benefits of diversity that had been made up until that time.

The Bakke decision served as the foundation for college and university admissions policies until the mid-1990s when the University of California Regents rescinded the practice of taking race into account in admissions and employment. A short time later, California voters approved Proposition 209, banning affirmative action, and the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, in *Hopwood v. Texas*, judged that any consideration of race and ethnicity in the admissions process was unconstitutional. The University
of Michigan cases that are currently before the Supreme Court represent the first time that the court has agreed to consider any of these challenges to the decision on Bakke.

Today, overt discrimination has all but disappeared but more subtle remnants of racial, gender, and ethnic/cultural bias remain and continue to prevent our campuses from being the models of pluralism America needs. A glimpse of the future tells us that we must work to rid academe of these barriers to success because the next tidal wave of students will look quite different than the one that arrived in the 1960s.

Drawing upon U.S. Census Bureau projections, it is projected that the presence of white undergraduate students on college campuses will decline from a level of 70.6% in 2000 to 62.8% in 2015. Eighty percent of the growth from 13.4 million to 16 million undergraduates will be African American, Latino/Hispanic, and Asian/Pacific Islander students. While the increase in African American students is expected to be minimal, Latino/Hispanic students will become the predominant minority group and the presence of Asian/Pacific Islander students will grow by 86% during this period.

These figures indicate clearly that racial diversity on most college and university campuses in America is unavoidable. But much more needs to be done to eliminate the gaps that still exist in college attendance and degree attainment for African Americans and Latinos as compared to white and Asian/Pacific Islander students. One reason for these disparities is the generally poorer level of academic preparation possessed by many black and Latino students, groups more likely to be from economically-disadvantaged backgrounds and the products of inferior elementary and secondary schools. But a major factor for the lower retention and graduation rates for these students is the failure of the institutions to recognize the educational and socialization needs of these different populations. With more aggressive outreach programs directed at those high schools with large enrollments of minority students and more active efforts to improve the climate on campuses for the changing profile of incoming students, higher educational institutions can eliminate many of the obstacles that impede entry and the pursuit of a successful college experience.

Even with the changing demographics that foretell larger numbers of minorities within the college-age cohort, there is no guarantee that many of our colleges and universities will reflect the presence of these students in their student populations. There are three principal reasons for this prediction. The first is that the high price of attendance and correspondingly low levels of financial aid will discourage many, particularly those first-generation college-goers from low-income families. (It has been estimated that a $1000 shift from grant to loan has as much as a 17% negative impact on retention for minority students.) Second, selective colleges and universities, in an effort to gain prestige, are admitting a significantly smaller percentage of students today than they were 20 years ago. This trend is expected to continue. The losers are likely to be those minority students who meet the requisite entrance requirements but may not fare well in a highly competitive, SAT- and GPA-driven admissions environment. And, third, government-backed abolition of affirmative action policies and practices on many of our nation’s campuses removes important incentives for admissions officers to produce diverse entering classes each fall. Thus, in spite of a more diverse group of college-eligible high school graduates in the future, it is highly probable that some institutions may even be less diverse, at least racially, than they are today. It is not beyond the realm of possibility that we could return to a condition such as the one that existed in 1962 when Harvard had only nine black students in its freshman class.
Defining Diversity and Pluralism

What is diversity? Why is diversity important to higher education? Answering these questions is not a simple matter. Part of the reason is that the word, diversity, has become overworked and misused in higher education. It is most often used to denote the extent of the presence of various racial and ethnic groups within the population of students on college and university campuses. But that is not all that it should mean. It is my thesis that diversity should mean much more than numbers and percentages, that it should not be limited to matters of race and ethnicity and that, importantly, the presence of diversity should not be construed to mean that there exists the presence of equity. By constraining the definition of diversity to apply only to the mix of students in an institution—even if issues of sexual orientation, gender, disability, religion, national origin and economic class are taken into consideration—overlooks many other important considerations such as the range of ideas and intellectual concepts subject to study and inquiry.

Diversity is often used synonymously with pluralism. The two concepts are different. The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language defines diversity to be “The fact or quality of being diverse (distinct in kind, disparate, unlike), having variety in form, diversified, multiform. “ Pluralism, on the other hand, is defined to be “The condition of being plural (of or composed of more than one member, set, or kind).” It is further described as “a condition in which numerous distinct ethnic, religious, or cultural groups coexist within one nation.” It is the idea of coexistence within one nation, or community, that distinguishes pluralism from mere diversity, the idea of moving from what one writer described as “a passive coexistence to a dynamic atmosphere of collaboration.”

