March 23, 2010

M E M O R A N D U M

To: Robert C. Dynes, Chancellor, UCSD

From: Diversity Ad hoc Planning Committee

RE: Findings from the 2002-03 Diversity Activities and Summit

The members of the Diversity Ad Hoc Planning Committee would first like to thank you for your support of the Diversity Council's recommendation to establish campus wide diversity efforts.

We have found through this ten month process that innovative and collective efforts are possible and do produce positive results. We hope that this model can be replicated in the future.

Enclosed is a brief overview of the committee's thoughts and findings as well as the complete report given to us by Dr. Allen and his associates. Several findings and ideas are put forth that the committee encourages the University to investigate and implement. We also invite you to discuss with us our findings and recommendations. We would like to continue to be involved with this important topic as future plans and ideas come forth.

Thank you again for your support in the formation of this committee. We hope for a strong partnership as we take this information and begin to plan and develop recommendations.

Introduction to Ad Hoc Committee Findings

Imagine diversity at UCSD.

Imagine diversity as being a fundamental component, valued next to research, education and public service. Imagine diversity as a means to declare UCSD's continued success, and to further establish its national identity.

UCSD, from its inception, has been known for innovation and risk-taking. Today top researchers and scientists at UCSD speak about the value of diversity within their fields of study. Imagine a similar acumen, among all administrators, faculty, staff, and students, in discussing the value of diversity within their University community.

Imagine diversity as a value, a goal, and an ideal. Imagine systemic, strategic initiatives that utilize measurable outcomes as evidence for continuous organization-wide improvement to facilitate success in UCSD's diversity goals.

Imagine long-term public support for UCSD, garnered through its focus on diversity. Diversity becomes a concurrent trademark, in line with our trademark success in biotechnology, with over a third of the region's biotech companies spun off from UCSD. The benefits of diversity pipelines from UCSD into industry and the local community

Imagine diversity at UCSD.

The visioning process for the future began many years ago, and most recently rests in the work of the Chief Diversity Office and the Diversity Council and through this, the Diversity Ad Hoc Planning Committee.

Background

In July 2000, the Diversity Council recommended to Chancellor Dynes the creation of a planning committee to program diversity related events at UCSD and to include the Medical Center and Scripps Institution of Oceanography. This recommendation created the Diversity Ad Hoc Planning Committee with representatives from all Vice Chancellor areas, Associated Students, Graduate Student Associations and the UCSD Staff Association. Our charge was to work in conjunction with other campus organizations/entities to coordinate annual campus wide diversity activities. The committee addressed this charge through a series of activities around diversity and community.

For 2002-03 "Building Community" was the major theme for the activities listed below.

- In Fall 2002, the committee hosted a series of six roundtable discussions involving over 60 students, staff, faculty, alumni and San Diego community members to ascertain thoughts and ideas around community building and diversity (see supplemental materials).
- A mini-grant fund was also created to support campus-wide events, programs and activities that celebrate diversity and focus on community building at UCSD. We received over 35 applications from academic departments, student organizations, staff groups and the Medical Center. Of the 35 grants submitted 6 grants were funded.
- Contracted the services of Dr. Walter Allen (UCLA) and his associates from around the country who research effective strategies for universities to enact regarding community building and diversity.
- Campus wide diversity calendar featuring events from all segments of UCSD

- In Winter 2003, UCSD hosted a Diversity Summit with Dr. Allen's team and the UCSD community with over 200 staff, students and faculty in attendance.
- Received a detailed report outlining findings from the Allen group (see enclosed Allen report)

Outcomes

Triumphs

- The nature of the committee charge and our process itself created opportunity for community building across university lines.
- Staff internship through Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) was invaluable to the logistic and operational aspects of the ten month process.
- The committee put together a series of activities with the thought toward data collection, evaluation and community building in each phase of the planning process.
- Having a direct connection to the Chancellor's office helped make the event truly campus-wide.
- Funding for events gave the committee a good sense of the scope and breath that were adequate to cover our planned activities.

Challenges

- Decentralized nature of campus event planning and publicity made it difficult to effectively use points of entry to all segments particularly engagement with faculty and upper-level administration. An example of this could be seen in protocol difficulties with use of UCSD logo and the myriad of offices that needed to approve various documents and language.
- Lack of campus wide discourse or common language of diversity and community building hindered the program planning process.
- Difficulty in infusing diversity projects by committee and the ad hoc nature of activities gave the process a 'transient and impermanent' feel (i.e. What will happen to findings? Who will be in charge of seeing the projects to the next step?).
- Much of the roundtable discussions pointed to the need to move beyond the individual idea of diversity to a more systemic campus value for diversity.
- Current campus perception of diversity as an individual problem frustrated efforts to see practical, campus-wide solutions.
- Un-clear role with regard to Diversity Council caused some concern; specifically, the work of the committee under the auspice of the Council or a separate body.

Major Findings

It is important to note that the Allen Group's report included data gathered from three phases: 1) the fall quarter roundtables of faculty, staff, students, and community members 2), the stakeholder meetings(of which there were four), and 3) the summit itself. A number of consistent themes were heard across all activities..

- Dr. Allen's team gave high marks to the innovative way the committee had set up its process to infuse community building throughout our activities.
- The team also felt that the campus was taking a positive step in our efforts to move to a more systemic evaluation of campus climate and diversity.
- The team also stated that there has been an impressive array of individual and group efforts; they commented that this is clearly a campus that has struggled with the issue of diversity and has tried via the ad hoc committee to address these issues.

However, the most critical, consistent themes that emerged throughout the process were the perception of a lack of institutional commitment and accountability for diversity at UCSD. Members from all segments of the campus community perceived various manifestations of this lack of commitment:

- The failure to operationally institutionalize the Principles of Community in a consistent and visible way. During many of the discussions participants asked pointedly, 'How are the principles practiced at UCSD?'

- As noted in more than one place in the report, the current system of Chancellor as Chief Diversity Officer, while holding symbolic value, actually contributes to the lack of accountability for diversity outcomes.

- Campus leaders/administrators that see diversity as a cost rather than a value. This approach appears to reflect the lack of knowledge among campus leadership regarding diversity because of their mono-cultural, Eurocentric professional socialization. In turn, this contributes to a leadership that conceptualizes diversity only on an individual rather than systemic basis.

- Fragmentation and lack of communication across segments of campus (faculty, staff, and students). This is manifested in a system of "shared governance" that largely excludes staff and students.

- The college system that also contributes to fragmentation, particularly in diversity initiatives.

- A campus community (faculty, staff, and students) that reads its cues from campus leadership and is largely uncommitted to diversity.

- A lack of consensus among the campus community as to the definitions of both diversity and community.

- The lack of a central entity (with appropriate authority and resources) that places a sustained focused effort on diversity initiatives and assessment. The lack of a central entity to monitor and address racial harassment and a racially hostile climate.

- The constant "recycling" of diversity issues with inadequate, uninformed assessment of what is needed and subsequent failure to implement effective models.

- The vague role of the Chancellor's Diversity Council and lack of campus understanding of its role.

Again, there is a perception that there are no accountability processes or procedures in place currently, thus making the diversity initiative hollow. Due to the lack of any institutional processes in place and the perception that all diversity initiatives are temporary and might change tomorrow, accountability issues pose major barriers (p. 14).

