

# **IUPUI EXTERNAL REVIEWER REPORT ON THE CAMPUS CLIMATE FOR DIVERSITY**

## **Our Role as External Reviewers**

We are pleased to submit this report to IUPUI as external reviewers for the Climate for Diversity self-study conducted from 1997 to 2000. We have witnessed a number of diversity initiatives across the country and have conducted climate studies on campuses enough to know that final reports typically contain a balance of “bright spots” and areas that need attention. Our role is to convey our general observations, respond to questions about diversity issues, and provide some realistic recommendations based on the IUPUI context. Our observations may or may not resonate with particular groups on campus, and therefore the Diversity Cabinet may need to balance the “external” and “internal” views of IUPUI in setting its goals for diversity. The urban location of IUPUI and its evolving history present both a great challenge and tremendous opportunity for a research institution. We seek to address both the challenges, as we see them, and the opportunities to achieve the university’s aspirations to excellence and diversity.

## **General Observations**

### **An Historical Frame of Reference**

American higher education has been responding to the challenge of diversity since Harvard College, in its first half century, extended itself beyond its Puritan origins. Originally, according to historian Juergen Herbst, some of its Congregational founders had opposed receiving a charter from the King of England for fear that it might give

Anglicans, and perhaps even Baptists, a foothold on the governing board. Over time, Harvard managed to become Protestant, then Christian, and eventually fully secular.

The milestones along the American pathway toward educational inclusion encompass a proliferation of sectarian colleges and universities built to meet the needs of specific denominations, institutions like City College of New York that provided educational access to waves of new immigrants, the land grant movement, which brought in the so-called “industrial classes,” historically black colleges and universities, women’s institutions, community colleges, and urban commuter universities like IUPUI. While American higher education is still traveling along this pathway, it has come a long way. Its institutions are richly differentiated according to type and purpose, and taken together, they provide educational access to a larger proportion of the population than in any other large industrial nation. When the story of this country’s engagement with diversity in higher education is fully told, it will be judged a success story. It is important to consider what will become IUPUI’s contribution to this success story.

### **A Conceptual Frame of Reference**

While “diversity” has not always been the watchword for this historical development, it has always been implicated just beneath the surface. As the journey has unfolded, diversity as a construct has traversed a broad conceptual landscape, assimilating new meanings along the way. It is now a robust and richly endowed theme that occupies multiple domains of discourse. That constitutes value added, but it is also an increasingly complex challenge. For these domains of discourse, though overlapping and interrelated, are sufficiently distinct to foster confusion. Take, for example, the views of diversity as social justice and diversity as an educational asset for all learners.

Advocates of the former are likely to focus on members of disadvantaged and aggrieved groups, while the educational advocates focus on getting members of the academic community to see the educational benefits of diversity. Those who want social justice will argue that the identities – racial, gender-based, ethnic and the like – that have faced oppression should be the focus for purposes of redress. Some might criticize those who speak of diversity as an asset as a failing to recognize the historical continuous inequalities that exist in society. Neither perspective is sufficient to catalyze institutional change alone, and the many reasons to support a diversity agenda need to be brought together under the same umbrella. Those who see in diversity a powerful educational resource will want to expand the list of diversity dimensions to include many more identity indicators, and they will insist on moving beyond the labels and indicators to get at the lived experience and the social consequences associated with them. Moreover, it is important to recognize that many groups come to education to learn about each other and to learn about their own place in American society. It is the lived experience, shared in community with others, that has educational value. It is far too easy for advocates of different positions to talk past each other, rather than to appreciate the complementarity of their interests. These are conversations, or dialogues, that IUPUI will have to manage and negotiate in the future.

Institutions that make themselves deliberately conversant with the multiple domains of diversity discourse have a much better chance of achieving their goals of inclusion and of deploying diversity as an educational resource. For illustrative purposes, we list here some of the domains of discourse that have invoked diversity and produced rich dialogue on the subject:

- Diversity as demographics, which helps us catalogue the dimensions of diversity and examine their social significance
- Diversity as difference, which focuses our attention on pluralism and differential access to resources and power
- Diversity as unity, which perceives that diversity always implies a unifying context, as for instance when we point to the diversity of Americans, implying an American commonality that embraces the differences
- Diversity as social justice, which seeks redress of historical wrongs
- Diversity as education, which values diversity as an educational asset and seeks to deploy it as an educational resource
- Diversity linked to democracy, which advances the argument that diversity is the defining characteristic of democracy, that without diversity, democracy would thrive and, perhaps become impossible in today's more complex and diverse world
- Diversity as civic competence, which admonishes the educational enterprise to prepare students for active civic engagement in a diverse and pluralistic democracy
- Diversity as a matter of institutional management, which sees diversity as construct and practice ramifying into all the precincts of institutional activity
- Diversity as the dynamic of identity, which imparts to individuals increasing capacity to influence their definition of self and affirm their affiliation with multiple identity groups
- Diversity as the crossroads where identity and social history intersect to form both a powerful educational instrument and a challenging educational imperative, for institutions as well as for individuals and groups.

