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The concept of diversity in higher education has evolved over several decades. This chapter is the first of three that examine key concepts that are the underpinning of this entire book—diversity, excellence and leadership. In the paper , I will critically examine how the many definitions of diversity have emerged from a complex series of policies, legal decisions, laws, and our country’s rapidly shifting demographics, to the broadly inclusive concept that I believe we need to guide diversity efforts on our campuses now and in the coming decades.

The earliest form of the concept of diversity was the concept of **“integration,”** which focused on access for racial minorities in the context of the legal initiatives and decisions of the civil rights movement of the 1960s. Before the Supreme Court decision**,** *Brown v. Board of Education* ***on*** May 17, 1954, states were allowed to operate separate public schools for black and white children. Under these laws, for close to 150 years, blacks did not have the constitutional rights of white citizens and were only allowed to attend educational facilities specifically for blacks. This was a part of the history of racial segregation and the Jim Crow laws that operated predominately, but not exclusively, in the South. Colleges and universities as well as K-12 schools were segregated. A very few colleges, notably Oberlin in Ohio and Berea in Kentucky, did admit blacks and were prominent in the abolitionist movement. The first two Historically Black Colleges and Universities in the United States (HBCUs) were Cheney University (Pennsylvania), founded in 1837, and Wilberforce University (Ohio), founded in 1856.

**(http://www.collegeview.com/articles/CV/hbcu/hbcu\_history.html)**

 “Between 1861 and 1870, the AMA (American Missionary Association) founded seven black colleges and 13 normal (teaching) schools. Many of these institutions, along with the private historically black colleges and universities founded later by the AMA, the Freedmen's Bureau, and black churches, became the backbone of black higher education.” In 1890, the second Morrill Act required that institutions in the land-grant college system created in 1862 either admit blacks or provide funding for black institutions. ( Slaughter---, )

A new era in higher education for minorities began when theBrown decision struck down *Plessy v. Ferguson*, the 1896 Supreme Court ruling which had upheld the Constitutionality of state segregation laws. The*Brown* decision that separate educational facilities are inherently unequal imparted dual meanings to the term “integration.” In a literal sense, the meaning was requiring any higher education institution to allow access to blacks. In a more subtle sense, the decision was also endorsing the access of blacks to a quality education, because in the past it wasassumed that African Americans were not capable of learning the same material as whites, and the resources made available in their educational institutions were far inferior to those in institutions for white students.

 Throughout the period of legal segregation, the concept of diversity was basically related to whites and blacks (sometimes referred to somewhat more broadly as “people of color.”) But this began to change as the federal government took a more active role in outlawing discrimination. Federal Executive Orders issued by both Presidents Kennedy and Johnson codified the imperative for diversity in education, including the prohibition against discrimination in hiring –as well as admissions--by educational institutions. In 1961, President John Kennedy issued Executive Order 10925, which created a Federal Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity and mandated that federally funded projects take "affirmative action” to ensure that hiring and employment practices were free of bias. This language went beyond previous concepts of diversity as the duality of black and white people, by prohibiting bias based “race, creed, color or national origin.”

( reference here)

A few months after outlining the concept of affirmative action in a speech delivered at historically black Howard University, President Lyndon B. Johnson issued Executive Order 11246 in 1965, and established enforcement guidelines and documentation procedures for federal contractors. In 1967, the order was amended to cover gender discrimination as well.” ( Goodman, Moses and Jones 2012: ) Also see (<http://www.understandingrace.org/history/gov/begin_end_affirm.html> )

Race: Are We So Different? A Project of the American Anthropological Association, \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Multiculturalism**

In the 1970s and 1980s the concept of integration, primarily meaning access to education, was broadened to “multicultural education.” James A. Banks, Director of the Center for Multicultural Education at the University of Washington, has defined the term as:

 “An idea, an educational reform movement, and a process (Banks, 1997). As an idea, multicultural education seeks to create equal educational opportunities for all students, including those from different racial, ethnic and social-class groups. Multicultural education tries to create equal education by changing the total school environment (often referred to as diversifying K-12 settings) so that it will reflect the diverse cultures and groups within a society and within the nation’s classrooms. Multicultural education was seen as a process because its goals are ideals that teachers and administrators should constantly strive to achieve.” (Banks 1996: ).

As the following section will show, starting in the 1960s campus conversations about diversity were no longer rooted only in the black and white dichotomy; they had already began to encompass a broad range of differences, including the gamut of racial and ethnic backgrounds found in the United States, gender and class differences. The creation of ethnic studies and women’s studies programs on dozens of campuses in the late 1960s, 1970s and 1980s testified to the shifting definition.