It would appear that all these barriers are impacted negatively by the lack of institutional commitment to diversity that comes across so urgently and consistently in the perceptions documented in this report. This reflects negatively and has enormous implications for the campus, as the literature on successful diversity efforts describes such an institutional commitment as an indispensable element:

> Comprehensive commitment to the value and significance of campus diversity is a key, the research suggests, to the effectiveness of diversity initiatives. This commitment must pervade the institution from senior administrators through faculty and staff; it must be both communicated and demonstrated to students. It cannot be solely the work of the student affairs staff, a small group of faculty, or those who are directly served by diversity programs. Students have alert antennae that readily distinguish between lip service and pervasive values. **Throughout the research literature, we have uncovered consistent, positive outcomes for students who perceive that their campus has made a strong commitment to the value of diversity** (Smith and Associates, Diversity Works: The Emerging Picture of How Students Benefit, 1997, p. 39, emphasis added).

This issue of institutional commitment and how it is convincingly demonstrated (in part through strong accountability measures) is probably the report's most poignant finding.

Recommended Next Steps

Dr. Allen's team identified several key action items, all of which are important and reflect keen observations of UCSD's areas of improvement with regard to diversity initiatives (page 16 of report). The Committee feels that three of the recommendations require special attention and can make significant strides in our pursuit of diversity as an institution

- First, the creation of the position of a **Chief Diversity Officer** (CDO) is the one action item that stands out in its significance, urgency and broad impact on all other action items listed.

  This current report, the findings, recommendations and concerns highlighted in eight previous task force reports (created over a period of eight years), and the ineffectiveness of the currently active work groups and committee's indicate that this campus needs to develop an office that has the authority, power and the responsibility to "assess, program, and provide oversight and accountability, thus supporting the Chancellor in his role and advancing the work of the campus constituencies". The lack of accountability in all matters related to diversity seems to be at the core of UCSD's failure to make significant strides in all matters of diversity. The creation of a CDO office would achieve this accountability because it is the institutionalization of the efforts currently assumed by standing and ad hoc committees populated with temporary members (see page 9-10 of Allen report)

- Secondly, during these times of financial constraints and budgetary limitations, it is essential to pay close attention to the implications (short term and long term) of actions that affect any of the facets of diversity.

  Preparation of our students for life in the 21st century through an education by a Research University located in Southern California must take place in an environment that is diverse in a rich variety of ways and that reflects the depth of diversity of our contemporary society. A very substantial portion of our curriculum is enhanced by the discourse made possible by the heterogeneous backgrounds of our students. Equally, a significant part of education in our institutions takes place outside the classroom, in extracurricular activities where students learn how to work together, as well as to compete; how to exercise leadership, as well as to build consensus. If our institutional capacity to bring together a genuinely diverse group of students is removed--or severely reduced--then the quality and texture of the education we provide will be significantly diminished.

- Last, but not least, we need to engage the campus in discussions that explore the meaning of diversity. A naïve reader of the document might interpret 'diversity' very narrowly as solely defined by race and ethnicity. Next steps can only be effective if there is a common understanding of the meaning of diversity.

Action Items

While the Allen Group's report included several recommendations for instituting campus wide efforts for diversity, the committee identified action items that we feel should be given priority. We have categorized them within short term and long term timelines.

Short term

- The creation of a new Office of Institutional Initiatives and Assessment with a faculty director and administrative coordinator. This office would be housed under the Chancellor's Office and would report directly to the Chancellor as the Chief Diversity Officer.
- It is recommended that the current Diversity Council form the steering committee to create this office and that it remain an advisory council to its director. Target date for the start of the new position is July of 2004.
- Form an assessment subcommittee within the Diversity Council to perform a campus wide diversity assessment. This assessment should lead toward a campus wide diversity plan by Summer 2005
- Begin planning process to hire a campus diversity officer who has resources and authority to put forth diversity initiatives and assessment and to pull all segments together on a campus diversity plan

Long term

- Develop an institutional definition of diversity, which would be embedded in the campus wide diversity plan. Clarify the meaning of "diversity" within our campus context, not having a clear definition more often than not reduces diversity to only encompass racial and ethnic issues.
- Identify ways to embed diversity as an institutional value.
- Invite Allen group back to assess progress on recommendations. Target date Fall 2006,

We hope that identifying key recommendations and providing a timeline for completion will facilitate the accomplishment of our long term and short term goals.

NAME	AREA	PHONE	MAILCODE/ ADDRESS	E-mail
Phyllis Coleman	Chancellor's Office	40405	0005	pcoleman@ucsd.edu
Paula Doss	Business Affairs	43694	0923	pdoss@ucsd.edu
Dean Drake	Academic Affairs	46703	0502	pdrake@ucsd.edu
Sonny Ellis-McCauley	Medical Center	290-2726 (beeper)	8843	X33762
Lou Felix	School of Medicine	41501	0602	lfelix@ucsd.edu
Ross Frank	Diversity Council	46646	0522	rfrank@ucsd.edu
Dennis Girardot	SIO	46364	0234	dgirardot@ucsd.edu
Ashanti Houston-Hands	Council of Deans	44390	0509	ashouston@ucsd.edu
Loevinger, Nancy	Women's Center	20074	0096	nloevinger@ucsd.edu
Catherine Medrano	Associated Students	(858) 320-0481	9450 Gilman Drive #921537 La Jolla CA 92092-1537	cathym14@yahoo.com
Kyra Randall	External Relations	21537	0937	krandall@ucsd.edu
Catherine Salsman	Graduate Student Association	22477	0358	catherin@chem.ucsd.edu
Marcia Strong	UCSD Staff Association	40496	0078	mstrong@ucsd.edu
TBD	Graduate Studies & Research			
Travers, Shaun	LGBT Resource Office	23493	0023	rainbow@ucsd.edu
Irma Martinez Velasco	Consultant	46862	0005	imartinez@ucsd.edu
Patrick Velasquez	Student Affairs	41467	0045	pvelasquez@ucsd.edu
Gabriele Wienhausen	Provost	25951	0054	gwienhausen@ucsd.edu
Sonya Woods	Resource Mgmt & Planning	43691	0057	slwoods@ucsd.edu
Staff				
Edwina Welch	Cross-Cultural Center	49689	0053	ewelch@ucsd.edu
Jocille Flores	Diversity Committee Intern	43290	0354	jflores@physics.ucsd.edu
Charlene Martinez	Cross-Culture Center	49689	0053	ccmartinez@ucsd.edu
Nancy Magpusao	Cross-Cultural Center	49689	0053	nmagpusao@ucsd.edu
Jennifer Dabu	Cross-Cultural Center	4-9689	0053	jdabu@ucsd.edu

Final Report for UCSD Diversity Ad Hoc Planning Committee
February 21, 2003

INTRODUCTION

The Chancellor's Diversity Ad Hoc Planning Committee was created in July 2000 based on a recommendation from the Diversity Council to Chancellor Dynes. The charge of the committee is to plan and implement annual diversity related events in conjunction with other campus organizations at UCSD as well as the Medical Center and Scripps Institute of Oceanography.

The Diversity Ad Hoc Planning Committee chose "Building Community" as the major theme of its activities for the 2002-2003 academic year building on the UCSD's Principles of Community.