Today, a casual perusal of any issue of the Chronicle of Higher Education or some other publication that announces impending conferences and meetings on higher education will reveal a plethora of sessions with the word “diversity” somewhere in the title. This has been true for most of the last decade and especially so since Proposition 209 and Hopwood. Those of us who believe that diversity is an essential ingredient for what is the best in American higher education rejoice when we recognize that the issue is high on the agenda of those writing and speaking about the state and the future of our nation’s colleges and universities. But I am becoming increasingly suspicious of the notion that diversity should continue to be the topic that occupies so much of our attention. It has, I contend, mesmerized us to the extent that it has masked from our view what we really should be discussing in such sessions. That is, how do we transform our higher education institutions into pluralistic learning communities characterized by equity and excellence?

In the field of mathematics, one encounters the concepts of necessity and sufficiency. Mathematicians deal with propositions that are required or necessary in order for a truth to be upheld but that are in and of themselves not sufficient for a theory or postulate to be declared true. Some other proposition or fact must be present in order to declare the existence of truth or proof. Such is the case, I argue, with diversity.

If we accept as our goal the creation and sustenance of culturally pluralistic and inclusive institutions that affirm the presence of difference throughout and that value excellence at all levels of the institution—in its students, faculty, staff, administration, governing board, curriculum, student services, social organizations and mission—then we need to do more than achieve and celebrate diversity. To be certain, an institution cannot achieve what I have just described without the presence of diversity.
Diversity is necessary but it is not sufficient, by itself, to produce the desired result. In other words, the mere presence of diversity does not assure the presence of equality of opportunity. Something else has to be present besides mere diversity in order to reach that goal. Something within the institution has to be in place.

That something, in my opinion, consists of two things. One, the institution must have the will and the capacity to change in order to address fully the educational and socialization needs of its increasingly more diverse population. Two, there must be an unwavering commitment to excellence. Not the ersatz, narrow view of excellence found in most of those publications that have anointed themselves to be the judges of America’s best colleges and universities but the kind of excellence that can best be measured in the quality of outcomes. The favorite argument of those who fear diversity is that it represents a diminution of an emphasis on quality and the pursuit of excellence as a consequence of its focus on equality and the presence of equity. Nothing could be further from the truth. Excellence cannot be narrowly defined, measured and compared by the use of SATs and GREs no matter how hard we try.

One of the principal impediments that we must overcome is the mindset on most college and university campuses that diversity refers only to the composition and characteristics of the student body. Ask an administrator or faculty member at most institutions to comment on the diversity at his or her institution and you will most likely receive a reply with percentages that pertain to the latest incoming class of students. If you respond to this answer with a question about faculty diversity you are most likely to receive a response that is significantly different, one that demonstrates that little attention has been given to this matter. A true commitment to diversity requires more than concern for the diversity of the students who come to be educated. It requires a similar commitment to the diversity of those responsible for providing the education—faculty, administrators, staff, and trustees—and to the diversity of academic and support services provided to those students. Only then, can a meaningful assessment of the institution’s commitment to a pluralistic, inclusive and multicultural learning environment be made. Only then, does a commitment to diversity make itself evident.

Transforming Our Institutions for Diversity

Today, higher education is confronted with the reality that the presence of African American, Latino and American Indian students, faculty and administrators falls well below the proportion of those groups in our society. Given the extraordinary demographic changes occurring throughout much of the country, this is a situation, if unheeded, portends serious and, even, dire consequences for the nation.

In order to rectify this situation there is a crying need for a transformation in education in this country. That transformation must begin in pre-school where successful interventions have already been shown to be possible. It must continue through all levels of education up to and including graduate school. Our colleges and universities must embark on a new era of teaching and learning in which excellence is not so narrowly defined as it is today. It will require that we eliminate, to the extent possible, privilege from our definition of merit. (It is true, as Barry Switzer, former Oklahoma Sooners and, later, Dallas Cowboys coach once said, “Some people are born on third base and go through life thinking that they just hit a triple.’’) True measures of quality must be adopted that are based upon a much deeper engagement with students—all students—than is occurring on the campuses of many colleges and universities of our nation. It will require that we show a greater commitment to the formulation
and implementation of policies that will make higher education more affordable, accessible and equitable for all. We must have the courage to make higher education an inclusive rather than an exclusive industry where quality is no longer measured by the percentage of students who are declined admittance. We need to focus more of our attention on outcomes rather than primarily on input measures such as standardized admission test scores whose importance in predicting success in college is vastly overrated.

