Environmental Scanning Report

Campus Diversity: Emerging Trends and Themes

Planning, Assessment, & Institutional Research Office
September 2004

The University of Scranton *President's Letter* of 15 June 2004 has identified the enhancement of diversity as a key issue for upcoming institutional planning. Reflected in the *Diversity and Globalization* theme of the University's current strategic plan, the University has committed itself to "create a fully integrated campus environment that is marked by ethnic and racial diversity and that actively fosters within its students, faculty and staff an understanding of and respect for issues of gender and for cultures other than their own" (*A Community of Scholars A Culture of Excellence* 20). As the University enters into the development phase of a new strategic plan, assessing the accomplishment of the *Diversity and Globalization* theme and identifying current trends in diversity-related scholarship and issues may provide context and direction for future diversity planning efforts. This scan, though not exhaustive, attempts to capture some general, strategic themes of the diversity conversation taking place in higher education.

Executive Summary

- Diversity includes representation of diverse persons, the presence and practice of diversity-related initiatives, and the exchange of information and ideas of diverse kinds and between diverse individuals. Before proceeding in planning, it is important for an institution to characterize what they perceive as diversity on their campus and how they plan to identify, enhance, and assess it. Institutions may also discuss to what degree they consider globalization and international programs an element of diversity or diversity-related planning.

- Statistics show that minorities and women are among the fastest growing populations of students in higher education. Minority populations—particularly Hispanics—are expected to grow more quickly than white populations in the United States. Numbers of minority elementary and secondary students, along with populations of high school graduates, are expected to continue rising. Numbers of White, non-Hispanic elementary and secondary students and high school graduates are projected to decline in coming years. Capturing minority students into matriculation pools may encourage diversity and general enrollment for institutions of higher learning.

- In addition to considering racial diversity, higher education is concerned with ensuring equal access to students of all income brackets and backgrounds, as well as those with disability. Some schools have practiced admissions policies which consider race as a criterion for admission to ensure representation. Court cases over the past decades have charted the conversation over the legality of this practice. Questions related to the educational preparation of diverse populations entering higher education abound. Significant literature supports the benefits of diversity throughout the higher educational landscape—for students and other members of campus communities. Diversity planning and assessment may be key factors in ensuring the success of diversity efforts.

- Questions about institutional mission—what a college or university wishes to accomplish, who it serves, and the manner in which that service is fulfilled—are integral parts of diversity discussion. Most experts agree that campus diversity, diversity education, and diversity scholarship are beneficial to the overall institutional environment and to all members of the community, particularly students.

- Creating and nurturing a caring, collaborative, and inclusive working, living, and learning environment is an important part of a successful campus community. Measuring campus climate will help institutions ensure that their environment displays these characteristics.

What is Diversity?

If there is to be a concerted effort on the behalf of any institution to begin or enhance diversity efforts, there must be some consensus of what goals are to be reached and how they will be fulfilled. What will diversity look like? Feel like? How will we know if we have it, measure to what degree it is there, or identify its absence? What *is* diversity on a college campus? Answers to these questions remain largely subjective. For many, "diversity" conjures images of heterogeneous representation characterized by equity and welcome for all within the campus community. Within higher education, diversity can also be used to define and categorize behaviors and practices relating to instruction, assessment, student experience, and any host of campus dialogues and initiatives.

> Campus diversity is more, however, than a list of communal traditions and experiences with which individuals may identify and to which others may react. The term 'campus diversity' has also come to refer to the variety of strategies institutions and leaders have developed to address the consequences of earlier homogeneity both at a particular institution and in higher education generally…For some it is a code word for the presence of designated and previously excluded groups; for others it is a climate that welcomes heterogeneity; for still others it is a range of programs designed to influence what and how students learn. For many it is all of these things simultaneously (Smith 8).

Jeffrey Milem and Kenji Hakuta identify a three-part definition of diversity of the college or university campus: presence of structural diversity, diversity-related initiatives, and diverse interactions. The interrelatedness of each of these elements is to be stressed; the first, structural diversity, which reflects numbers and proportions of representation, often feeds initiatives to expand diversity related activities. The presence of both encourages the development of diverse interactions, or exchanges between diverse persons, or of diverse ideas and experiences (391-92). Both of the latter can and often do assist in the growth of the former, and so the cycle goes.

Though discussions of diversity generally begin with student issues and concerns, the topic reaches virtually every element of college and university operations:

> While earlier formulations focused mainly on issues of access and preparation, diversity issues have broadened to include questions concerning pedagogy, the curriculum, notions of community, retention, decision making, faculty composition and evaluation, leadership, the role of staff, funding resources, and fundamental questions concerning institutional mission. In the past students were the focus, but now all constituents are part of the discussion (Smith 1).