The Diversity Ad Hoc Planning Committee contacted UCLA Professor Walter Allen to help develop the diversity activity for February 2003. In the Fall of 2002, the Committee hosted a series of six roundtable discussions involving over sixty students, staff, faculty, alumni and San Diego community members to explore issues and gather ideas about community building and diversity. After consultation, we agreed on an alternative to the previous single-speaker format (Dr. Julienne Malveaux and Dr. Daryl Smith had lectured previously). It was also agreed that the Diversity Ad Hoc Planning Committee would provide Dr. Allen with background material and statistics about UCSD. The Principles of Community, UCSD diversity demographics, and materials generated from the roundtables were shared with Dr. Allen to assist in the preparation for the February activity. Dr. Allen organized a team of researchers and diversity specialists and together, with the support of the Diversity Ad Hoc Planning Committee, a series of meetings with key UCSD stakeholders were planned for February 6 and a Community Diversity Summit was developed for February 7 as the committee's annual diversity activity. This report summarizes the activities of these two days and concludes with a series of recommendations resulting from a documents review of past reports, current activities and feedback from key stakeholders over the course of the two-day sessions.

AGENDA – FEBRUARY 6 AND 7

Based on the information presented to Dr. Allen's team, an inclusive approach wherein key stakeholders could give input and feedback around diversity issues was mandated for the two-day visit. In addition to information from the UCSD community, it was critical that feedback and information be shared with the UCSD community about salient diversity issues and best practices. As a result of a series of phone conferences between Dr. Allen's team and the Diversity Ad Hoc Planning Committee, the following two-day agenda was developed.

Day 1 – Thursday, February 6

11:30 am – 1:00 pm. Lunch with Ad Hoc Committee to serve as an introductory meeting and to provide an overview of activities planned. This meeting was to be used to discuss with Ad Hoc Committee members pertinent issues regarding diversity initiatives at UCSD.

1:15 pm – 5:30 pm. Four concurrent stakeholder meetings were held to provide a venue for sharing information gathered from roundtables and to receive feedback and input from these stakeholders:

1. Meetings with Associate Students, Graduate Student Association, Community Centers and Student Affirmative Action Committee
2. Meetings with Student Quality of Life Workgroup, Student Office for Human Relations, Office of Instructional Support and Academic Services, Academic Enrichment Programs, Office of Graduate Studies and Research, Student Office for Leadership and Organizations

3. Meetings with Vice Chancellors, Academic Deans and Council of Provosts
4. Meetings with Human Resources Staff, Staff Association Chairs, and Quality of Work Life Office

6:00 pm – 10:00 pm. Meetings of Dr. Allen's team to share information gathered in the stakeholder meetings and to incorporate information gathered from Day 1 into presentations for the Diversity Summit scheduled for Day 2.

Day 2 – Friday, February 7

Diversity Summit: Culture, Respect, Awareness and Community

11:00 am – 11:10 am	Chancellor's opening remarks
11:10 am – 11:30 am	Ad Hoc Committee provides a summary on their process and the roundtable reports
11:30 am – 12:30 pm	UCLA team presentations

11:30-11:50	Jeff Milem overviews research on achieving campus diversity
11:50-12:10	Grace Carroll introduces concept of affirmative development, a strategy for optimizing returns from campus diversity
12:10-12:25	Marguerite Bonous-Hammarth overviews best practices and institutional goal-setting. She also frames the task to be completed by conference attendees in break-out groups

12:30 pm – 1:15 pm	Facilitators and/or participants assign a note-taker; groups address one of four themed questions at their tables. Part A questions should help participants connect their discussions to model elements when examining diversity issues on campus, and Part B questions should engage participants in goal-setting and action plans to achieve more inclusive communities (see Attachment A).
1:15 pm – 1:45 pm	Break-out groups report back to Town Hall audience
1:45 pm – 2:00 pm	Professor Walter Allen summarizes and closes the session

INDIVIDUAL MEETING SUMMARIES

Each meeting provided rich information, discussion and, at times, debate over key UCSD diversity issues. What follows is a brief summary of each of the sessions held on Day 1 as well as a summary of information from the Diversity Summit on Day 2.

Luncheon Meeting

A dominant theme from these discussions revolved around the costs of diversity at UCSD. The Ad Hoc Committee discussed how their requests for support of diversity initiatives/programs were met with responses from administrators about concerns over cost, with administrators asking where the funding for these initiatives could be found. Not once did we hear anyone talk about the benefits of diversity at UCSD in these initial meetings. Some of those present felt that the campus is doing "the diversity thing" because it is what they are expected to do – not something that they are doing because they want to do it or because they recognize the inherent value of diversity.

There seemed to be a widely held consensus that the Principles of Community adopted by the campus have not been institutionalized. While people know that these principles exist, it is more difficult for them to show evidence of these principles in the day-to-day operation or "practices" of the university. This is not an uncommon phenomenon at many institutions of higher education across the country. While campuses and campus leaders talk about diversity, they often do not fully commit or know how to appropriately enact diversity. Chang, Smith, Milem, Hurtado, et al. and others argue that diversity is transformational. It requires colleges and universities to change themselves in some rather fundamental ways if they are to successfully incorporate diversity into their educational missions. This relates directly to the discussion of the costs versus benefits of diversity mentioned above. Most campus leaders are likely to focus on the costs of diversity because they have never personally been in diverse educational environments that would allow them to realize or actualize some of the benefits of diversity. They grew up in racially homogeneous neighborhoods, attended racially homogeneous schools, colleges, graduate schools, and served as faculty members in academic departments that for the most part were racially homogeneous. Such homogeneous learning environments provide these administrators, faculty and others with embedded benefits that further their individual success but do not consider the group advantages/privileges or barriers to the success of those not benefiting from these embedded advantages.

Another issue raised is there does not appear to be a central place on campus to refer members of the campus community regarding issues of hostile climate or workplace. There does not seem to be a central, prominent mechanism by which students, staff, and faculty can pursue concerns regarding discrimination based upon race, gender, and sexual orientation. While the campus has clearly articulated policy/investigation procedures regarding sexual harassment, it is not clear how issues of race-ethnic/cultural discrimination are/should be pursued. In fact, some staff reported that they were afraid of retaliation if they were to bring concerns of this type forward. To address these issues, it might be a good idea if the campus worked to create a campus human relations code and a clearly defined mechanism for enforcing the code. The University of Maryland's code and reporting system could be helpful as a starting point in considering how best to do this. After it is enacted, strong efforts should be made to publicize the code and the enforcement procedures. This would prevent students and staff from feeling that they are getting the "run-around" when they come forward with an issues concerning racial discrimination or perceptions of hostile work/learning environments due to lack of understanding about diversity issues.

Some of those present felt that they have been here before. They felt the University recycles issues around diversity – continually bringing it up in the form of committees or task forces but never seriously considering the issues and establishing mechanisms for accountability. This accountability theme was prevalent throughout our meetings. There was a perception that the rhetoric for diversity was loud and strong; however, the follow-up or the accountability around diversity issues was virtually non-existent. Consequently, the programs that continue to foster diversity and the work provided by students and some staff are frequently due to the monumental efforts of individuals versus the active, organized support of the University. This work often goes unappreciated and unrecognized by the University. Indeed in some instances, dedicated staff, faculty and students apparently had been penalized for their efforts to improve campus climate for diversity.