**Creating Inclusive and Pluralistic Communities**

It is becoming increasingly imperative for those of us in higher education to see the demographic changes that are taking place in society and, increasingly, on our campuses as an opportunity rather than a problem. We need to see them as an opportunity for us to educate ourselves and, ultimately, America, on how to develop and sustain inclusive and pluralistic communities-ones with shared values and goals, common purposes and dreams. To be sure, diverse, equitable and multicultural communities are difficult to create and sustain. Witness the bloodshed in Eastern Europe or in the Middle East or in parts of Africa as an example. In this country, many of the hopes that were fostered in the post-civil rights era of the 1960s for building such communities have been dashed by the backlashes of the ‘80s and ‘90s, the reactions against affirmative action and increasing de facto residential segregation. I contend that such communities will be needed if America will ever fulfill its promise and, furthermore, that our colleges and universities must show the way. But to do so requires that we move far beyond the goals of achieving and celebrating the diversity of our students to the higher, common ground of inclusiveness and equality of opportunity throughout our institutions.

Most of all we need to concentrate on building educational communities of the type that Ernest L. Boyer wrote about in his foreword to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching 1990 report, *Campus Life: In Search of Community*. These are communities that are “purposeful, open, disciplined, just, caring and celebrative.” Boyer wrote, “And, I’m convinced that the challenge of building community reaches far beyond the campus as well. Higher education has an important obligation not only to celebrate diversity but also to define larger, more inspired goals and in so doing serve as a model for the nation and the world.”

In this era during which previously disenfranchised and newly emergent groups are demanding recognition and rights of participation, a sense of community, of belonging and identity on the part of all individuals is essential. Without these measures of security no common ground can be found, no shared vision is possible, no mutually conceived and collaboratively pursued goals can exist, and no harmony can be achieved.

To be left out of the community, to be denied the opportunity to contribute to and benefit from community membership, to be considered a part of the “other” is tantamount to failure in our rapidly changing society. This is no less true in the cloistered realm of higher education. Far too long, some groups have not had full access to all the opportunities and benefits that our colleges and universities provide. Because they generally are not considered to be representatives of “the best and the brightest,” many, particularly members of racial minority groups in America, find themselves on the outside looking in. They experience a sense of isolation and alienation that often leads to poorer performance and higher dropout rates than those whom the institutions consider within the mainstream and more traditional.

Throughout my career in higher education I have heard alumni from the 40s and 50s decry the loss of community on their college campuses that are now increasingly populated with faces that were not present when they, themselves, were students. To be sure, the homogeneity that existed then does
not exist today nor will it ever again. What is required, therefore, is that a new definition of community be fashioned that encompasses differences rather than similarities. That is the challenge for higher education and, ultimately, for the nation and the world.

In his monograph, “Building Community,” John Gardner pointed out the necessity of moving beyond the idea of the traditional community with its antiquated concepts of history and continuity. He suggests that although we may value the memory of the traditional community, we need to move into new forms of shared values and social interdependencies appropriate to more contemporary social organizations. Gardner calls for a pluralistic community with a high degree of coherence, what he calls “wholeness incorporating diversity.” This is, in his opinion, “the transcendent goal of our time, the task for our generation-close to home and worldwide.” He goes on to say, “The play of conflicting interests in a framework of shared purposes is the drama of a free society. It is a robust exercise and a noisy one, not for the faint-hearted or the tidy-minded. Diversity is not simply “good” in that it implies breadth of tolerance and sympathy. A community of diverse elements has greater capacity to adapt and renew itself in a swiftly changing world.” No better argument can be made for creating inclusive learning communities at our colleges and universities-communities that are characterized by wholeness incorporating diversity.