Finding ways to bring these conversations together in many venues, with diverse groups, and on many occasions will extend the work initiated by the self-study in a significant way.

## **Observations Regarding IUPUI**

### **The Self-Study Report**

It is gratifying to note that IUPUI's review of campus climate has touched, however subtly, on many of these domains. The challenge now is to examine these domains more systematically, analytically, and critically. The examination should prompt practitioners to move from "either/or" paradigms to "both/and" arguments. Excellence and diversity offer a compelling case in point. "How much excellence should we sacrifice to achieve diversity?" is a question often heard in academic circles. The assumption is that we must choose between them, that one diminishes the other. Our argument is that each enhances the other, and there are many outstanding examples of very diverse public, institutions that are also excellent. It is clear that IUPUI aspires to and needs both. It can achieve both by reconstructing the paradigm, examining the existing evidence of the positive impact of diversity on student learning, and aligning institutional practices more closely with institutional mission.

The self-study represents an excellent starting point to understand where IUPUI should go next in achieving the vision as laid out in Chancellor Bepko's *State of Diversity Message* (January 17, 2000). The self-study is one of the most comprehensive assessments of activity occurring in the many units that we have seen conducted on a college campus. It is more like a "program review" than a focus on perceptions of the environment typical in many climate studies. The IUPUI review helped to focus on

activities and behaviors and to document what the institution is actually doing in the area of diversity. These activities reveal how individuals (students, faculty and staff) experience IUPUI differently depending on their location within the institution.

For example, it is clear that activities at the School of Nursing have begun to realize the vision as laid out in the IUPUI *State of Diversity Message* (January 17, 2000) in terms of creating diverse learning and work environments that will meet the needs of the changing population in Indianapolis. The comprehensiveness of the self-study report, and the nature of the questions placed before each unit, also reveal strikingly uneven institutional progress toward diversity goals. Admittedly this is probably the case at many institutions but, at this point in time at IUPUI, there is a mismatch between what the Chancellor envisions and current activity in many key units. It is evident that not all units have assumed broad responsibility for incorporating diversity into core activities of teaching, research, and service. What may be the next phase of work on campus to ensure broader responsibility for meeting diversity goals and responsiveness to diverse populations? How will this become part of academic affairs and permeate broad areas of campus activity? The self-study report raised these important questions and began to illustrate that diversity initiatives cannot remain dependent on any one person or unit to articulate and carry out.

There is a noticeable lack of activity in some units. While many small activities were noted, in some cases, no plans for incorporating diversity were evident. Still others admitted they were in the process of thinking about planning. This clearly indicates that units are at various stages of awareness about how diversity is part of the institutional mission. No single initiative will have lasting impact without coordination into a

sustained set of activities, motivated by a coherent philosophy and action agenda. Units should begin regular planning and reporting on their activities on diversity and receive rewards for their progress. In our recommendations we offer a list of characteristics of a plan for diversity.

The self-study report also indicates that some communities (e.g. African American community) are still looking for evidence of real institutional commitment. There was a sense that the route of self-study has been taken before, that change has not occurred in many units, and that there is lack of visible minority leadership at the institution. There is also a sense that as the institution aspires to excellence, it is turning away from the "urban mission." IUPUI must respond to these views with concrete and visible changes if it expects to improve the attitudes and opinions of internal and external communities about its commitment to diversity.

### **Continuing Challenges:**

IUPUI is challenged by its identity and its history. It needs to discover its crossroads, where identity and social history intersect. It needs to exploit the crossroads for its educational value and accept the ethical mandate of affirming honest social history. The two are closely linked. To us, IUPUI seems nervous about its mission as an urban institution. The mission is articulated, but not always enacted in practice, and on both sides of the town-gown divide there linger concerns about the institution's history. Some of that history is associated with painful memories of the institution's establishment. From one vantage point, it was the birth of a splendid social, cultural, and economic agency. From another, it was the death of a thriving ethnic neighborhood.

We found this historical legacy lingers in daily interactions. This history should become a learning tool for IUPUI and its community. IUPUI should examine the history honestly and use it to inform institutional self-understanding, to undergird its sense of urban mission, and to establish a basis for greater engagement with the community. These are both challenges and opportunities. It is important for the institution to be cognizant of how its narrative surrounding diversity is socially constructed.

The organizational structure of IUPUI is another significant challenge. Like many large complex universities, IUPUI is subdivided into schools with well-defined missions and considerable autonomy. While we recognize that this arrangement contributes in major ways to IUPUI's pursuit of excellence, we also note that it has side-effects that diminish the institution's capacity to achieve some of its institution-wide objectives, including those associated with the multiple domains of diversity. The schools guard their autonomy, while the central administration pushes for change. The schools respond, quite legitimately, to the outside professional and economic pressures that influence their mission and reputation, while the central administration urges attention to broader educational concerns such as general education, civic competence, or student development. These sometimes debilitating tensions diminish the overall capacity of the institution to pursue its goals, and we suspect also burden the schools as well. It is our clear perception that the tensions render the institution less efficient in using its substantial resources than it could otherwise be. Any process for change will be most effective when units see both external and internal pressures converge and they see the general benefits that can accrue as a result of attention to diversity issues.