Meetings with Associate Students, Graduate Student Association, Community Centers and Student Affirmative Action Committee

Dr. Allen's team went into each of the Day 1 break-out day sessions with an overview of salient issues, which emanated from campus statistics and the roundtable discussions summaries provided to the team from the Diversity Ad Hoc Committee. A set of questions was developed to guide the discussion with the specific target group. In this meeting, the salient issues and guide questions were as follows:

Salient Issues:

1. UCSD has the responsibility to be a role model to the community in diversity efforts. More commitment is needed to have the campus represent the broader diversity of California.
2. Less bureaucracy and a more effective process are needed to implement priorities identified through committee work
3. More communications and actions are needed to build unity across and within departments
4. The campus needs to provide a clear definition of "community" to acknowledge how diverse contributions, skills and talents of students, faculty and staff are valued.

Questions for Interactive Discussion:

1. Please provide your current definition of what community is and what it should be at UCSD, based on the salient issues we just identified from the roundtable groups, and any additional issues you perceive that were not voiced here.
2. What are the routes to achieving your optimal vision of community on campus?
3. What is your role in seeing that this vision is achieved?

Summary of Responses

Unfortunately only one student came to the beginning of this session. She represented the Student Affirmative Action Committee (SAAC). Toward the end of the session, a second student came but did not talk much. The student reported that most of the other students on campus do not know about SAAC. She believes that this a part of the student culture of UCSD; many students are not politicized nor do they care about racial diversity, and an individual or group has to "carve out (their) own spaces and sources of support" on campus. She also described a hostile campus climate towards diversity and affirmative action and pointed to *The Koala* publication as one of the sources of this hostility.

The participating student was very articulate and she voiced some of the same concerns about accountability as did faculty and staff members. The structure of the University college system made it difficult to get students informed and involved. She felt that the University "used" the students who were active to promote the notion that diversity is a high priority to incoming students. She gave the example of when they want to show the campus to prospective black students, they call on her to be the tour guide. She also felt that because the University cut the resources of the student groups, it made a statement of low priority. Now, these groups have to do more with less funds and because they are students, this is an additional burden for them. How to spend the necessary time on getting good grades and fighting issues of racism becomes a challenge. Also, because there are so few to mount the battle, this is particularly difficult.

Meetings with Student Quality of Life Workgroup, Student Office for Human Relations, Office of Instructional Support and Academic Services, Academic Enrichment Programs, Office of Graduate Studies and Research, Student Office for Leadership and Organizations

Salient Issues:

1. Students need holistic, interconnected support structures that avoid giving a fractured view of the campus.
2. Mechanisms are needed to ensure that a range of student voices – reflecting the present and future diversity – will be heard and considered by top campus officials and program representatives.
3. Freedom of expression and principles of community need to find common ground. The campus needs to provide a forum, safe spaces for individuals to voice their opinions, but needs to ensure accountability for actions and behaviors that devalue others.
4. The campus needs to offer alternatives and additional options in events, activities, and curriculum to Euro-centric practices and principles.

Questions for Interactive Discussion:

1. Please provide your current definition of what community is and what it should be at UCSD, based on the salient issues we just identified from the roundtable groups and any additional issues you perceive that were not voiced here.
2. What are the routes to achieving your optimal vision of community on campus?
3. What is your role in seeing that this vision is achieved?

Summary of Responses

Some in the group believe that UCSD is the least diverse UC campus that contributes to the diversity challenge. Even though the Chancellor has included increasing diversity among students and faculty in his ten-point plan, the numbers are not substantially increasing. Another issue that surfaced involved the discussion of the decentralized model under which UCSD operates (the five separate colleges) and how this model/structure breeds isolation and fragmentation. The divisions and fragmentation can be traced to and is reflected within the separation of colleges and departments. This raises the issue of a necessity for power sharing within the institution and the lack of willingness by some to do so.

In a discussion about diversity, respondents thought we should look at both the culture of the institution and how it is structured. Diversity is not equated with excellence in UCSD's general culture. In fact, there was a tendency to equate diversity with lowered standards and to assume that diversity equated to "less than." This was one of the most repeated themes. It appears that UCSD equates diversity with unnecessary expenditures and being achieved only at the price of excellence.

Student Affairs Officers are not given sufficient power or authority. The power is perceived to be in the hands of faculty. Student Affairs is viewed as less important, less powerful and merely window dressing by those in power. Those present also felt that they do an important job that goes unnoticed – that their work is done well due to their dedication and personal connections despite limited resources and low prestige in the University. To support the point, examples were given of a program that yielded positive results being cut (the overnight program with an 80% yield) and another scholarship program with weaker results that was not cut. This is not an "either-or" proposition; it sometimes seems that the hard work and positive results of those in student services are not viewed as important or critical to the mission as the more "academic" components. The relationship between these services and the academic mission is not made salient or is unclear to those in power to make University decisions.

The work of people who really care about and work towards diversity is not built into the structure of the University. They perceive that in important decisions, their views are not heard nor taken seriously. The concept of "last hired, first fired" when budget cuts are made, was voiced for programs and staff in these areas.

Regarding "The Principles of Community," only a few of the respondents felt that the whole campus, from students to faculty to administrators, knew these principles. Others felt this was not necessarily true. Some members of the group felt the principles were so general that they did not really know what they meant. They are good at the concept stage but are not realized at the operational stage. It appears that such principles are just "lip service" about what people should

believe. When the rubber hits the pavement and there is an issue, however, the principles have no "teeth" or power and thus do not go into action. This group felt that students who might feel there is an issue of racism or discrimination, get the run-around and that the principles do not incorporate or include accountability. The accountability issue was a major theme for this group. There needs to be a mechanism to encourage action, some accountability for adhering and practicing these principles. There is also a divide about how to adhere to these principles. For example, there is a perceived disconnect between academic (faculty) and service providers (e.g., Student Affairs Officers) in attempts to adhere to the principles.

Another recommended goal for the University was to have a freshman-year course designed to discuss the Principles of Community in which each student's accountability plus the accountability of the faculty and staff would be reviewed. An example of a course given was the Marshall College Core writing course that addresses issues of race and diversity while also incorporating the principles. However, this effort was viewed as fragmented, as the other colleges did not build similar courses. A core course across all colleges was recommended but it was seen as difficult to get anything done across all colleges based on the structure of the University and Colleges. Building work on diversity into the pay structure or the tenure process was also recommended to increase faculty accountability and provide incentives for involvement with diversity and community activities. Currently, there is no faculty incentive to adhere to these principles and no negative consequences if you do not. In addition, the brevity of the quarter system also hinders fostering a sense of community.

The issue of who are UCSD students arose. Staff and faculty need to really know students and not make assumptions based on race. Faculty training of some sort was hinted but they felt this would be too much of a threat for the autonomy of faculty. It was hinted that the minority students at UCSD are probably not who we assume (for example, a segment of the "underrepresented" minority population at UCSD come from upper middle-class and privileged backgrounds). There is also important internal diversity within a racial/ethnic group. An appreciation for internal diversity should be more salient. The fact that some colleges and their students do not ever have to deal with race issues fuels false assumptions based on stereotypes, both by faculty and by students. We need to further explore the internal diversity at UCSD and how this impacts the University.

It was also recommended that the University define what "community" is more precisely. Does it incorporate the San Diego community and its diversity as well, or is the notion restricted just to the La Jolla community?

Meetings with Vice Chancellors, Academic Deans and Council of Provosts

Salient Issues:

1. UCSD has the responsibility to be a role model to the community in diversity efforts. More commitment is needed to have the campus represent the broader diversity of California. University does not reflect the demographics of the state.
2. University needs to do more outreach to other institutions of higher education in the area and to the larger community.