**Ethnic Studies**

The 1960s and 1970s saw the development of programs and curricula reflecting the heightened interest and protests by racial and ethnic minorities and women that mainstream education failed to acknowledge their role in—and especially their contributions to –American history and society. Once the Civil Rights Act of 1964 barring discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion or national origin was enacted, activists set about forcing the national educational system on all levels to acknowledge and address the history and role of minorities and their exclusion, not only from the history books, but from the halls of the academy. These programs often grew out of the politics and social justice movements of the times. For example, in 1968, the student strike at San Francisco State University ended when then Dean S. I. Hayakawa finally agreed to establish a School of Ethnic Studies and appointed Dr. James Hirabayashi as first dean of the school (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ethnic_Studies> . The creation of the National Association for Ethnic Studies in 1972 provided “an interdisciplinary academic forum for both scholars and activists concerned with the national and international dimensions of ethnicity.” ([www.ethnicstudies.org/objectives.htm](http://www.ethnicstudies.org/objectives.htm) ) In subsequent years, these programs have proliferated to the point where there is hardly a campus that does not offer some type of ethnic studies program or degree. (Yang 2000). Also see (<http://www.ethnicstudies.org/programs.htm>.)

**Women’s Studies**

Increasingly, during the 1970s, educational equity was becoming a major thrust of the women’s movement. Passage of Title IX of the Higher Education Amendments of 1972 put pressure on campuses across the United States to end sex discrimination, and passage of the Women’s Educational Equity Act in 1974 provided modest funding for activities and programs supporting sex equity in higher education. Most people today associate Title IX with requiring sex equity in athletics programs, but in fact it covers a wider range of equity provisions across higher education including hiring, curriculum and institutional policies that promote leadership. ( Ware 2006)

The women’s studies programs that emerged in the 1970s were also considered part of the definition of multicultural education. The first program was created in 1970, at San Diego State University “after a year of intense organizing of women’s consciousness-raising groups, rallies, petition circulating, and operating unofficial or experimental classes and presentations before seven committees and assemblies.” (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Women%27s_studies> ) According to the National Women’s Studies Association (NWSA), in the same year programs also started on a diverse selection of campuses, including Bryn Mawr, Mankato State University in Minnesota, the University of Illinois Champaign-Urbana, and Baltimore Community College. In those early years, many universities and colleges created interdisciplinary programs (with very few departments). These interdisciplinary programs usually had women faculty from other fields and disciplines. So initially both ethnic studies and women studies programs relied on the largesse of traditional departments to supply their faculty. (Howe 2011, Boxer 1998)

A recent 2007 survey conducted by the NWSA found 652 women’s and gender studies programs at higher education institutions. Undergraduate women’s studies courses enrolled nearly 89,000 students in 2005-06. Graduate courses had a total enrollment of nearly 2,700 students. The study also shows that women’s studies faculty were more diverse than higher education faculty as a whole: 30.4% of women’s studies faculties were faculty of color, compared with 19% of faculty nationally. <http://082511c.membershipsoftware.org/files/NWSA_CensusonWSProgs.pdf>

**After Bakke**

 In 1978 the Supreme Court delivered *Board of Regents of the University of California v. Bakke*—a landmark decision that was to further influence the definition of diversity and how the concept was to be operationalized on American campuses. The case was brought by Allan Bakke, an applicant who had been rejected by the University of California Davis medical school. Bakke contended that because his examination scores were higher than those of some minority students who were admitted, he was a victim of discrimination.

 The Court’s ruling that affirmative action is Constitutional but use of racial quotas is not, was an affirmation of the value of racial and ethnic diversity on campus and in society as a whole, and made it inevitable that higher education institutions would need to seek ways to support and increase diversity on their campuses. Foundations became a source of support for programs ranging from recruitment of more diverse faculty, to curriculum changes, and promoting more robust efforts to recruit and retain diverse students, including women and students of color. The Ford Foundation undertook a multi-year project: “The Campus Diversity Initiative (CDI), and established a national network that eventually included more than 400 U.S. colleges and universities” (“More Reasons for Hope, p.1). In the early 1990s I served as one of four reviewers and as a consultant to review these Ford Foundation programs. The reviewers were myself, Daryl Smith , Milred Garcia and Caryn McTighe Musil. Our collaboration under the Direction of Program Officer, Edgar Beckham and Director of the Educational Division, Alison Bernstein was the publication of the monograph, *Diversity in Higher Education: a Work in Progress.* .( Musil, Garcia, Moses and Smith 1999). What we found was that most institutions that er studied were in the proocess of defining what diversity was. There was a focus, if any, on starting programs. There was not any kind of institutional take on what diversity meant. Other foundations such as the Lilly Endowment, the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation , and the Hewlett Foundation and the James Irvine Foundations in California were all funding diversity initiatives from the 1990s to 2000 . While all of these foundations had robust evaluations done for each of their diversity initiatives, there was not a clear sense from any of them that campuses had moved from the programmatic focus on diversity programs to seeing diversity as an institutional imperative. (see Musil , Garcia, Hudgins, Nettles, Sedlacek and Smith 1999); Smith D.G. 2004; Smith, D.G., Parker, Clayton Pederson, Moreno and Teraguchi 2006) . but the data had not been collected as to the value and the effectiveness of achieving the outcomes of more diverse students faculty and staff. So by the 2000’s, the nation and higher education were in the midst of major demographic trends and policy/legal shifts that were to spur newer and even more complex definitions of diversity and inclusion to reflect the rich and nuanced realities of the value of what happens with an intentional institutional focus on diversity which also includes understanding the profile of students, staff and faculty .( Smith, D.G. 2009)

 **National Demographic Shifts**

At the same time our colleges and universities were beginning to articulate their

Long term Commitment to diversity, even in a rudimentary way, the country was experiencing

demographic shifts that prompted further changes in operational definitions of the

concept. The demographic changes were especially dramatic on the West Coast ( California, Arizona and new Mexico) , in

Florida ( especially around the Miami area) and in Midwestern areas such as Chicago ( Hispanics) and in Minnesota ( South East Asians, And Somalis).