It may be challenging to accommodate so many different viewpoints on the myriad of elements that comprise diversity on our modern campuses. However, even if one specific definition cannot be agreed upon, institutions must take some step to frame this multifaceted subject. The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) publication Diversity Works: The Emerging Picture of How Students Benefit describes such a design, ordered around four dimensions of campus diversity: representation, education and scholarship, institutional transformation, and climate and intergroup relations (Smith 9).

National Statistics and Population/Enrollment Projections:

Prior to analysis of each of these elements, it may be helpful to review some statistics. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES),*

> High School completion rates for 18-24 year olds, as measured by U.S. Census data, show that rates for white students have grown over the past two decades—reaching 87% in 2000. Minority rates have held relatively steady; 75% for African American students, 59% for Hispanics.
>
> More women than men are enrolled in institutions of higher learning.
>
> Though the majority of full-time undergraduates are under the age of 25, the majority of part-time students are older over the age of 25.
>
> In 1999, NCES reported 68% of students were white. Of the over thirteen million enrolled students in 2001, the majority of American college students were white (64%). Twelve percent are black, non-Hispanic; 10% are Hispanic; and 6% are Asian/Pacific Islander. Collectively, these minorities represent nearly one-third of college enrollees.
>
> Minority enrollments account for nearly all of the enrollment growth in higher education during the past twenty years. Minority enrollments over the span have increased 122%, while white enrollments rose by 9% in the 1980s and decreased by 2.4% in the 1990s.
>
> Twenty-two percent of degrees awarded in 2001-02 were awarded to minority students. The proportion of degrees awarded to groups other than white students was highest at the associates level (27% of these degrees awarded to minority students).
>
> In 2001-02, women earned 58% of all degrees conferred. Men still are earning the majority of doctorate and first-professional degrees (54% and 53%, respectively).
>
> Though still holding far fewer positions than whites, minorities have increased representation in faculty and administrators. Minority faculty members doubled in numbers during the past two decades, increasing their share of total faculty members from about 9% to 14%.

*Sources: The Condition of Education 2003, Indicator 32; American Council on Education *Fact Sheet on Higher Education*, 2004; NCES *Postsecondary Institutions in the United States: Fall 2002 and Degrees and Other Awards Conferred: 2001-02*. American Council of Education *Minorities in Higher Education Annual Status Report*, 2002-2003.

**For additional statistics, see: Status and Trends in the Education of Blacks. (2003). NCES. Status and Trends in the Education of Hispanics. (2003). NCES.

According to the Chronicle of Higher Education's 2004-05 *Almanac* issue, minority enrollments were higher in two-year public and private institutions than four-year schools in 2001 (8). In Pennsylvania, a state that is itself 86 percent white, 16 percent of students enrolled in college or universities in 2003-04 were minorities; this figure compares to the national average of 29 percent. 56 percent of Pennsylvania enrollees were women, identical to the national average (4, 82).

Projected numbers of minority college-age students are high throughout this decade.

> "The transition in the United States from a nation with a White, non-Hispanic majority to a nation of multiple minorities is evident in the composition of elementary and secondary school enrollments over the last several years and those projected over the next few years…White, non-Hispanics have a decreasing share of public school enrollments, dropping from nearly 67 percent of all enrollments in 1993-94 to 56 percent projected in 2007-08. The greatest change will occur in the proportional share of Hispanic students. In 1993-94 Hispanics comprised 12 percent of total enrollments; that number is expected to increase to nearly 21 percent by 2007-08" (Knocking at the College Door 43).

The second largest increase is projected for Asian/Pacific Islander students, "moving from 3.6 percent of enrollments in 1993-94 to 5 percent in 2007-08" (43). Black, non-Hispanics and American Indian/Alaska natives are expected to comprise about the same shares of public school enrollments through 2007-08, 16 percent and 1 percent respectively (43).

Though some of these percentages may not seem particularly large, their translation to actual numbers illustrate the dramatic change this will cause: "The number of American Indian/Alaska native student in public elementary and secondary schools is expected to increase by over 136,000…over 1 million additional Black, non-Hispanic students are expected in public schools…and the schools should see more than 4.3 million more Hispanic students" by 2007-08 (47). The only racial/ethnic group anticipated to decline is White, non-Hispanics, expected to decline by about 1.4 million over the period (47). Higher education acknowledges this great rise in Hispanic population with its acceptance of a new Federal designation: over the past decade, large numbers of HSI's (or, Hispanic-serving institutions) have been designated by the government, joining other classifications such as HBCU's (historically black colleges and universities)[1].