3. Faculty does not have time to do outreach. Faculty is not rewarded for their service/outreach efforts.
4. This is not an open campus from the top down and there needs to be greater disclosure from the top.
5. Students need mentoring and support services that provide cohesive structure.
6. Students say that it is not clear whom they need to approach regarding help/assistance with diversity-related issues.
7. How does the campus provide resources for effective recruitment of faculty, staff and students amid legal and budgetary constraints?
8. Campus is "fractured" and not welcoming to the community. There are few spaces on campus to build unity (e.g., Cross Cultural Center, University Centers).
9. Calls for greater curricular diversity, greater faculty diversity, and more opportunities to engage diverse others in classes.
10. The campus needs to provide a clear definition of "community" to acknowledge how diverse contributions, skills and talents of students, faculty and staff are valued.

Questions for Interactive Discussion:

1. Please provide your current definition of what community is and what it should be at UCSD, based on the salient issues we just identified from the roundtable groups and any additional issues you perceive that were not voiced here?
2. What are the routes to achieving your optimal vision of community on campus?
3. What is your role in seeing that this vision is achieved?

Summary of Responses

Our meeting with executives was unique in that here we were, presenting the views of other stakeholders – faculty members – who had participated in roundtable discussions where it appears the executives were not present. It was our impression that in the other three sessions, we were repeating what members of the stakeholder groups had said or heard, generally receiving quick confirmation that the points were valid. However, here we were met with some surprise and defensiveness, perhaps because it was difficult to hear some of the concerns reported or perhaps because we were not reflecting back to this group what they or other executives had previously heard or understood to be of the case. It would have been good to have included a roundtable with executives during the preparation stage as clearly, faculty – and the Academic Senate – play critical roles in addressing diversity issues through teaching, research, and service and also in creating a welcoming climate. Just as clearly, there seems to be some miscommunication between these stakeholders regarding these issues. Certainly it will be important for these stakeholders to address and resolve what are apparently conflicting views.

It was telling that the UCSD executive group at the table during the discussion was white and that this passed without comment by members of the group. There was also a noticeable absence of academic deans (only one, a member of the Ad Hoc Committee, attended for part of the session) and vice chancellors. College provosts were reasonably well represented, along with several other campus officers (e.g., ombudsperson) but, for the most part, the upper-level administrators were absent. Presence and engagement in such discussions can communicate to other stakeholders how seriously key administrators (those with the most power and influence) take these issues on a campus. Without doubt, the presence – or absence – of key stakeholders

and decision-makers sends a message to the community about whether such goals and discussions are valued.

Meetings with Human Resources Staff, Staff Association Chairs, and Quality of Work Life Office

Salient Issues:

1. UCSD has the responsibility to be a role model to the community in diversity efforts. More commitment is needed to have the campus represent the broader diversity of California.
2. Campus is "fractured" and lacks spaces, opportunities to build unity. The campus needs a clear definition of "community" to acknowledge how diverse contributions, skills and talents of students, faculty and staff are valued.
3. The institution needs more shared power structures in place to promote diversity priorities and to include more students, staff and faculty in the process. Similarly, the campus needs to ensure an effective and understandable process for reporting and accountability.
4. Will the UCSD of the future be equipped to deal with the increased diversity among its students, staff and faculty? What structural changes will support this transformation?

Questions for Interactive Discussion:

1. Please provide your current definition of what community is and what it should be at UCSD, based on the salient issues we just identified from the roundtable groups and any additional issues you perceive that were not voiced here
2. What are the routes to achieving your optimal vision of community on campus?
3. What is your role in seeing that this vision is achieved?

<u>Summary of Responses</u>

One important observation is that since attitudes, opinions, and experience related to campus diversity seem to vary by position, it is vital to involve all constituencies for productive dialogue and realistic programming to occur. Another key point made during this discussion was that the structure of the institution itself creates and maintains the divide between administrators, faculty and staff. We heard enthusiastic reports on the pancake breakfast that brings various constituencies together, and recognition that some departments have events honoring their staff. More such occasions would be welcomed. Other means of strengthening the community and recognizing staff could be identified through dialogue and advanced collaboratively.

There is concern about having the Chancellor serve as the chief diversity officer for the campus. While this can have great symbolic value for the campus community, from a practical perspective, it can be quite problematic. Specifically, because the Chancellor is designated as the chief diversity officer for the campus, it is unclear if there is any way to ensure "hands-on" accountability regarding furthering of the campus diversity initiatives. If someone else at UCSD was to be delegated this responsibility, the Chancellor could hold them responsible. When the Chancellor is the person delegated to ensure that this work is being done, it is difficult to design, mobilize and evaluate a full program of diversity activities. Some type of institutionalized accountability system needs to be established if the campus is to make progress in this area.

Importantly, Chancellor Dynes has assumed the role of CEO for diversity. Under his leadership, a deputy officer could effectively serve as a focal point for communication, programming, coordination, and oversight with regard to diversity issues on campus. As has been suggested in roundtable discussions, this person could serve as diversity officer. This officer could be immediately accessible for those working on diversity committees or programs; for administrative officers contributing to a campus-wide diversity initiative or advancing efforts at faculty recruitment and retention; for faculty and Senate committees developing or revising courses and curricula; for constituents with questions, concerns, or difficulties related to diversity. He or she would act as a conduit for information and a coordinator of activities, acting as a liaison between the Chancellor and the campus, and expediting campus efforts to promote and sustain diversity. Alternatively, this officer could focus on one or more areas – faculty diversity, for example – if it should be established that there are particular needs that should be given priority attention at this time.

In either case, there should be a supportive committee structure to expand the reach of the Chancellor and the diversity officer and to ensure representative participation in conversations and decision-making, as appropriate within the larger campus structure of leadership and responsibility, on diversity-related matters. We understand that the Diversity Committee is currently being reconstituted. There would be value in consulting with stakeholders, including previous committee members, as this action is taken. This reconsideration creates an opportunity for tightening the connection between the committee and the campus leadership. The Chancellor and/or the diversity officer might well chair the committee or serve as valued ex officio members. Similarly, this is an occasion for integrating the committee's work into the larger process of strategic planning, planning, and program development, again in ways that support those holding administrative and academic leadership positions on campus. The key is to develop comprehensive and viable means of connecting the committee's work with that of establishing campus priorities and deploying and managing campus resources.

Panel Presentations (see Appendices 2-4)
Panelist #1: Dr. Jeff Milem, Graduate School of Education, University of Maryland-College Park.

Dr. Milem presented the various factors that directly impact the diversity climate on campuses of higher education. He began with presenting the four key assumptions being made:

1. Students are educated in distinct racial contexts.
2. These contexts are shaped by external and internal (institutional) forces.
3. Most institutions focus on only one element of the climate – increasing the numbers of racial/ethnic students on campus.
4. There are other elements of the climate that require attention and constitute key areas for focusing diversity efforts.

Dr. Milem then described both the internal (institutional) and external forces shaping the racial climate of campuses. He further discussed the salient institutional context for diversity

(historical legacy of inclusion/exclusion, structural diversity, the psychological and the behavioral climate). Dr. Milem concluded with a discussion of twelve design principles for educational practice:

Principle 1: The goal of achieving a campus climate supportive of racial and cultural diversity must be affirmed as an institutional priority.