What caused these demographic shifts, and what was the impact on

colleges and universities? A major factor in the increase in racial and ethnic minorities

was a rise in the number of immigrants. From 1960 to 2010, the foreign-born population

of the U.S. rose from 9.7 million to 40 million (13% of the total). A statistic that is sure

to have future relevance for higher education is that 24 % of the immigrant population is

under 18 years old.

( see <http://www.census.gov/prod/2012pubs/acs-19.pdf> .The Foreign-Born Population in the

United States: 2010, Elizabeth M. Grieco et al., issued May, 2012)

This suggests that our institutions will continue in coming years to enroll significant

numbers of students who are the first generation in their family to enter postsecondary

education. In addition to increasing their numbers, minorities expanded their share of the

total population: From 11% in 1960 the share of the U.S. population counted in a

minority group climbed in each decade to reach more than 28% in 2010. (<http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=DEC_10_SF1_QTP3&prodType=table> Race and Hispanic or Latino Origin: 2010 Census )

As an article from the U.S. Bureau of the Census observes, “While non-Hispanic white

alone population is still numerically and proportionally the largest majority racial and

ethnic group in the US, it is also growing at the slowest rate.” Data show that from 2000

to 2010, the Hispanic and Asian-American populations both increased 43%, and the

African American population increased 12.3%. (<http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-02.pdf> “Overview of Race and Hispanic Origin” p.22)

**Higher Education Demographics.**

The shifts in our national population have translated into major changes in the demographic profile of our campuses. The make-up of student enrollment changed dramatically in the last four decades of the 20th Century and the first decade of the 21st Century, as U.S. campuses reported higher proportions of women, minorities and older, non-traditional students. The “Snapshot,” ( put snapshot here) illustrates the presence of racial and ethnic minorities and women on campus in 1976, when I received my PhD, and compares this with their presence 34 years later.

**Women.** Females not only became the majority on campus; they went from 34 %

of post baccalaureate students in 1970, to 59 % in 2009. All women--including women

of color-- have been increasing the number and share of degrees they receive at all levels.

(<http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d11/tables/dt11_215.asp>, Table 215 shows Total

Postbaccalaureate Fall enrollment in degree-granting institutions, by attendance status, sex of student, and control of institution: 1967 through 2010 )

 ([www.nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/tables/table-dcd-2.asp](http://www.nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/tables/table-dcd-2.asp) The Condition of Education 2012)

But despite earning more master’s and doctoral degrees over the last decade, women still lag in their representation in the Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM), fields which traditionally been dominated by men. Between 1999-and 2010 the number of women who earned degrees in engineering and related technologies, and in computer and information sciences, increased but, women still received only about a quarter of the degrees awarded. (The Condition of Education 2012, Indicator 39, Graduate Fields of Study, etc.)

However, by analyzing awards of STEM degrees by generation, the U.S. Department of Commerce found signs of hope that more women will secure degrees in these fields in the future. “What we find is that younger generations of women are more likely to major in STEM fields than are women in previous generations.” In the Baby Boomer generation, born from 1945 to 1964, they found that 26.2 percent of STEM degree-holders were women. In each successive generation, the percent increased, with the highest number for “millennial” born between 1980 and 1984.

(U.S Department of Commerce Economic Briefing, April 24, 2012, <http://www.esa.doc.gov/print/Blog/2012/04/24/economic-briefing-april-24-2012-stem-across-%E2%80%9Cgenderations%E2%80%9D> )

**Racial and Ethnic Minorities.** Between 1990 and 2009, the number of students identified as racial and ethnic minorities enrollment increased from 22 % to 38% (NCES, Mini-Digest of Educational Statistics 2010 –March 2011—Thomas D. Snyder) Broken down by racial and ethnic group, the increases were:

* Black: nine percent to 14.3%;
* Hispanic 5.7% to 12.5%;
* Asian/Pacific Islander 4.1 to 6.5%;
* American Indian, etc., .7 to one percent.