Numbers of minority high school graduates, who will be part of the potential pipeline for college enrollment, show corresponding increases nationally. According to Knocking at the College Door, nationally "Hispanic public high school graduates are projected to show the greatest gains, producing an increase of 73 percent more graduates in the class of 2014 than 2002" (47). Asian/Pacific Islander and American Indian/Alaska natives

1. For more on Hispanics in higher education, see: Schmidt, Peter. (28 November 2003). "Academe's Hispanic Future." *The Chronicle of Higher Education: A Special Report*. See also: Fry, Richard. (2004). "Latino Youth Finishing College: The Role of Selective Pathways." Pew Hispanic Center Report.

also show gains, 44 percent and 16 percent respectively over the period. Black, non-Hispanics are expected to have only 6 percent more students in 2014 than 2002; White, non-Hispanic high school graduates are expected to decline, with "close to 11 percent fewer high school graduates in 2013-14 than 2001-02" across the nation (47).
In the northeastern part of the nation, although Black, non-Hispanics will "increase their share of the graduating class only modestly between 1994 and 2014," Hispanics will "be about one in every ten high school graduates in 2014," up from 6 percent in 1994 (58). Additionally, "White, non-Hispanics represented over three-fourths of the class of 1994. In 2014, that portion is expected to drop to two-thirds" in the northeast (58). Nationally, general growth trends are expected to be mirrored in Pennsylvania, with one exception: although Black, non-Hispanic public and non-public high school graduates are projected to rise in the state through 2011-07, a decline is predicted in the population through 2017-18 (132).

Statistics like these illustrate the rapidly changing face of the college student body, and future pools of its faculty and staff. They also force the academy to ask itself questions, such as why minorities comprise larger percentages of two-year institutions than four-year schools, how more diverse student bodies can be nurtured, and how institutions will respond to the needs a more diverse population. Growing representation of diverse persons nationally suggest that diversity initiatives on college campuses is a growing social and academic imperative. Ensuring an environment in which persons of diverse backgrounds can interact and upon which diverse ideas can converge will be equally important. For a Jesuit institution, these may also speak to issues of social justice.

Some University of Scranton Statistics
Measuring diversity is not an easy business. Relying solely on figures that count representation of diverse persons does not tell the whole story; rather, it is critical to consider elements of interaction and value of discourse that may be taking place on campus. However, given the data above, it may be useful to consider some representative figures for the University of Scranton.

The institution's Fall 2003 Fact Book shows that, like higher education institutions in general, more women were enrolled at the University than men; of the 2003 total headcount of 4,679 students, 58% were female (I-1). The average age for day school students was 20 years, for Dexter Hanley 34 years, and for the Graduate School 31 years (I-3). Fall 2003 headcounts by ethnicity—reported voluntarily by students—shows that 84% of all students were white; the largest minority at the University of Scranton is Hispanic, constituting 3% of the student population; 2% of students are Asian/Pacific Islander; 2% Non-Resident/Alien; 1% Black; and 0.1% American Indian/Alaskan, accounting for a total 8% minority student population—roughly one-quarter the national average and roughly half that of Pennsylvania. Seven percent (7%) of Scranton students are of unknown ethnicity.

As reported by US News and World Report's *America's Best Colleges 2005*, the largest minority populations for some regional schools are as follows: East Stroudsburg University, 4% African-American; Wilkes University, 2% Asian-American; College

Misericordia and King's College, 2% African-American; and Marywood University, 1% Asian-American.

Some Jesuit peer-competitor schools report the following largest minorities: Villanova University, 5% Asian-American; Canisius College, 7% African-American; St. Joseph's University, 7% African-American; Fairfield University, 5% Hispanic; and Loyola College in Maryland, 5% African-American.

Dimension One: Representation

The preceding statistics paint a picture of high traditionally underrepresented population growth with relatively low reflections of these populations on the Scranton campus. Important in considering these data is that "the real policy dilemmas for American Higher Education do not result from the size of population growth, but rather from where and how the growth is occurring" (Swail 19). Though institutions keen to increase their representative diversity may feel challenged to aggressively respond to these population projections, they should carefully analyze their geographic regions to ascertain to what degree and in what term (short or long) they may expect to feel these effects. For example, relatively high population growth is occurring in the western portion of the United States, and this growth is largely driven by expansions in minority populations (particularly Hispanic). Pennsylvania is experiencing more modest growth. Gains in diversity in the regional area result from growth in females and older citizens, offering age-based diversity to the region.

Some recent research seeks to determine whether there is a gender gap in college enrollment and educational success between males and females. According to the American Council on Education's "Gender Equity in Higher Education: Are Male Students at a Disadvantage?," nationally, "there is virtually no difference in the number of white, traditional-age men and women enrolled as undergraduates" (9). However, "until the late 1970's, there was not a strong expectation that women would attend college or participate in the professional world. Since then, most women have chosen to enter, or been forced by circumstances into, a workforce in which some type of postsecondary education is increasingly necessary. As a result, women hold a large majority among students over the age of 24…it will be important to monitor enrollment—in both traditional degree programs as well as adult and continuing education—to determine whether a gender gap emerges among 'lifelong learners'" (8). There is also a large gap between minority men and women: "while there is a small female majority among white students at four-year institutions, it is dwarfed by the female majorities among African Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans" (9).