Principle 2: The institutional climate for diversity should be systematically assessed in terms of the historical legacy, structural diversity, psychological climate, and behavioral elements in order to understand the dimensions of the problem.

Principle 3: Guided by research, experiences at peer institutions and results from the systematic assessment of the campus climate for diversity, develop a plan for implementing constructive change. The plan should include specific goals, timetables and pragmatic activities.

Principle 4: A detailed and ongoing evaluation program should be implemented to monitor the effectiveness of and build support for programmatic activities aimed at improving the campus climate for diversity.

Principle 5: Create a conscious effort to rid the campus of its exclusionary past, and adopt proactive goals to achieve desegregation that includes increasing higher education opportunity for previously excluded groups.

Principle 6: Involve faculty in diversity efforts that are consistent with their roles as educators and researchers.

Principle 7: Create collaborative and cooperative learning environments where student learning and interaction among diverse groups can be enhanced.

Principle 8: Increase student interaction with faculty outside of class by incorporating students in research and teaching activities.

Principle 9: Initiate co-curricular and curricular activities that increase dialogue and build bridges across communities of difference.

Principle 10: Create a student-centered orientation among faculty and staff.

Principle 11: Activities to increase student involvement in campus life must include diverse students. Diversity programming should involve both general support services as well as activities and support programs directed primarily at students of color.

Principle 12: Increase sensitivity and training of staff who are likely to work with students of color.

[Reference: Hurtado, Sylvia, Jeffrey Milem, Alma Clayton-Pedersen, and Walter R. Allen. *Enacting Diverse Learning Environments: Improving the Climate for Racial/Ethnic Diversity in Higher Education.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, Volume 26, No. 8. Washington, DC: The George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development, 1999.]

Panelist #2: Grace Carroll, Center for Research on Students Placed At Risk (CRESPAR), Howard University.

The focus of Dr. Carroll's presentation was the concept of Affirmative Development Environments. These are environments created wherein students and staff believe that the institution affirms:

- Their value to their family, school and community;
- Their talents, skills and potential;
- An expectation of success for all;
- Processes and procedures to encourage, develop and support their positive sense of self, their community, talents, value and success; and where
- Safety nets are created to affirm a positive environment even when one fails at reaching a goal, so that one can have the courage and support to try again.

The presentation included:

1. A theoretical framework of symbolic interaction as a backdrop for understanding why people view others and themselves the way they do;
2. Why and how difference can often be viewed as a stress factor (Mundane Extreme Environmental Stress, MEES);
3. How different context and perceptions interact with how we view others and ourselves;
4. Different response modes to MEES; and
5. Strategies for affirmative development in context of MEES.

The following beginning action steps were offered at the conclusion of the presentation:

1. Believe that positive change and affirmative development environments are possible;
2. Get and utilize accurate information;
3. Better communicate;
4. Better understand the perspective and assets of others;
5. Accept that mistakes are inevitable;
6. Learn from one's personal mistakes and mistakes of others where possible;
7. Take action and responsibility for one's actions;
8. Honestly assess one's own thoughts, actions and belief systems;
9. Understand that you cannot help or support others effectively if you, too, are not supported thus build a proactive support network;
10. Be more open and flexible; and
11. Seek help when needed.

[Reference: Carroll, Grace. *Environmental Stress and African Americans: The Other Side of the Moon*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 1998.]

Panelist #3: Dr. Marguerite Bonous-Hammarth, CHOICES Study, UCLA Institute for Social Science Research.

Dr. Bonous-Hammarth's focus was on organizational change to realize diversity initiatives. She discussed with numerous examples the power of individual agency to impact organizational structure. She shared how effective agency is achieved through collaborative endeavors, goal-

setting and congruent aims and that lone initiatives are doomed to failure and requires structural reorganization for desired outcomes. Dr. Bonous-Hammarth then discussed the necessary requirements for organizational learning to implement diversity initiatives effectively:

1. Holistic rather than isolated orientation
2. Consciousness of dynamic, complex environments
3. Realistic expectations (planning) and preparation for conflict and system stress, and unexpected outcomes
4. Continual assessment and revisioning.

Dr. Bonous-Hammarth concluded her presentation with a listing and discussion of best practices and tools to aid effective organizational change. She then gave the instructions and process for the subsequent break out sessions.

Summit Roundtables

After the panel presentations, audience members were asked to discuss a set of questions that were placed on their tables (see Attachment A). The groups were given time to discuss the questions and time to share briefly with the larger group highlights of their discussions. These highlights echoed some of the discussions from the previous day, as well as additional insights about diversity at UCSD. They included:

1. Calling for more formal opportunities for members of diverse communities to be able to come together to build bridges across communities of differences. Numerous people indicated that there were not enough places (safe places) for different members of the community to do this. The success of the University of Michigan, Arizona State University, University of Massachusetts, and other institutions with their intergroup dialogue programs indicates that these opportunities are very important and have a profound role in encouraging positive intergroup relations on a campus. While these groups are open to all members of the campus community and confer significant benefits to them, they are especially important learning opportunities for students.

2. Reviewing some of the current UCSD programs, such as the CREATE program. The program was implemented after SP-1 and SP-2, and UCSD went into partnership with four local school districts. Representatives from UCSD provided college-going workshops for high school students. A criticism of this program was that by the time the students were able to attend these workshops, it was too late. The students could not fulfill the A-G requirements because they were already juniors or seniors. One student, who represented the Student Affirmative Action Committee, said that regardless of the CREATE program and a $100,000 budget for outreach, it has been a struggle to do outreach. Another person mentioned the Pulitzer program, which provides one-on-one tutoring for K-12 students living in a low-income housing complex in La Jolla. The Summer Bridge program, which is run by OASES, is commended and the two student participants in this table discussion indicated that many of the minority students who are politically active on campus went to Summer Bridge.

3. The problem of not having a diverse population on campus was raised along with how the issue of diversity is not being central to the mission of UCSD, as it should be. Participants said that this issue affected all students, not just racial minorities. Current programs are not working because most people do not know who is doing what. They also mentioned that the way the university is organized lends itself to fragmentation.

4. One student suggested that they should get course credit for "diversity work" should be available, such as conducting college-going workshops and participating in outreach activities. The group agreed that there needs to be a common definition of diversity, and members of the UCSD community at all levels need to feel like they have a stake in what happens on campus.

CONCLUSIONS

The issues of fragmentation of the campus, diversity as being a low priority, and lack of accountability regarding diversity matters were the major themes in all of the sessions. Regarding fragmentation, participants felt the actual college structure of the University made it difficult to implement any campus-wide initiative. It was mentioned that this was a problem for undergraduates but even more so for graduate students, who identify by department and do not participate as much in the larger "UCSD community." Many participants thought that diversity was a low priority given the budget spent ("first cut" on these issues) and the little power given to those who focus on diversity.

The accountability issue surfaced frequently with many thinking that the Chancellor did not have sufficient time to actually be the diversity director for the University without others supporting him who have decision-making, oversight and budget power. On the student level, the example of *The Koala* newspaper was repeated. It was stated that *The Koala* is a racist publication and was distributed on campus. In spite of its negative and racist position, it was not immediately sanctioned. It is unclear if it was ever sanctioned. Due to the small numbers of students and faculty of color, the extra burden of dealing with responding to the many diversity areas as they arise became a big problem. Which battles do you pick to fight given limited resources and the fact that the majority community does not come to bat for these issues? Who will be held accountable for the recommendations of the Diversity Council? Again, there is a perception that there are no accountability processes or procedures in place currently, thus making the diversity initiative hollow. There appears to be no institutionalized departments or programs that consistently address diversity issues. Committees are temporary, while an administrative office, department or unit is not. Until the issue of fragmentation is addressed, significant changes are unlikely to occur. Due to the lack of any institutional processes in place and the perception that all diversity initiatives are temporary and might change tomorrow, accountability issues pose major barriers. Administrators, faculty and students do not see diversity as a true institutional priority or worry about consequences for actions/policies that undercut community at UCSD. An office where the "buck stops," which has power and resources, was viewed as an essential component for any effective plan.