Another way to view this important demographic shift is to look at the increase in enrollment rates for the traditional U.S. college-age population (18-24 years old) from 1988 to 2008 .Whites increased 31 to 45%; African Americans from 22% to 34%; Hispanics 17% to 28%; (Data for American Indians is only available for a few recent years. ) Comparable data for Asian Americans in that period is also lacking, but in 2008, with 63 %, Asian Americans of traditional college age had the largest enrollment rate of any racial or ethnic group, including whites (Minorities in Higher Education 2010, Mikyung Ryu, ACE P.26.) In the same general period, there was also a commensurate increase in the number of degrees for students of color. But although all minority groups showed significant percentage increases in the number of degrees earned at all levels including Associate, Bachelors, Master and Doctoral levels, in the decade from 1999 to 2010, there are still significant gaps between the rates of increase in different minority groups and, in many cases, between the rates of increase by gender. (<http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/tables/table-dcd-2.asp> , The Condition of Education 2012, Table A-47-2)

**Older Students. W**hen we talk about diversity, historically we tend to talk most about racial and ethnic minorities on campus. However**,** asteady upward trend in the numbers of college students 25 years or older may turn out to be just as important a factor in our changing concept of diversity, and in developing programs and policies to ensure student success. In some institutional types, such as community colleges and urban comprehensive universities, this age group is no longer considered non-traditional. I saw this trend develop in the early 1990s on the City College (CCNY) /CUNY campus where I was President from 1993 to 1999. At that time, the majority of our students were over 25 with families and jobs.

 That number of adult students has continued to rise, with the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) reporting an increase in postsecondary students age 25 or older from 28% in 1970 to 42% in 2010, and projecting it will reach 46% by 2020. <http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d11/tables/dt11_200.asp>. (Digest of Educational Statistics 2011, Table 200).Congruent with the movement to increase college completion across the board, research has shown that current data are inadequate to get a complete picture of the success of these greater numbers of adult, non-traditional students in completing their studies. A 2008 study by the Council for Adult and Experiential Learning concluded that although some institutions have undertaken both better data collection and initiatives to eliminate barriers to older adults’ learning success, “unlike the data available about traditional higher education, consistent and comprehensive data about many aspects of postsecondary education and other adult education options are uneven across states in the U.S. This is because definitions are inconsistent, state assignments of responsibility for adult learning are dissimilar, and states’ willingness and capacity to collect the needed data are varied.” (<http://www.cael.org/pdf/State_Indicators_Monograph.pdf>)

This situation reinforces the importance of campus leadership making a special effort to learn more about this already-large, fast-growing demographic, with its special characteristics (more likely to be employed full-time, supporting a family, etc.), and ensuring that older students do not get left out of our institutional plans.

**Beyond Counting for Diversity**

The confluence of the overall population increase, plus dramatic increases in the share of women, minorities and older students on campuses, prompted almost continuous expansion of the categories that institutions use to define diversity. But to arrive at an operational definition, we need to answer the questions: Who are the higher education students of today? And are we truly capturing their diversity and addressing their diverse needs? The “snapshot” that started off this chapter offers a very general picture of trends over the last four decades, but to really understand what is happening on our campuses, we must also pay attention to the subtleties of the trend data we have as well as how the data are collected.

Some institutions collect data that reflect a true picture of diversity on their campus, but most do not. The most basic data we all have is collected by the federal government, which requires institutions receiving federal support to verify that they do not discriminate by race or ethnicity, gender, country of origin, veterans’ status, or against students with disabilities.

 As federal legislation required increasing attention to the needs of all disabled students, institutions also were required to pay more attention to their attendance and needs. The federal government’s most recent data, for 2008-2009, shows that institutions enrolled approximately 707,000 students with disabilities, of whom about half were attending 2–year institutions. The data are broken down by type of disability, and institutions also reported on the types of programs they have instituted to serve the needs of these students. It is not possible to identify detailed longer-term trends on student disability, because data collected previously is not compatible with those collected for 2008—09. However, gathering this information about disabled students is a good example of the approach that we should take in the future on all of our campuses, for all of our students (<http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2011/2011018.pdf> Students with Disabilities at Degree-Granting Postsecondary Institutions, First Look: **June 2011, Kimberley Raue, Laurie Lewis)** By identifying a student’s special needs---whether they be for a note-taker in class, accessibility for a wheelchair, etc., an institution is in the best position to provide the ingredients the student needs to be a successful student.

As we strive to describe our students in an accurate and nuanced way, another issue that deserves more examination is how international students are counted. Of course they should be included in an overall summary of diversity on a particular campus. But the needs of both internationally and domestically diverse students can get masked or lost in the broad categories such as “Asian” or Black, or Hispanic.” Even combining diverse domestic groups of racial minorities into the same category can be misleading. On the University of California Riverside (UCR) campus where I am based, we use the term Asian-Pacific American, but it is problematic because the term includes at least 12 different ethnic and cultural domestic groups that get masked or made invisible by this process. General data of the sort collected by the Census or what institutions are required to collect for the government, do not tell the whole story.