Representation of women is strong in some areas of the University of Scranton campus. According to fall 2003 data, 58 percent of the total student population is female. Fifty-seven percent of full-time staff are female; 4 percent of full-time staff are minorities. However, only 33 percent of full-time faculty are female. Nine percent of full-time faculty are minorities. (Fact Book VII-2).

Despite strong representative numbers, climate issues for women in the workplace are perceived to persist on many college and university campuses. A 2002 American Council on Education Office of Women in Higher Education publication, "Breaking the Barriers: A Guidebook of Strategies," describes some steps that may be taken to encourage representation and career mobility for women in higher education. The text suggests that four areas be addressed: programming leadership development, promoting career advancement, identifying and addressing workplace and campus climate, and opportunities for mentoring. While focusing institutions on the question of representation, considering issues regarding retention of diverse populations may also prove beneficial. The University may wish to make use of current institutional research data on this subject.

Dimension Two: Education and Scholarship

Discussion of the role of diversity in American democracy and in higher education has taken place since the mid-nineteenth century. Following thirty years of radical social change and persistent growth of diverse student populations in the United States, the 1990's saw a surge in scholarship measuring and comparing successes of various student populations in an effort to determine the effect of diversity on higher education and those who participate in it. Responding to these findings, much recent literature focuses on the benefits of diversity in the collegiate curriculum. According to Milem and Hakuta, these benefits are: the enrichment of the educational experience; the promotion of personal growth and a healthy society; strengthening of the community and the workplace; and the enrichment of America's competitiveness (389). Of these benefits, the enrichment of the academic experience of students and faculty may be of primary importance: "With the changing demographics of the country, the increased globalization of the economy, and the continuing evidence of intolerance and inequities, many campuses have begun to conclude that educating *all* students for a diverse society and world is part of an emerging institutional mission—one from which all students might benefit and, one for which having students from diverse backgrounds is a genuine asset" (Smith 11). This leads many to consider diversity "as central to teaching and learning, not just because some students may require new approaches, but because what and how we need to be teaching has changed" (Smith 11). Institutions nationally have been challenged to review their curricula and mission to ascertain to what degree they address diversity and inclusion academically, as well as in terms of social service and operations. "The most current set of initiatives focusing on the curriculum, then, respond to significant developments in scholarship, the demands for new knowledge in a pluralistic society, and to calls for new capacities for intercultural understanding in all students" (Smitt 11).

Access and Admission

When considering higher education, student access has become a chief concern of the American public. Many Americans believe that access to higher education is particularly curbed for many minority groups; some of these minority groups see access as an issue for their states. According to a recent joint study report from The National Center for Public Policy and Higher education and Public Agenda tracking public opinion, the "change in the percentage of people who say that students from ethnic/racial minorities have less opportunity (29% in 2000 and 27% in 2003)" has not been significant

(Immerwahr 7). Yet, respondents are increasingly concerned over access and affordability for middle class persons. In 2000, only 15% of the public believed that middle class families, regardless of ethnic background, have less opportunity than others to attend college; by 2003, the number had grown to 24%. Each of these impediments to student access—along with certainly others—limit prospective students' "contexts for choice," and the degree to which they practice self-determination: "constrained contexts of choice may limit individuals' real choices in such a way that their nominal choices do not reflect their potential talents, abilities, and aspirations. An unfavorable context of choice hinders student's development of self-determination, which is a crucial underpinning of an education for justice and democracy" (Moses 706).

Within the general population, concern about access to higher education "is especially widespread among parents of high school students and African Americans" (3). This finding is supported by data from the study, which concludes that "in 2000, 60% of African American said that many people in their state do not have an opportunity for higher education, as compared to a much smaller number of whites (44%). But by the 2003 study, the lever of concern among African Americans spiked, with 76% saying that many qualified people are shut out of higher education," compared with 51% of white respondents and 67% of Hispanics (5). But when pondering fiscal access, there is more to consider than just race—income has a major effect on student access across all ethnic boundaries. According to <u>Diversity Challenged: Evidence on the Impact of Affirmative Action</u>,

> Some critics of race-conscious affirmative action point out that many black, Latino, and Native American students are poor, and ask whether their different experiences and beliefs aren't largely a product of poverty. Can't colleges and universities achieve diversity by admitting more poor students, without considering race? ...The answer is that race is related to poverty but is different in key aspects. Poverty affects the various racial groups differently, and many racial problems have a serious impact on people who are not poor. As a result, admitting poor students through race-blind affirmative action would not produce the kind of diversity we have been describing, thought it would add some other important dimensions to the diversity of the campus (26).