The Essential Role of A Diverse Faculty

It is instructive to realize that it wasn’t until 1948 that the first African American received tenure as a faculty member at a major, predominantly white American university, the University of Chicago. For many years, silence was the best word to describe the level of discussion concerning faculty diversity in America’s colleges and universities. With rare exceptions, the only persons who dared speak on the subject were the tenured, secure faculty persons of color who attempted to arouse academe to recognize and rectify what they considered to be discriminatory hiring, retention and promotion practices. While some positive results occurred as a consequence of these calls for action, the overall level of faculty diversity in American higher education, and, in particular, in our nation’s research and graduate institutions remains unconscionably low. The most encouraging sign today is that more and more people are writing and publicly discussing faculty diversity and why it is essential for the betterment, not only of education, but also of American society.

The most common response that one hears to the question of low minority representation on higher education faculties is that there is a dearth of qualified minority Ph.D.s, and that those who do exist are highly sought by other colleges and universities. In other words, there is a “pipeline” problem. This argument has become the standard excuse given by administrators and faculty leaders when challenged to explain the relative absence of diversity among the instructors and researchers on their campuses. In their book, Faculty of Color in Academe: Bittersweet Success, Caroline Turner and Samuel L. Myers, Jr. argue that the problem of the pipeline can be traced to the invidious presence of racial, gender and ethnic bias in the academy. Its presence not only discourages the pursuit of faculty positions on the part of minorities and often, women, it creates an unwelcome and non-supportive atmosphere for those who do enter the profession. They are made to feel, according to the authors, as “guests in someone else’s house.” To be successful, faculty of color must overcome the effects of many myths that collectively suggest that minorities are likely to be unqualified, unavailable or unsuitable for hiring as members of the professorate. As a result, among the nation’s research and graduate level institutions minorities account for less than 5% of the total number of faculty. Sadly, this statistic shows no sign of improving. Not one of the top 50 chemistry departments in America hired an African American as an
assistant professor between 1991 and 2001 although more than 350 graduated with Ph.D.s in chemistry during that period.

Today, African Americans constitute 5% of America’s full-time faculty members, 2.4% are Hispanics/Latinos, 5.1% are Asian/Pacific Americans, and less than 0.5% are American Indians. One-half of all black faculty are at HBCUs; the proportion at predominantly white universities, 2.3%, is virtually the same as it was 20 years ago. Most Latino faculty are at two-year colleges, while Asian Americans remain grossly underrepresented in administrative positions.

The poor record of success in producing diverse faculties in our nation’s colleges and universities is due to many factors. They include the inadequate K-12 preparation received by racial minorities and the economically disadvantaged who are concentrated in many of our poorest and lowest achieving urban schools. There is a higher dropout rate for many of these same students and lower levels of entrance and progression in college and graduate school. Those who go on to pursue graduate and professional studies are more likely to encounter stereotypes and obstacles that serve to discourage them in their quest for full membership in the community of academic scholars. Subtle discrimination, ranging from the difficulty of finding dissertation advisers and mentors to the devaluing of their research areas, prevents many minority graduate students from completing their doctoral studies, the entry to the academic profession. Those who do obtain their doctorates are still faced with the high probability of encountering discrimination in employment due to long-held attitudes and practices in colleges and universities. The failure of accreditation bodies (and those who presume to rank the performance of colleges and universities) to value the relevance of faculty and staff diversity to educational quality is one reason so little has happened in this area. Institutions focused on the goals of increased prestige and greater recognition in the “meritocracy” of American higher education feel no incentive and receive no reward for diversifying their faculties. In fact, institutions that do commit to increasing faculty and staff diversity risk being criticized for “pursuing equity at the expense of excellence.” This fact, alone, accounts for much of the apathy shown by colleges and universities toward improving faculty diversity despite their awareness of the benefits to educational quality that would accrue.

Daryl Smith, a professor at the Claremont Graduate University and a respected scholar argues that, “The emphasis on a diverse faculty and staff is indeed critical but for more reasons than are often articulated.” She describes five reasons.

- **There is a need to diversify faculty and staff in order to provide support for the benefit of students from particular groups.**
- **Diversification is an important symbol to students from these groups about their own futures and about the institution’s commitment to them.**
- **Diversification of the campus community creates a more comfortable environment for students as well as for faculty and staff.**
- **Diversification of the faculty and staff is likely to contribute to what is taught, how it is taught, and what is important to learn, contributions that are vital to the institution.**
- **A diverse faculty and staff reflect one measure of institutional success for an educational institution in a pluralistic society.**
Time does not allow me to discuss each of Smith’s points but I will say a few words about the last one.