The basic data the government requires campuses to collect should only be the beginning of our data collecting. To fully understand and define the diversity of our students, we must also disaggregate the data on each of our campuses. The following example from UC Riverside shows why the choice of which numbers to count can be extremely important. *US News and World Report* has named UCR one of the top five most diverse Research I Universities in the United States (http://www.ucr.edu/about/ranks.html) We are very proud of that designation. But because we also want to focus on student success, a few years ago we set out to serve each and every one of our students in as specialized a way as we could through our honors programs, our first-year learning communities, and our undergraduate student research initiatives. Here is what we found out about who are students really were when we disaggregated the data to find out how well we were doing with our programs:

* Nearly one- third of our Black students were immigrants from other countries
* Hispanic students represented a dozen different Spanish-speaking countries and cultures
* Asian Americans (39%) represented 19 different ethnic groups and cultures.
* Even among Euro-American students (22%) we found a diversity of class, religious and regional differences that are not evident at first glance.

* In addition, we found that nearly half of all of our undergraduate students are the first in their families to attend a university; and many more of them than we were aware of had to work off campus at the time they were studying. So, class is a very salient issue for us as well.

(Does this data need to be updated? Should we mention the year?)

We are still learning today in 2013 from this kind of disaggregation that we cannot make assumptions about who our students are by just looking at the gross numbers. UCR is lucky to have the diversity of enrollment that other institutions are trying to achieve. But we must move beyond the numbers if we are to truly embrace diversity as an institutional value that underpins the entire campus living and learning environment. As one of our faculty members, Dr. Vorris Nunley has said on numerous occasions, “UC Riverside must move beyond body-count diversity.”

There are several reasons why it is so important to look beyond the gross, superficial statistics on our students, staff and faculty:

* First and foremost, we cannot serve our students well unless we know who they are. Institutions can all too easily fall into assumptions that the life experiences and educational needs of all members of a broadly-defined group are the same.
* Knowing who our students are, we have a better opportunity to create the optimal environment that they will need to be successful;
* It makes sense economically to know exactly where to put developmental or supplemental dollars in these tight fiscal times. Also, we can reassure students and their parents that we are clear about our educational priorities, and how we plan to leverage their tuition dollars to offer an education that will provide them with optimal opportunities to learn in a diverse learning environment.
* The research shows that a diverse student body in and of itself brings value to the learning experience of all the students. (Hurtado 2010) Thus it is important to embrace diversity as a two –way street. Our institutions must learn to view students not as empty vessels to be filled, but in anthropological terms, as bringing their own “funds of knowledge” to the campus. Finding ways to empower students to participate in their own learning is a positive way to let students know that they do not have “to leave their culture and identity at the door when they enter our institutions.”
* While many undergraduate programs have quite diverse enrollments, diversity at the graduate level at these same institutions is more elusive (as at UC Riverside). We pride ourselves on our undergraduate diversity, but have only recently begun to disaggregate the data and to critically examine, why our undergraduate domestic diversity is not translating into more diversity in some of our Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) graduate programs and departments.

Our experience at UCR suggests that disaggregating the data on your students will reveal to you both what you know and a lot about what you thought you knew. Hopefully, complemented by use of focus groups and ethnographic data gathering, this disaggregation of data will provide some understanding of why there are disparities, and what needs to be done to remedy them Ethnographic data gathering is an anthropological technique that gives one the opportunity to get to know the people and the environment in the people in those large data sets live everyday. It is a way to take large data sets and make meaning of those numbers by focusing on a smaller sample of people to ask follow up questions, and to actually observe them in what they are doing. For example, California has a 3- tiered higher education system called *The Master Plan of Higher Education.* In this plan the University of California is charged with providing doctoral education for all students; the California State University provides education for the master’s and bachelor’s degrees, and community colleges are supposed to provide the first two years of college as well as vocational, technical and professional training in some fields. But in reality the system does not work as proactively as it should to ensure sure that there is diversity at all levels of higher education. ( see Smelser 2010, Callan 2012)). Disaggregation of data by race/ethnicity, gender class, sexual orientation and age across all three sectors would be a step in that direction.

**Developing an Operational Definition of Diversity**

One of the questions that I am asked when I visit a campus as a keynote speaker or a workshop organizer for senior administrators or for faculty groups around diversity is: “What is diversity?” The implication is they’re requesting a definition, “so we can get on with implementing ‘it.’ ” I explain there is no simple definition that I carry around in my head, because it is different for each institution. So in these sessions, we quickly get into a discussion about the many dimensions and the flexibility of the term as it relates to their own core values and institutional goals..

One of these discussions occurred at a regional conference our university convened in 1997 at CCNY to host a dozen or so campuses that were receiving funds from the Ford Foundation to implement their programs at the time. In an open session, the foundation project officer of the Campus Diversity Initiative (CDI), Dr. Edgar Beckham, refused to provide a simple definition. The audience was a bit miffed that the person who conceived the program for The Ford Foundation would not share his own definition of diversity. Dr. Beckham told the audience that he did not have a pat definition because he did not want campuses to be limited by that definition. What he did say to the audience is: “ I cannot tell you what it is, but key elements of it include an open environment for dialogue, a culture of tolerance and respect, and engagement across faculty, staff and administrators, and some kind of reward structure ( especially for faculty) for those people who put quality time and effort into the enterprise.”