Administrators do need to keep in mind, however that there seems to be a stronger connection to funding difficulties for some minorities than for white students. Among undergraduates at four-year colleges, "The comparison of students from five racial/ethnic groups reveals that, among white students, just 24 percent come from families making less than $40,000 per year, while 56 percent of Black students and 52 percent of Hispanic students come from such families" ("Institutional Graduation Rates" 5). Considering tuition and financial aid policy in legally assuring access to persons from all backgrounds may remain a key planning concern for the University. Institutions must also review the ways in which they meet—or fail to meet—the needs of students with disability.

The University of Scranton offers this fall its third annual "Conference on disAbility." The University of Washington offers students with disability the DO-IT Scholars

Summer Study Program, designed to expose students to college life and career options, while exploring the challenges faced by disabled students (Roberts). Surprisingly little data or study related to students with disability in higher education exists. NCES Data shows that, in 1999-2000, 9 percent of all students in degree-granting institutions reported a disability that created difficulties for them as a student. Aside from those with physical disability, 17 percent cited mental illness or depression. Eleven percent cited a learning disability or ADD; of this number, "32 percent of students with a learning disability or ADD reported not receiving the services or accommodation they needed" (NCES "Contexts of Postsecondary Education").

One organization, the Pathways to College Network, seeks to extend opportunities for diverse populations by "focusing research-based knowledge and resources on improving college preparation, access, and success for underserved students, including low-income students, underrepresented minorities, first-generation students, and students with disabilities" (www.pathwaystocollege.net). The Network's recently released report, "A Shared Agenda: A Leadership Challenge to Improve College Access and Success" discusses ways to ensure underserved students can reach higher education. The Pell Institute for the Study of Opportunity in Higher Education and its Campus Equality Initiative focuses efforts on research and furthering opportunity for low-income college students. Though considering affordability issues for many low- and middle- income students is proving difficult for many schools, some believe they have found a way to address issues of racial diversity—by considering race in the admissions process.

Race-conscious Admissions

Following the case of *Brown vs. Board of Education* in 1954 and the Civil Rights Act of 1964, American courts have responded to race-related challenges to educational access. Most recently, legal disputes involving the University of Michigan Law School (*Gratz v. Bollinger*, 2003; *Grutter v. Bollinger*, 2003) have brought discussion of race-sensitive admissions policies back into public discussion. Forced by a federal judge to suspend a policy using race as a criterion for admissions in 2000, the University of Georgia noticed a decrease in admissions of black students over the past years. However, a new proposal is being considered by the institution, one that seeks "diversity by race and ethnicity and admitting students from different areas of the state and nation, those who speak foreign languages, students with varied socio-economic backgrounds and those with special talents" (Johnston). According to the institution's associate vice president of admissions and enrollment management, "We have tried to look at diversity very broadly at Georgia this year—much more than race and ethnicity" (Johnston).

Whether or not they believe in the benefits of diversity on college and university campuses, Americans seem unsure of race-sensitive admissions policies. Some feel that any consideration of race in the practice is discriminatory in some way. Some suggest that basing admissions decisions on racial backgrounds negatively stigmatize and categorize the minority student. Another popular belief is that considering race in admissions decisions may risk the elimination of a qualified non-minority candidate in favor of a less-qualified minority prospect. Still others believe that admitting on the merits of race only serves students of color who need it least, and who may, by virtue of

higher socio-economic status, have received greater academic preparation (Moses 711). Others propose that admission based on race is preferential treatment which increases racial animosities in larger society. However, as William Bowen and Derek Bok have observed, "if race-sensitive admissions were truly poisoning race relations, one might expect to see some evidence of growing dissatisfaction among the white alumni/ae who were most exposed to these policies and most likely to have experienced them when they applied to graduate school. In fact," according to Bowen and Bok's study of 1951, 1976, and 1989 cohorts passing through several selective colleges and universities, "the very opposite is true" (Bowen and Bok 269).

Dimension Three: Institutional Transformation

Discussions about the perceptions, needs, and challenges of diversity and diversity efforts promise to persist in higher education. Central to these efforts will be monitoring the role diversity plays in the academic enterprise. Much literature exists on the benefits diversity brings to student learning outcomes and social experience[2]. In order to realize these benefits, institutions must actively engage in the building of a diverse learning environment. For many colleges and universities, diversity planning may well remain part of or be introduced to their agendas. Determining proper federal policies for areas such as admissions and financial aid will remain requisite components of diversity planning research. This year, The College Board has issued an updated manual for strategic diversity planning. The publication, "Diversity in Higher Education: A Strategic Planning and Policy Manual Regarding Federal Law in Admissions, Financial Aid, and Outreach," works from the premise that "racial or ethnic diversity is not an end in itself, but is, rather, a means to broader educational goals." The manual presents the Board's most current review of recent legal trends and federal policy. Reviewing the status of the diversity question on a college campus may lead institutions to consider operational goals through long- or short-range planning activities. The University of Arizona, Colorado University at Boulder, and The University of Wisconsin System[3] have all developed plans designed to promote diversity and diverse learning environments at their institutions.