The final point in her list of reasons for improving faculty diversity is that success in this endeavor is one important measure of an institution’s commitment to a pluralistic society. Success may not be easy to come by given that the supply of potential minority faculty members is smaller than desirable, especially in the fields of science and engineering. But the overworked excuse that qualified candidates do not exist is untenable. Institutions committed to faculty diversity can and do find prospective minority faculty members. These institutions act affirmatively and aggressively in seeking and recruiting minorities (and women of all races), making them feel welcomed and appreciated, and providing them with a sense of comfort and respect for the contributions they make to the intellectual and social life of their academic communities. It is this commitment, from the top to the bottom of the institution that is the difference-maker. Without true commitment to this cause, American colleges and universities will continue to have token representation of faculty members of color and other historically underrepresented groups; the colleges and universities will be the poorer for it. By demonstrating this commitment, higher educational institutions can create the communities described by Gardner and Boyer, to which I referred earlier. The creation of a pluralistic learning community characterized by “wholeness incorporating diversity” allows an institution to serve as a beacon for the improvement of American society. There can be no “larger, more inspired” goal than this for any college or university at the beginning of the 21st century.

Conclusion
I have attempted, in this address, to show that the creation of an inclusive campus environment reflecting institutional commitment to the synergistic goals of excellence and equity must be the overarching purpose for higher education in the 21st century. Success requires that the institution’s commitment be genuine; that it not only talks the talk but also consistently walks the walk. This commitment must be evident in the institution’s mission statement, its catalog of course offerings, its admissions and hiring policies, its student life programs, and its community and public relations efforts. It must be seen and sensed at all levels of the institution for it to be deemed true. And it must be done with the same sense of urgency reflected in the message on the “No Trespassing” sign in the Indiana countryside that says, “If you want to cross this field you had better do it in 9.9 seconds, the bull can do it in 10 flat.” Only if an institution does each of these things will it be seen as a college or university that provides all of its students with a total educational experience of the highest quality; one that prepares them for life in a world that has become increasingly complex, pluralistic, and interdependent.
Outcomes from Concurrent Sessions

In the final conference session, panel leaders reported the highlights from their sessions.

Challenges Ahead

Graduate fellowship resources – requires a campus-wide reallocation of resources
What kind of priority do we give to diversity?
What is a “best practice” in diversity? How do you replicate it on member campuses?
“Swapping, Exchanging and Stealing faculty”- instead of recruiting away from each other there needs to be a net gain in faculty recruitment.
How do we work with the faculty we have now? How do we use the “whole” pipeline and not just the “star” faculty?

Strategies

International students:
Create escorts for International students – transportation, companionship, witness their treatment.

Diversity Initiatives:
Treat Diversity as a compelling interest.
Work with local, regional employers for co-sponsorship of conferences.
Exploit all available resources – not relying solely on special programs.
Bring in “bridge” folks – engage people who can articulate issues well, who can serve as ambassadors, as well as those who are more skeptical about diversity, and who cast dissenting votes. When it’s just “us” we’re preaching to the choir.
Create a CIC Speakers Bureau - send articulate people with a message to talk to people locally.
Develop strategies within the university as well as beyond; form a “Diversity Council” for an opportunity to hold frank discussions with a liaison to the executive branch of the administration.
Seek “Big Picture” info from academic professions – many decisions are made at an administrative level; and partner with “hidden resources” (ex: librarians).

Faculty:
Create bridge programs for PhD’s.
Encourage other CIC member institutions to recruit faculty of color via accountability measures; best practice sharing (role modeling); data from a growing pool of candidates
Create a venue to gain a return on the investment via climate, diversity, institutional transformation, inter-group communication, audits, assessments and data.
Work with the CIC Academic Leadership Program to focus on department leadership, which hasn’t changed substantially, but needs to change and grow.
Acknowledge faculty achievements and efforts forming a “climate” connection.
Mentoring – junior colleagues (ex: roundtable discussion); “Partners for Success” is a model for graduate student mentoring.
Barbara M. Allen, Director, Committee on Institutional Cooperation

Chancellor Cantor set the stage for us Sunday night. She boldly, clearly, and starkly set out for us the challenges faced by all of us living in a highly unequal and segregated society. Her message was clear. Affirmative Action is necessary, it is right and just, and there is no proxy for race in this consideration.