The actual meaning of diversity became an issue for much discussion. It was felt that there is no consensus around "diversity" on the campus. Some participants appeared to believe that diversity referred to underrepresented groups on the campus, especially in the aftermath of SP-1 and SP-2. Others believed that diversity simply means that people are different from others on various dimensions (e.g., social class, region of origin, sexual orientation). It is this lack of consensus around the definition of diversity that may impede any course of action that the Committee on Diversity attempts to undertake.

There was a suggestion that some evaluation processes be put into place to assess whether programs facilitate diversity. By doing so, effective programs and services could be duplicated. For example, the incorporation of racial diversity issues into the Freshmen Core Writing course at Marshall College could provide a model for the other colleges to implement. The replication may also address the issue of fragmentation raised in group discussions.

There was a call for greater involvement – of students as well as staff – in campus decision-making. The call is a perennial one. At a time of reassessing how to establish a campus environment more fully honoring and engaging its diverse members, new perspectives and new responses to the challenge for broader participation may develop. Being open to these possibilities may bring surprising results – results that can be shared and replicated on other campuses. Again, creating occasions for focused and continuing dialogue seem an important step – building on what has been accomplished during the Ad Hoc Committee's term of service. For example, discussions like those held on Thursday might be continued – this time, in mixed groups, with representatives of various stakeholder groups convening to address certain key issues identified through the process leading to the diversity summit.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Numerous task forces and committess on diversity at UCSD have previously offered recommendations on improving campus community and diversity. The Work Group on Quality of Student Life for Underrepresented Students reviewed eight reports:

1. Affirmative Action Program Review Group for U of C 1/13/94
2. Chancellor's Advisory Committee Reports on Affirmative Action and Diversity at UCSD
3. Diversity Council Annual Report 1998-1999
4. Five Year Undergraduate Student Affirmative Action Plan 1989-1994
5. Quality of Life Survey, Summer, 1998
6. Student Affirmative Action Committee Report 1998-1999
7. Student Affirmative Action and Human Relations Program Annual Report 1998-1999
8. Responses to the Latino Eligibility Task Force Recommendations 1995

The recommendations of these reports were given ratings of adequately addressed, partially addressed or not yet accomplished. Revisiting this report and its ratings should be a priority, as the issues surfaced overview the responses of administrators, faculty, staff and students. There are strong indications that many of the issues reviewed and recommendations offered by previous UCSD task forces/committees still remain areas of concern.

There truly needs to be clarity of meaning regarding diversity, Principles of Community, and accountability. To this end, we recommend:

1. Continuing the process of dialogue, giving sustained attention to pervasive issues of discrimination and structural imbalances.
2. Developing an appropriate position for an officer of diversity with the power to assess, program and provide oversight and accountability, thus supporting the Chancellor in his role and advancing the work of the campus constituencies.
3. Re-appoint or re-establish the diversity committee through a consultative process and integrate this committee – through membership, procedures, and responsibilities – in some appropriate and effective manner into key decision-making activities on campus.
4. Expand the opportunities for administrators, faculty, staff, and students to collaborate on meaningful projects and to interact socially.
5. As budget cuts are made, give close attention to their possible impact on diversity-related efforts and initiatives. Such reductions always reveal campus priorities, so this is a time to make evident that the commitment to campus diversity is strong and enduring.
6. Continue finding effective ways to keep the diversity initiative and its elements in the campus and local press and on school/departmental/committee agendas. The process leading to the Diversity Summit, and the Summit itself, showed that diversity has a prominent place on the Chancellor's agenda. This valuing of campus diversity – as evidenced by energy and attention – should be sustained and expanded.
7. Review and disseminate a copy of the Special Focus Section ("The Benefits of Racial and Ethnic Diversity in Higher Education" by Jeffrey F. Milem and Kenji Hakuta) in the American Council on Education's *Minorities in Higher Education, 1999-2000: Seventeenth Annual Status Report* (Deborah Wilds, ed., ACE, 2000) and a copy of the manuscript for the upcoming book *Compelling Interest: Examining the Evidence on Racial Dynamics in Higher Education* (Mitchell Chang, Daria Witt, James Jones, & Kenji Hakuta, eds., Stanford University Press, in press). Each of these manuscripts summarizes empirical research that supports the idea that diverse colleges provide more opportunities for better learning than homogeneous learning environments provide. This should be the first of many efforts to infuse the fact that diversity and excellence go hand in hand and dispelling the myth that diversity happens at the cost of excellence.

APPENDIX 1

Biographical Sketches of CHOICES Research Team Members

Walter R. Allen (Ph.D., University of Chicago, 1975) is currently Professor of Sociology at the University of California, Los Angeles and Co-director of CHOICES, a longitudinal study of college attendance among African American high school graduates in California. He has held teaching appointments at the University of Michigan (1979-89) and the University of North Carolina (1974-79). Among his many honors and awards received while at UCLA, Dr. Allen was the 1996 recipient of the Harriet and Charles Luckman Award for Distinguished Teaching.

Dr. Allen's research and teaching focus on family patterns, socialization and personality development, race and ethnic relations, social inequality and higher education. His research has received media coverage in print (Le Nouvel Observateur-Paris, New York Times, USA Today), on radio (National Black Network News, WBZ-Boston, and WABC-New York City), and on television (ITN-London, CBS News/Dan Rather, and McNeil-Leherer).

Dr. Allen also has worked as a consultant to communities, business and government. Among his more than eighty publications are two co-authored books, *The Color Line and the Quality of Life in America* and *Improving the Climate for Racial/Ethnic Diversity in Higher Education Institutions*, and three co-edited books, *College in Black and White: African American Students in Predominantly White and Historically Black Public Universities*, *Beginnings: The Social and Affective Development of Black Children*, and *Black American Families, 1965-84*.

Grace Carroll has over twenty-five years' experience in research, assessment, training and program development with an emphasis in sociology of education, evaluations and diversity. She is nationally recognized for conducting research and training in evaluations and cultural/ethnic diversity. Dr. Carroll received her Bachelors of Arts in Sociology from Stanford University, where she also received two Masters of Arts degrees (Sociology and Education) and her Ph.D. in Sociology of Education. She has served as a senior research associate with Aguirre International and as their Principal Investigator for the diversity study contracted by the United States Postal Service. At Aguirre, she also served on projects for the Census Bureau, the Corporation for National Service as a lead evaluator for the AmeriCorps*USA evaluation, and provided technical assistance and training to State Commissions with Project STAR. She developed and served as the Director of the Office for African American Student Development at the University of California, Berkeley, that focused on issues, programs and strategies that positively impact student retention and graduation rates. For a decade she was the Research and Development Director for the Institute for Developmental Studies, which conducted research and provided services for teen mothers and adolescents placed at risk of dropping out of school. Her consultant clients included Kaiser Permanente, Harvard Business School, Urban Strategies Council, Alameda County, and various school districts throughout the country. She has published various research articles and technical reports in her areas of expertise. Her recent book, *Environmental Stress and African Americans: The Other Side of the Moon* (Praeger, 1998), is a collection of creative psychosociological empirical research inquires she has conducted, which focuses on race as a stress factor and effective coping strategies. She currently serves as the Associate Director at Howard University's Center for the Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk (CRESPAR).