Globalization remains a key issue propelling diversity research and planning in higher education. Population explosions in other parts of the world will continue to shape American higher education. Though American minority populations are expected to soar, growth in world populations of diverse individuals—who may constitute the mainstream population in other parts of the globe—dwarf American growth. "In 2025, North America represents only 5 percent of the total" of the world population. "Asia, in contrast, represents 55% of the global population and will experience a total population increase of over 1 billion people by 2025—14 times the increase of 73 million in North America" (Swail 16). This leads higher education to consider questions about its role as a service provider, including: what role will U.S. higher education play in serving these emerging markets? Will global shifts in population put increasing pressure on U.S.

---

2. More resources on this subject are available through the Equity and Diversity Office and the Planning, Assessment, and Institutional Research Office
3. See list of Sources for Web links to these plans.

institutions to serve overseas students? How will the global market and increased competition impact U.S. educational policy and practice? What kinds of global experiences will U.S. students wish to investigate, both personally and academically? (Swail 17-18). Institutions may question how they can meet the demands of an increasingly international admissions territory. They may consider the roles that various trade agreements and U.S. regulations concerning international students play in the development of their own planning and policy. American colleges and universities may review current academic offerings, services, and supplemental programming to discover if it meets the needs of an increasingly diverse and borderless world. And, they will need to navigate questions of preparation and training—both those it needs to deliver their services to a global environment, and those it seeks to instill in the students they educate. The roles international diversity and globalization will play in shaping the operations of institutions may lead to questions of institutional identify and mission: who does the institution serve and in what ways?

Assessment and Measures

How will an institution know when it's "diverse?" When will it know it has reached objectives of diversity planning? A key element to successful planning is selecting appropriate measures for the success of any one goal, and ensuring that processes exist for monitoring progress. Some institutions attempt to use metrics to gauge growth in diversity-related outcomes. One such effort, the Diversity Scorecard Project, is employed by several schools in California, a state responding to huge increase in Hispanic student populations. For schools with this immediate surge in population, the challenge it not "how to become more diverse… [it is] how to translate diversity in the student body into equity in educational outcomes" (Bensimon et al. 14). The Scorecard is used to establish whether this kind of equity is present at the institutions. Designed around four "perspectives"— access, retention, excellence, and institutional receptivity— the Scorecard captures some fifty-eight measurements. The project hopes to stress the importance of using data disaggregated by race and ethnicity as routine practice and to make "disparities by race and ethnicity… more readily recognized" (15).

It is important for planning and assessment to be outcomes-based, meaning that successes will be measured by outputs, rather than assumed by inputs or theoretical, "placeholder" language. Jeffrey Milem and Kenji Hakuta describe four types of such outcomes. Two, identified by Patricia Gurin (1999), relate learning and democracy outcomes. Learning outcomes include "active learning processes in which students become involved while in college, the engagement and motivation that students exhibit, the learning and refinement of intellectual and academic skills, and the value students place on these skills after they leave college" (Milem and Hakuta 393). Democracy outcomes relate ways in which "higher education prepares students to become involved as active participants in a society that is becoming increasingly complex" (393). Milem builds on these concepts by introducing process and material benefits. Process outcomes reflect ways students "perceive that diversity has enriched their college experiences;" also of assessment value are also the "material benefits students accrue when they attend diverse colleges" (393-4). These material benefits include financial gains of salary/wages and "the attainment of advanced graduate or professional degrees and/or better job placement for students

educated at more diverse institutions and/or who receive affirmative action in college admissions" (394). However, the benefits described by Milem are reliant on the qualifier "more diverse colleges," assuming that institutions already consider themselves or are considered by others to be "more diverse" than others. Important to diversity assessment may be determining ways in which these measures can be used in or be related to benchmarking activities and/or institutional assessment for all schools

Institutions should be discouraged from viewing diversity as a "problem that is in need of a solution" (Smith 49). Colleges and universities are advised to "build evaluation components into their programs to determine whether or not, based on given criteria, a diversity program is successful and whether the program has validity for a given population…The appropriateness of a program needs to be addressed, its institutional context explored, and the level of institutionalization of the program evaluated, so that results, positive and negative, can contribute to the national discussion about effectiveness" (49).