John Slaughter reinforced those points made by Chancellor Cantor – spinning out for us a vision of a new academy that is characterized by pluralism. He pointed out that no mutually conceived goals or collaboration are possible without a foundation of community.

Many voices were shared:
- Shared perspectives, best practices, advice, guidance
- Challenged us, questioned us, reinforced messages we heard from the keynotes
- Beautifully expressed by the CRLT actors — our aspirations, our challenges, our opportunities – to change!
- We were called to think about – repeatedly – the definition of diversity, which was brought home to us richly in the performance of last night. (Democracy and Pluralism)
- What will it take: the will & capacity to change.
- Move beyond good intentions to transformation.
- Unwavering commitment to excellence.
- We are all change agents, and while we are responsible for programs and activities, at the same time we are engaged in changing the academy and that is hard work.
- This conference was an opportunity to renew, refresh, recommit, share, evaluate, identify new strategies and move forward – individually and collectively as the CIC.

Next Steps
- Preparation of report – available through CIC web page, and shared with many peer groups across the CIC. Foundation for shared understanding, basis for collective action.
- Link SROP to enrollment and better manage and disseminate information about the students we contact through SROP and recruitment.
- Bridge from graduate programs to faculty positions across the CIC
- Use the CIC ALP & DEO program as opportunities to effect changes
- Diversity Forum 2005, April 2-5, Purdue University
- Bring new folks to the conversation!

Many thanks…
- Bill Berry, Larine Cowan, Chancellor Cantor, Provost Herman, Ellen Foran (UIUC)
- The CIC Senior Diversity Officers, the CIC Members (Provosts)
CIC Members

University of Chicago
Richard P Saller, Provost

University of Illinois
Chicago Campus: R. Michael Tanner, Provost, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Urbana-Champaign Campus: Richard H Herman, Provost, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Indiana University
Sharon Stephens Brehm, Chancellor IU Bloomington
Vice President for Academic Affairs for Indiana University

University of Iowa
Jon Whitmore, Provost, Office of the Provost

University of Michigan
Paul N Courant, Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs

Michigan State University
Lou Anna K. Simon, Interim President and Provost

University of Minnesota
Christine M Maziar, Provost, Executive Vice President

Northwestern University
Lawrence B Dumas, Provost

Ohio State University
Edward J Ray, Executive Vice President and Provost

Pennsylvania State University
Rodney A Erickson, Executive Vice-President, Provost

Purdue University
Sally Mason, Provost

University of Wisconsin-Madison
Peter D Spear, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
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<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Illinois at Chicago</th>
<th>Ohio State University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patricia A Gill</td>
<td>Mac A Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Chancellor</td>
<td>Vice Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access and Equity</td>
<td>Minority Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign</th>
<th>Pennsylvania State University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William E Berry</td>
<td>W. Terrell Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Chancellor</td>
<td>Vice Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for Educational Equity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indiana University</th>
<th>Purdue University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Nelms</td>
<td>Alysa C Rollock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for Student</td>
<td>Human Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development &amp;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Iowa</th>
<th>University of Wisconsin-Madison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joe D Coulter</td>
<td>Bernice Durand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Provost for Diversity</td>
<td>Associate Vice Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. Opportunity at Iowa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Michigan</th>
<th>Michigan State University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lester P Monts</td>
<td>Robert F Banks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Vice Provost</td>
<td>Asst. Provost &amp; Asst. V. P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>for Academic Human Resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Minnesota</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sallye McKee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Provost for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Campus Teams

### University of Michigan
- John Matlock
  - Associate Vice-Provost
- Henry Meares
  - Assistant Dean
  - School of Education
- A. T. Miller
  - Coordinator of Multicultural Teaching and Learning
- Lester Monts
  - Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
- Amy Stillman
  - Assoc. Prof., Music & American Culture
  - Director, Asian/Pacific Islander American Studies

### Michigan State University
- Denise T. Anderton
  - Assistant Vice President
  - Human Resources
- Robert Banks
  - Assistant Provost/Assistant Vice Pres for Academic Human Resources
- Marquita Chamblee
  - Assistant to the Dean
- Paulette Granberry Russell
  - Senior Advisor to the President for Diversity
  - Director, Affirmative Action
- Lee June
  - Asst. Provost and Vice President for Student Affairs & Services
- Patricia Lowrie
  - Director
  - Women’s Resource Center
  - MSU Women’s Resource Center
- Rodney Patterson
  - Assistant to the Vice President for Student Affairs
  - Director Racial Ethnic Student Affairs
- Leonard Savala
  - Graduate Student
- Jayne Schuiteman
  - Interim Director, Women’s Studies Program
  - Personal Safety Coordinator, Women’s Resource Ctr
- Yevonne Smith
  - Associate Dean
  - The Graduate School
  - Office of ALANA Student Affairs