 So, like my colleague Dr. Beckham, I do not have a single definition either. But based on my own experience of decades of doing work in the field, I do have some suggestions of key factors that should be considered in developing a statement reflecting the campus’ definition of diversity. These suggestions are based on my belief that the statement be more than just words: It should be a commitment to ultimate institutional change and even transformation. Here are my thoughts:

* The definition must be **organic**, that is it must come from a process of commitment and discovery that involves the whole campus. The definition for any particular campus should be the product of discussion, dialogue, contestation and ultimately an agreement on principles to guide the work to be done. The process of arriving at a common definition is as important as the product that comes out of the process. The maximization of the benefits of diversity on a particular campus will be much more effective if you and your colleagues have taken the journey together.
* For me, the definition is inextricably tied to notions of **excellence**. My entire career has been spent in institutions of higher education as a change agent, so I have witnessed the synergy that occurs in institutions and people within those institutions when they speak of excellence and diversity together. (See Chapter 2 for a detailed discussion.) Diversity and excellence are twin core values that should permeate all aspects of campus life, including but not limited to student and faculty demographics, research, curriculum, and campus climate. (Subsequent chapters of this book demonstrate how to make the links from the level of values, to curriculum and programs and to operations.)
* The process must acknowledge the intransigence of cultural change and culture shift. Your institution took a long time to get the way that it is. Even if everyone says they are on board about the kinds of shifts that have to take place around diversity, real change is going to take time, persistence and leadership from all levels. (Chapter 3 focuses on the leadership issue.)
* One bit of advice that I give institutions above all is: “Get to know yourself all over again.” It is true that it is important to know and understand the meaning behind the student, faculty and staff numbers, titles, organizational structures and programs. It is just as important to understand the multiple cultural value systems that are at work on your campus. This requires seeking answers to questions such as: What do these cultural value systems look like? Is there a personnel hierarchy? How does it work? Who is privileged to engage in this work and who is not? Who gets to decide what diversity is, and whose voices are left out? To do a good job, leaders must look at their institution with fresh eyes. Think about this as anthropological fieldwork whose purpose is to understand what the culture(s) of your institution is, so that you can build on that culture(s) for the change you want to see. You may make assumptions about the institution, think that you know it…but to be successful, you should suspend your assumptions and start looking at the institution as if you were an outsider.

**Diversity and Mission Statements**

One of the ways an institution can work toward developing—and committing to -- its own definition of diversity is to craft mission and goals statements that speak specifically to diversity as a core value.Such statements are one of the most common, public ways of communicating priorities and even creating the image of a college or university that you want to aspire to be. Experts and individual higher education leaders may justifiably disagree on the form or the potential impact of a mission statement and related statements on goals. But the fact is that, when arrived at through an inclusive, collective process on campus, at their most effective, these types of statements can be “an authentic way of saying what’s important about an institution. An explanation of what you do and why you do it," according to University of Rochester Provost Ralph W. Kuncl.
(<http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2011/06/20/colleges_pare_down_mission_statements_to_stand_out>

 This process of building campus-wide consensus on the document can pave the way for

solidifying internal support for implementing the mission, for attracting students who find

that the mission is congruent with their personal goals—and for defining the meaning of

diversity in the context of a particular institution. If we accept the principle that mission

and goals statements can be both useful and important to an institution, and if we agree

that maximizing the benefits of diversity should be an integral part of the institution’s

mission, then it follows that the statement and/or accompanying statements of the

campus’ goals should reflect this priority.

 I have been a part of processes of crafting the mission statements and goals

for our campuses strategic planning Document : “ UCR 2020 “ on my campus , UC Riverside, and I have reviewed statements of a

variety of other institutions, private and public, large and small, community and liberal

arts colleges, and research universities. Excerpts from some of the statements I’ve

encountered appear in the box on page\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

 **At UCR,**

My involvement in the strategic visioning process for the “UCR 2020” process is as a faculty member and as an administrator. When I came to UC Riverside in 2003, the tagline for the university was , “A University of Distinction and Diversity,” But it was not clear, other than that statement what the connection was between distinction and diversity. The word diversity did not appear again in that statement.

But in the current “UCR 2020 “ strategic plan, diversity is one of four “strategic goals,” for the entire university and the other three goals (academic excellence, access and engagement) are clearly related. The current plan articulates areas in which the campus will work toward each of the four goals. It is aspirational, but it is aspirational on the institutional leve, championed by the Chancellor. The almost nationally unique situation of UC Riverside, a Research I Uuniversity, where 73% of the students are from traditional racial or ethnic minorities, has influenced the types of goals we chose and the strategies to achieve them . We believe that these strategies are especially appropriate to this campus. For example, given the fact that we are a Research I university, with a diverse student undergraduate population one of our goals to to me intentional about developing a robust graduate student population to help to fuel the next generation of diverse PHDs, not just for Cslifornia, but for the nation. In addition, we want to turn the research lense on ourselves to see what it is like to live, work and create new knowledge in a truly diversde learning environment ( at least from the perspective of the undergraduate students..) Diversifying the faculty , staff and management is an aspiration for us as well as for other institutions across the country.