In addressing the unique nature and needs of the nation's small liberal arts colleges, J.L. Stimpert, an economics professor at Colorado College, identifies some challenges inherent in the liberal arts organizational model with regards to diversity. Despite academic and residential designs that encourage dialogue and learning among students who have different viewpoints,

> "all too often small colleges fail to open their students to diverse perspectives. The classroom is obviously an important forum for encouraging this type of dialogue and learning, but faculty members must acknowledge that much of this dialogue and learning will have to occur as students live together and interact outside their classrooms. Well-designed new student orientation program, workshops, and other campus activities can also be catalysts for this kind of learning and interaction, but these programs alone—no matter how well executed—are insufficient. They must be bolstered by shifts in campus cultures that give added importance to the value of dialogue and the freewheeling exchange of ideas and viewpoints (47).

Stimpert's insights reflect the consensus of many that diversity measures, no matter what size the institution, cannot be compartmentalized as either academic or social exercises—they must be both.

Dimension Four: Climate and Intergroup Relations

Making gains in diverse representation will likely mean little to an institution if the climate and campus environment do not respond to and reflect the spirit and nature of inclusion. Campus Climate—what it feels like to be at an institution—dominates many discussions relating to diversity. And it is no less tangible a thing than data and numbers in terms of translating and representing an individual's experience. Climate includes how it feels for every person at an institution, but critical to higher education is addressing how climate impacts institutional and student success (Smith 10). Discussion of climate continues to "involve complex issues, including legacies of intolerance and racism" (Smit 11). According to a recent study by Brown University-based The Futures Project, of

students in community colleges, public four-year, and private four-year institutions (from a sample group of 51 students of various ethnicities from eight institutions in Massachusetts and Rhode Island), those students in private four-year schools found campus climate to be

> "the most hospitable. The financial aid office and bursar's office were seen as friendly and helpful. Nonetheless, academic advising needs to be improved. Students feel alone when having to make important academic decisions. The most troublesome complaint was that campus officials were more focused on creating a 'safe place' for students of color than on providing them with honest, constructive feedback. Deans, counselors, and, to an extent, faculty were always too positive. Students felt uncertain about their abilities" (Scurry 6).

Even though four-year students cited being very involved in the life of their campus, they felt "much less comfortable there," despite their working hard to become part of the larger community (18). In comparison, two-year students "talked about their campuses as a second home—even thought they were commuters. Their issues were more with dealing with administrative offices such as financial aid or the bursar. They felt comfortable interacting in a student body diverse in age and race"; many of the four-year students reflected on "how hurtful and frustrating it is to be viewed as a representative of their race, rather than as an individual" (18).

The importance of measuring diversity climate is stressed by a number of journals and studies. Assessing campus climate can serve as a measure of the experience of all community members: As Sylvia Hurtado, Jeffrey Milem and others capture in "Enhancing Campus Climates for Racial/Ethnic Diversity: Educational Policy and Practice," "an individual's position and power within the organization and his or her status as 'insider' or 'outsider' strongly influence attitudes…In other words, who you are and where you are positioned in an institution will affect how you experience and view the institution" (677). The authors identify four elements of campus diversity climate: historical legacy of inclusion or exclusion; structural diversity; the psychological dimension of climate; and the behavioral dimension of climate (Hurtado et al). Evaluating and monitoring these climate areas on the Scranton campus—study which will certainly be directed and enhanced by careful analysis and consideration of the recently completed University of Scranton Campus Climate Study—may provide direction and context for future diversity planning and for understanding the complex society of the institution.

Equally important will be ensuring a shared and animating vision for what the institution needs and wants to achieve with respect to diverse interactions, persons, and academic engagement—including what diversity means to the University's curricula. "Increasing numbers of campuses are recognizing the significance of creating opportunities for intergroup dialogue as part of diversity efforts. However, the conditions for effective dialogue cannot be assumed and the necessity of sustaining difficult dialogues has become increasingly urgent. There appear to be significant numbers of instances where institutions and groups are talking past one another" (Smith VI). In order for groups to speak in concert, they need to address and answer some critical questions.

Moving Forward

Following the University's Campus Climate Study, which articulated some diversity-related issues, the institution will need to address the report's findings. It may also wish to measure the climate of campus as perceived by its students. The University should identify diversity-related activities in its regional area, and continue to cultivate relationships with the community and with diversity-related groups or consortia (such as the Northeastern Pennsylvania Diversity Education Consortium, of which the University of Scranton is a member). A review of campus diversity or diversity-related assessment activities and a review of the status of current diversity or diversity-related committees may also be beneficial. If efforts are to be taken to the long-term, the University needs to ask itself some questions. A recent Chronicle of Higher Education article by Robert Shireman, former director of the higher education program at California's James Irvine Foundation, poses ten important questions college officials should ask about diversity:

1. How do we define diversity?
2. Why do we have this particular array of students?
3. Who gets financial aid?
4. How successful are our students?
5. What multicultural education are students receiving?
6. What does it feel like to be a student here?
7. Who are our faculty members?
8. What are our relationships with nearby communities?
9. Who is thinking about these issues on campus?
10. What do we want to change, and how we will know that we have changed it?