Marguerite Bonous-Hammarth (Ph.D., UCLA, 1995) is a Research Associate in the Higher Education and Organizational Change Division at UCLA. She currently coordinates a Spencer Research Training Grant in the Department of Education, and is Research Project Director for a study on CHOICES: Access, Equity and Diversity in Higher Education (W.R. Allen, principal investigator).

Dr. Bonous-Hammarth has worked in higher education research and administration for more than a decade, formerly in the areas of fundraising, communications, continuing education and admissions. Her current research and teaching interests focus on understanding factors that influence achievement and career success for ethnic minority students and for undergraduates in science and mathematics. Specifically, she examines the influence of fit between individual values and organizational norms on outcomes for students (i.e., persistence, satisfaction and degree completion) and for other members of the academic community (i.e., faculty productivity and satisfaction). Dr. Bonous-Hammarth also examines the factors that help to sustain change n organizations and the organizational transformation process in higher education. Her publications include *Testing a New Approach to Admissions: The Irvine Experience* (with Susan A. Wilbur), and *Value Congruence and Organizational Climates for Undergraduate Persistence*.

Jeffrey F. Milem (Ph.D., UCLA, 1992) is an Associate Professor and graduate program director for the higher education administration program in the Department of Educational Policy and Leadership in the College of Education at the University of Maryland. Previously, he served as an Associate Professor in the Department of Counseling and Personnel Services (CAPS). Dr. Milem is the research coordinator for Maryland's participation in the Diverse Democracy Project which studies the ways in which students' experiences with diversity while they are in college prepare them to participate as citizens in a diverse democracy. Jeff has extensive experience in the field of higher education having spent the past twenty-two years working as a faculty member, scholar, or administrator. Jeff received his B.A. in political science from Michigan State University, his M.Ed. from the University of Vermont, and his Ph.D. in higher education from UCLA.

As a widely recognized expert in the area of racial dynamics in higher education, Professor Milem has been commissioned to do research by the Harvard Civil Rights Project, the American Council on Education, and the American Educational Research Association's Panel on Racial Dynamics in Higher Education. His research interests focus on racial dynamics in higher education, the educational outcomes of diversity, the impact of college on students, and the condition and status of the professoriate – including the ways in which faculty effectively utilize diversity in their classroom teaching. Jeff recently co-authored (with Kenji Hakuta of Stanford University) the Special Focus Section of the American Council on Education's *Minorities in Higher Education, 1999-2000: Seventeenth Annual Status Report* (The Special Focus manuscript is titled "The Benefits of Racial and Ethnic Diversity in Higher Education"). Jeff is a co-author, with Sylvia Hurtado, Alma Clayton-Pedersen, and Walter R. Allen, of the book *Enacting Diverse Learning Environments: Improving the Campus Climate for Racial/Ethnic Diversity*. He is the author of a chapter titled "The Educational Benefits of Diversity: Evidence from Multiple Sectors" that will appear in *Compelling Interest: Examining the Evidence on Racial Dynamics in Higher Education* edited by Mitchell Chang, Daria Witt, James Jones, & Kenji Hakuta (to be published by Stanford University Press). Professor Milem is also the author or co-author of numerous manuscripts which appear in *Academe*, *Change*, *The Journal of Higher Education*, *Sociology of Education*, *Research in Higher Education*, *The Review of Higher Education*, *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*, *The Journal of College Student Development*, *Thought & Action*, and *The UCLA Journal of Education*.

Carol Petersen is Director of Academic Affirmative Action at UCLA. She has held appointments in the UCLA Chancellor's Office of Academic Development (1996 to 2002), contributing broadly to campus diversity planning and community college outreach programs. She has served as a Vice Provost of UCLA's College of Letters and Science (1986 to 1996), helping manage the affairs of the largest academic unit in the University of California. Earlier, she helped establish UCLA Writing Programs, serving three years as Assistant Director (1980-82) and three as Director.

Dr. Petersen has taught courses in writing, conflict resolution, affirmative action, and literature and medicine. Her publications include a book entitled *Composition and the Academy: A Study of Writing Program Administration* (MLA, 1986). She has given many presentations and workshops on topics of affirmative action, diversity/conflict resolution, academic planning and management, and writing/writing program administration.

A photographer, Dr. Petersen's solo exhibitions include "The House of the Gospel," presenting the art of artist Mario Avila Vargas (UCLA Fowler Museum of Cultural History, 2001); "Imag(in)ing the Future: UCLA Women Students" (UCLA and University of Minnesota, 1999); and "Into the Arena: The Story of the First US Paralympic Equestrian Team" (UCLA, 1996; Los Angeles Equestrian Center, 1997; and Gladstone, NJ, 1998). Her photos currently appear in the Smithsonian Institution Traveling Exhibition, "Los Tigres in Concert," *Corridos sin Fronteras.* Her work has been published in books (McLemore, Romo, and Baker, *Racial and Ethnic Relations in America,* 6th ed., Allyn and Bacon, 2000); journals (*Emergences: Journal of Media and Composite Cultures, 1999*); and newspapers (*Los Angeles Times,* 2001; *Austin Statesman,* 1999*; Atlanta Journal-Constitution,* 1996).

Dr. Petersen holds the following degrees in English Literature: Ph.D., UCLA, 1977; CPhil, UCLA, 1975; M.A., University of Minnesota, 1965; A.B., Duke University, 1962.

Rowena Robles is completing her doctorate in Ethnic Studies at the University of California, Berkeley. Her research interests are race and education. More specifically, she studies the impacts of a race-neutral desegregation policy on the students at an academic magnet high school and the school district as a whole. Currently, Ms. Robles is working with the CHOICES project at UCLA and, along with a team of researchers, assesses the college-going cultures of different high schools and high school students. She is also preparing several articles for publication and is teaching at the California State University, Long Beach.

APPENDIX 2

APPENDIX 3

APPENDIX 4

ATTACHMENT A

QUESTIONS FOR BREAK-OUT GROUPS

1A. Describe the way in which your campus has responded to pressures to become more inclusive over time.

1B. Given these responses, what steps or strategies would you suggest that the University take in order to create a more affirmative development environment for faculty, staff, and students?

****

2A. What special challenges do the ethnic/racial patterns of representation among students, staff and faculty present to your institution?

2B. Given these challenges, what steps or strategies would you suggest that the University take in order to create a more affirmative development environment for faculty, staff, and students?

****

3A. In what ways do students, staff and faculty from different racial/ethnic backgrounds view the UCSD community differently on your campus? What do you think helps to explain any differences in views of the campus?

3B. Given these differences, what steps or strategies would you suggest that the University take in order to create a more affirmative development environment for faculty, staff, and students?

****

4A. What is the nature of interaction between and among individuals from different racial/ethnic backgrounds, as well as the nature of intergroup relations on your campus?

4B. Given these relationships, what steps or strategies would you suggest that the university take in order to create a more affirmative development environment for faculty, staff and students?