 **CCNY/ The City University of New York**

**--**My role during my presidency at CCNY from 1993 to 1999 was to help provide the leadership for the reassessment and reinterpretation of the mission of the college. CCNY has one of the strongest place based missions of any institution that I have had the pleasure to work with. It was started in 1847 as the “free academy of the children of poor people and immigrants in the city of New York. Whern I go there in 1993 the college was going through budget crisies and on the table was whether or not the University would change its mission. We decided not to, and the board decided not to. This is the current mission statement from City College in 2013:

**-** The City College of New York, the flagship college of The City University of New York, is a comprehensive teaching, research, and service institution dedicated to accessibility and excellence in undergraduate and graduate education. Requiring demonstrated potential for admission and a high level of accomplishment for graduation, the College provides a diverse student body with opportunities to achieve academically, creatively, and professionally in the liberal arts and sciences and in professional fields such as engineering, education, architecture, and biomedical education. The College is committed to fostering student-centered education and advancing knowledge through scholarly research. As a public university with public purposes, it also seeks to contribute to the cultural, social, and economic life of New York.

[**http://www1.ccny.cuny.edu/prospective/aboutus/index.cfm**](http://www1.ccny.cuny.edu/prospective/aboutus/index.cfm)

CCNY has both a mission statement and a vision statement. The most important institutional characteristic of CCNY is its historical “open-door” policy for academically qualified New York residents, which over the years has generated an increasingly racially and ethnically diverse student body. The mission and vision statement together, signal CCNY’s commitment to go beyond access to provide their students with opportunities for high/excellent achievement. Part of my job was to convince older alumni that excellence and equity were both on the same saide of the equation.

Summary re other statements

These two examples from the University of California, Riverside, and from the City College of New York/CUNY and the excerpts from a variety of institutions on the sidebar on page \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_offer examples of the variety of ways that institutions approach internal and external expressions of their commitment to diversity in thir mission and vision statements and their goals for achieving that commitment to diversity and excellence.

But there are many other models. For example, anyone who approaches the Miami Dade College website cannot miss the simple, statement on the home page that it the “most diverse college in the nation.” This prominent, declarative statement both appears to promise a strong welcome to existing and future students of diverse backgrounds, and a sense that their presence is a crucial factor in the institution’s identity. Dartmouth College, an Ivy League institution where one-third of the students are members of racial or ethnic minorities, stresses the importance of diversity to enhancing the quality of education offered. In its statements, DePaul University, a Catholic institution, signals that despite its origins in one religion, the institution “affirms the central place of diversity in the university’s mission and institutional culture.”

But as eloquent as these mission statements are, in the end, these types of documents are only two-dimensional, static words that sit on paper unless they are activated, animated and made to come alive on behalf of the institution. To make such statements truly meaningful, institutions need to go the next step to ensure that the words reflect in a very real way a commitment to a way of knowing and being and to a vision, goals and an action plan for wanting to be better. Institutions should also focus on what has been achieved, or I should say is beingachieved –because the process is always ongoing. There should be a link between the mission, its goals and purposes, and the daily life on the campus at all levels. In later chapters this book offers a roadmap for institutions that want to truly link a meaningful commitment to diversity to implementing their institutional goals and purposes.

**Looking to our Future**

The Census Bureau envisions a U.S. population that will become increasingly

diverse in the coming decades. Census predicts that by 2050, the U.S. will have a

“majority minority” population. In 2010 the share of the minority population became 33%. The share of minorities in the United States is expected to grow to 5 4% by 2020.

 The Hispanic population is projected to triple by 2050 , and will account

for the majority of the growth, to become fully 30% of the national total. The number of

Asian-Americans is projected to increase from the current five percent to more than nine

Percent and the Black population from 14% to 15%. Representation of American Natives

and Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander populations, as well as

people who identify themselves as being of two or more races, are all expected to

increase as well. (<http://www.census.gov/newsroom/releases/archives/population/cb08-123.html> , press release, An Older and More Diverse Nation by Midcentury, Aug. 4, 2008)

(<http://www.census.gov/population/www/projections/summarytables.html>, National Population Projections, released 2008 and as of Sept., 2012, confirmed as the most current.)

In sum, we know that the U.S. population will be pluralistic, and that we all want to keep our democratic country and its people educated and participating in civil society, healthy , vibrant and competitive in the global and hopefully sustainable world. We also know that the cornerstone of any successful democracy is ultimately, the education of its citizens. Colleges and universities in this country are the portals to producing this educated citizenry. But does a diverse and pluralistic nation in terms of numbers translate into the same demographics in higher education for all of these groups? What do these overall population projections augur for the increase of diverse students and faculty in the academy during this same time period?

**Campus demographics.** The Census Bureau projects that with a more diverse

overall population will come a more diverse student population in higher education; particularly if we are intentional about making it happen. Current projections are only available through 2020, but they give us a good idea of what to expect. Non-white students will account for the majority of a 17% increase in enrollment by 2020. Hispanic enrollment is expected to increase by 46%, followed by both Black and Asian/Pacific Islander at 25% each, White at one percent and American Indian or Alaskan Native, a decrease of one percent.