Though these questions seem to weigh heavily on student diversity issues, tackling these questions may prove helpful in developing strategies for inclusive diversity planning that will consider the needs of all campus community members. Identifying current diversity efforts and developing relationships with community groups and consortia with similar goals may be beneficial.

Additional Resources and Readings

Bowen, William C. and Derek Bok. (1998). The Shape of the River. Princeton University Press.

Massey, Douglas S. et al. (2003). The Source of the River. Princeton University Press.

McDonald, William and Associates. (2002). Creating Campus Community. Jossey-Bass.

Orfield, Gary, ed. (2001). Diversity Challenged: Evidence on the Impact of Affirmative Action. The Civil Rights Project, Harvard University.

Racial and Ethnic Diversity in Higher Education. (2002). ASHE Reader Series. Pearson Publishing.

Swail, Watson Scott, Kenneth E. Redd and Laura W. Perna. (2003). Retaining Minority Students in Higher Education: A Framework for Success. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report.

Sources

American Council on Education. (2002). Breaking the Barriers: A Guidebook of Strategies.

---. (2000) “Gender Equity in Higher Education: Are Male Students at a Disadvantage?”

---. Minorities in Higher Education Annual Status Report, 2002-2003.

Bensimon, Estela et al. (2003). “The Accountability Side of Diversity.” *Diversity Digest*.

Bowen, William C. and Derek Bok. (1998). The Shape of the River. Princeton University Press.

The Chronicle of Higher Education. (2003). *Almanac Issue 2003-2004*.

Hurtado, Sylvia, Jeffrey F. Milem, Alma R. Clayton-Pedersen, and Walter R. Allen. (2002). “Enhancing Campus Climates for Racial/Ethnic Diversity: Educational Policy and Practice.” ASHE Reader Series, 671-685.

Immerwahr, John. (2004). “Public Attitudes on Higher Education: A Trend Analysis, 1993-2003.” Public Agenda and The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education.

Johnston, Lori. (11 August 2004) “UGA’s new freshman class to have fewer blacks.” Macon Telegraph. Retrieved 11 August 2004: www.macon.com

Knocking at the College Door: Projections of High School Graduates by State, Income and Race/Ethnicity. (2003). Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education.

Lerner, Robert, Ph.D. and Althea K. Nagai, Ph.D. A Critique of the Expert Report of Patricia Gurin in *Gratz v. Bollinger*.

Milem, Jeffrey F. and Kenji Hakuta. (2002). "The Benefits of Racial and Ethnic Diversity in Higher Education." Racial and Ethnic Diversity in Higher Education. ASHE Reader Series, 389-410.

Moses, Michele S. (2002). "Affirmative Action and the Creation of More Favorable Contexts of Choice." Racial and Ethnic Diversity in Higher Education. ASHE Reader Series, 704-726.

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). (2003). "Contexts of Postsecondary Education: Services and Accommodations for Students with Disabilities."

Pathways to College. (2004). "A Shared Agenda: A Leadership Challenge to Improve College Access and Success."

Scurry, Jamie. (2004). "In their Own Voices: Conversations with College Students from Underrepresented Populations." The Futures Project.

Shireman, Robert. (15 August 2003) "10 Questions College Officials Should Ask About Diversity." The Chronicle of Higher Education.

Smith, Daryl G, et al. Diversity Works: The Emerging Patter of How Students Benefit. (1997). Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Stimpert, J.L. "Turbulent Times: Four Issues Facing Liberal Arts Colleges." Change July/August 2004, 42-49.

The University of Arizona. (2002). Diversity at the University of Arizona: Assessment and Action Options. Available: http://w3fp.arizona.edu/~c11/diversity/

The University of Colorado at Boulder. (1999). Campus Diversity Plan: A Blueprint for Action. Available: http://www.colorado.edu/cu-diversity/blueprint/index.html

The University of Scranton. (2000). A *Community of Scholars A Culture of Excellence*.

---. (2003) Fact Book Fall 2003.

The University of Wisconsin System. UW System Plan 2008: Education Quality Through Racial/Ethnic Diversity. Available: http://www.provost.wisc.edu/plan2008/

USNews and World Report. (August 2004). *America's Best Colleges 2005*. "Campus Diversity: Universities—Master's (North)."

~Planning, Assessment, & Institutional Research Office~
Jerome DeSanto, Vice President for Planning and CIO
Robyn Dickinson, Director
Valerie Taylor, Institutional Research Analyst
Bonnie Thomas-Sharksnas, Assessment Analyst
Kate Yerkes, Research Assistant