### University of Minnesota
- Pearl Barner II
  - Executive Director/LRC’s
- Rita Bashaw
  - Coordinator
  - Multicultural Center for Academic Programs
- B David Galt
  - Director, GLBT Programs Office
- Tina Jackson
  - Coordinator MN Women’s Center
- Geoffrey Maruyama
  - Assistant Vice Provost
  - Multicultural and Academic Affairs
- Carolyn Nayematsu
  - Executive Director
  - Multicultural Center for Academic Programs
- William Solhoe
  - Disability Specialist
  - Office for Multicultural & Academic Affairs
- H. Jeanie Taylor
  - Director, Office for University Women
  - Multicultural and Academic Affairs
- Patrick Troup
  - Associate Director
  - Multicultural Center for Academic Programs

### Ohio State University
- Olga Esquivel-Gonzalez
  - Associate Director
- Judith Fountain
  - Assistant Vice Provost for Women’s Policy Initiatives
  - Director of The Women’s Place
- J. Stephen Henderson
  - Director of Compensation
  - Office of Human Resources
- Alayne Parson
  - Vice Provost
  - Office of Academic Affairs
- Mac Stewart
  - Vice Provost
  - Office of Minority Affairs
- Lawrence Williamson, II
  - Directory
  - OSU-OMA-Hale Black Cultural Center
- Yolanda Zepeda
  - Director of Enrichment Programs
  - OSU Graduate School

### Pennsylvania State University
- Dr. Nuket Acar
  - Director of Women in Science and Engineering Inst.
- Mike Blanco
  - Senior Diversity Planning Analyst
  - Email: mhb4@psu.edu
- Walter T. Jones
  - Vice Provost for Educational Equity
- Bonnie MacEwan
  - Assistant Dean for Collections and Scholarly Communication
- Thomas Poole
  - Associate Vice Provost for Educational Equity
- Susan Rankin
  - Senior Diversity Planning Analyst
Campus Teams

Allison Subasic  
Director  
LGBTA Student Resource Center  

Marcus Whitehurst  
Director, Multicultural Resource Center  

Courtney Young  
Race, Gender & Ethnicity Librarian  

Purdue University  
Barbara Clark  
Director, Science Diversity Office  
Director, Women in Science Programs  

Kauline Davis  
Assistant Director, Women in Science Programs  

Denise Driscoll  
Diversity Resource Specialist  
American Railway Building  

Karen Hall  
Director  
Women’s Resource Office  

Gina Kerr  
Assistant Director, Compliance and Disability Services  
Affirmative Action Office  

Dwight Lewis  
Director of Minority Programs for the Graduate School  

Diana Prieto  
Director  
Affirmative Action Office  

Alysa Rollock  
Vice President for Human Relations  

Dorothy Simpson-Taylor  
Director, Diversity Resource Office  

Regina Todd Hicks  
Director, Multicultural Science Programs  
Associate Director, Science Diversity  

University of Wisconsin-Madison  
Bernice Durand  
Associate Vice Chancellor for Diversity & Climate  

José J. Madera  
Director  
Diversity Education Programs  

Mojis Olaniyan  
Assistant Dean & Coordinator, Policy Group  

Dorothy Ann Sanchez  
Assistant Dean - Graduate School  

Jennifer Lindsey Stoddard Cameron  
Coordinator of New Faculty Services  
Office of the Secretary of the Faculty  

Committee on Institutional Cooperation  
Barbara Allen  
Director  

Monica Fortune  
Program Coordinator  
Graduate Multicultural Collaboration  

Brian Hosmer  
Director, CIC American Indian Studies Consortium  

Catherine M. Player  
Program Coordinator, Academic and Technology Collaboration  

Anne Price  
CIC Secretary  

Galen Rafferty  
CIC Secretary  

Karen Singer  
Communications Officer and Assistant to the Director  

CIC American Indian Studies Consortium  