Current trends in the gender and age of our students would also continue in the decade from 2010 to 2020. Enrollment of men is expected to rise by 9% percent, and of women, by 19% . On average, the age of enrolled students will continue to rise. NCES predicts enrollment will increase by 9% for 18-24-year-olds; 21% for 25- to 34-year-olds, and 16% for students age 35 or older. (<http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d11/tables/dt11_200.asp>. (Digest of Educational Statistics 2011, Table 200)

 These trends are also expected to create ripple effects in the diversity of higher education faculty and staff; again if we are intentional in making it happen. As discussed earlier, currently, faculty and professional staff on U.S. campuses are much less diverse than the student bodies tend to be particularly in predominately white institutions. ( PWI. In fall, 2009, all minorities together totaled some 18% of the faculty in colleges and universities in the United States. The breakdown includes 8% Asian Pacific Islander, 5% Black, 3.8% Hispanic, and less than one percent American Indian/Alaskan Native. Of the full-time instructional faculty, 57% were males and 43%, females (Hussar and ***Bailey***, 2011) ...” Minorities were 19% of all ***s***taff, including faculty, professional and nonprofessional.

#### (<http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=61> Fast Facts: Race/ethnicity of

#### College Faculty)

A 2003 survey by NCES—the most recent data available-- found that among faculty age 55 to 64, half expected to retire between the ages of 60 and 65. The same study found that among that age 45 to 54, 20% expected to retire within 11 -15 years and another 22%, in 16-20 years. (<http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2007/2007157.pdf> Institutional Policies and Practices Regarding Postsecondary Faculty, First Look: Fall, 2003) These plans suggest “an unprecedented number of retirements and departures from colleges and universities nationwide,” **(**TIAA CREF Institute: Advancing Higher Education: Regenerating the Faculty Workforce: A Significant Leadership Challenge and a Public Policy Concern, Valerie Martin Conley: 2008). The combination of the anticipated increase in minority student enrollment in higher education and pending retirements could further accelerate a trend, already documented, toward increasing the share of minority faculty and staff on many campuses.

As the economy improves, the retirement of these large numbers of faculty offers us a two-pronged opportunity to enhance faculty diversity: 1) an opportunity to be deliberate about strategically creating a pipeline of undergraduate, graduate, postdocs, and newly minted PhDs to replace our retiring colleagues; 2) and an opportunity to recruit more diverse faculty and administrators and prepare them for working with the larger, more diverse population.

**The Challenges of Diversity**

The historical perspective I have offered in this chapter shows a fluid and expansive definition of the crucial concept of diversity in higher education. The definition originated in the segregated educational, political and social/cultural system in which “diverse” encompassed a relatively simple racial distinction between blacks (or persons of color) and whites. Over some 150 years, as a result of cultural and social changes reflected in changing laws, policies, demographics, and social cultural norms the generally accepted definition we use on campus today encompasses many more parameters, including religion, country of origin, disability, age and sexual preference.(Goodman, Moses and Jones 2012)

The definition has also expanded to encompass a holistic view of how a campus should function--—as an entity in which the promise of diversity goes way beyond access, to acknowledge the benefits of diversity for all who are involved in the collegial process; whether students, faculty or staff. The challenge of implementing a commitment to the value of diversity and inclusion is to tie it to other core values of the instititution , and to make it resonate and become leveraged as an institutional aspiration made real through policies and practices, programs, curriculum, the living environment, as well as through the institution’s administration and staffing (at all levels).

 At a time of severe financial constraints, diversity work will be difficult if it is treated as a set of programs that can be cut off when money gets tight. As resources shrink, it becomes all the more important to frame the diversity issue as a core values issue. Even in tough budget times, an institution does not tuen its back on its core values. It will be important to have the campus wide conversation about the meaning of diversity in yout institution. It is the role of leaders in the institution to provide spaces for these very important conversations. The promise of diversity is that it must be moved to the center of the campus mission, it cannot and should not be seen as an “add-on” to be discarded if and when “the money runs out.” These kinds of conversations are often stressful, but ultimately very productive on campuses, especially if the conversations result in establishing long-term institutional goals and priorities, and linking them as priorities to existing resources. ( references here)

This is not easy work. But on campuses across the country, many have begun and are making progress. There is also ample evidence to show that embracing diversity benefits everyone in the instuitution( references here) and makes institutions strong, and makes those that are stron even stronger( references here). To make progress, institutions must realize that diversity is not just a stand-alone concept, but is an essential component of academic excellence. In the next chapter I will review examples of how scholars, institutional leaders and stakeholders have defined and continue to grapple with linking the value of diversity with the value of excellence. I hope to offer examples of what is being done as well as what is possible for institutions to do as they move forward with the incremental, but ultimately transformative change that can ,will and do occur when we link diversity to other core values of the academy.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Query on whether to use technical, legal form of citation for court cases:

Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954)(This was used as example in the APA style book)