Another significant challenge emerged in our initial conversations with the institutional leadership. IUPUI draws its student body from a large pool that is diverse in background and preparation. Competition for this pool is growing, and the advent of community colleges in Indiana will increase the competitive challenge. This complex reality is one of the domains of diversity discourse that requires IUPUI to engage in more systematic study and planning. There is an awareness of the challenge, but apparently not yet a well-formulated plan for meeting it. Devising multiple ways for the institution to become a significant pathway to the baccalaureate degree should be one of its highest priorities. Otherwise, it is clear that progress toward diversification of the student body will be diminished, and negative views of institutional commitment will be reinforced.

### **A Process for Change**

We recommend both a top down and bottom up approach to planning and implementing a diversity strategy. Perhaps the most challenging implication of the top down approach is our recommendation that the Diversity Cabinet constitute itself a learning community and become conversant with the state of discourse in all the domains of diversity. That will require perhaps continuing study, self-education, tenacity, and leadership. It will also require time, which will have to be taken from other priorities. But it will also build the capacity of the leadership of IUPUI to manage the discourse on diversity in powerfully productive ways. Over time, the discourse will become more efficient, which will benefit the institution in substantive ways.

We also recommend a bottom up strategy. It begins with small organizational units. Each unit has already begun to describe with precision what it does in the area of diversity, the next step will be to encourage each to articulate an action plan and identify

the ways in which the unit's activity contributes to the mission of the overall institution. Then, with careful attention to the multiple domains of diversity discourse, the unit is asked to identify the ways in which diversity intersects and influences the unit's activity and aspirations. At various times, several units may be brought together to explore and discover shared values and opportunities for collaboration. The intention is to percolate the mission of the institution throughout its precincts and to encourage new ways of thinking and acting in regard to unit activities and broad institutional objectives.

Another approach would be to define outcomes and ask units to report how they are achieving a select set of outcomes to monitor over the short and long term. Table 1, formulated as part of our response to the last question in the next section, may help to begin these conversations.

### **What will it cost?**

During our visit at least two individuals wondered about the cost of diversity initiatives. Speculations about cost range from the very expensive (e.g. cluster hiring of a group of interdisciplinary scholars) to very inexpensive (e.g. Diversity Awards for contributions of campus members). However, what is not often evaluated is the cost of neglect of diversity issues. First, it has been well-documented that a poor climate and lack of civility on campus impacts students' transition to college, sense of belonging, and eventual academic achievement (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pederson, & Allen, 1999). Second, the image of IUPUI as being inaccessible to members of the Indianapolis community can be perpetuated by a lack of diversity, lack of information about the contributions of IUPUI in diverse communities, increasing selectivity without visible pathways to help underrepresented groups attain degrees at IUPUI, and the lack of

outward signs that invite individuals to experience the campus. These are real costs to an institution that wishes to develop an identity as an urban institution. Initiatives may call for resource allocation toward areas that make the institutional boundaries more permeable in a variety of ways.

Ultimately, as our comments imply, the cost will depend on the content of the plan. Cost should be a consideration in the plan, but what must be weighed is the cost of neglect affecting the education that students obtain to meet the challenges of a diverse society (e.g. how effective is business education without consideration of diverse populations?).

### **Questions and Responses Developed by the Campus to Guide the Review**

Prior to the visit, we were provided a list of questions that the campus wished to have addressed and tap into our expertise for subsequent deliberations. While we identified these other issues during the visit that need attention, we also recognize that the questions raised by the community in their initial discussions about diversity on campus are important. Below we provide our thinking on these questions. We urge subsequent working groups to use our suggestions as a basis for developing solutions that work best for the IUPUI context.

- 1. Are there specific “lessons learned” from other institutions that will assist IUPUI in realizing its goals for diversity?**

One of the lessons we have learned from observing campuses is that the next steps following an extensive self study are very important in determining whether the institution has the will to do more. Too often the mistake is made that important initiatives are assigned to someone who shoulders the responsibility for developing changes but has very little authority over faculty affairs or activities that must be undertaken campus-wide. The more individuals that take responsibility for change, the more likely it is that needed changes will occur. Furthermore, the university community may be at different levels of readiness for "new areas of concern" that emerge as result of a self-study. There may also be a reluctance to "experiment" with new ideas or ways of thinking that broaden diversity as an integral part of the institutional mission. Making use of the self-study report for regular conversations and for brainstorming new areas of focus is important. Too often these reports are put on the shelf and forgotten.

Institutions that have attained some success in diversifying their student body and faculty find that the "real work" begins after this phase is a success. Institutions must find ways to train faculty to use diversity in the classroom for educational objectives. (The FACET summer institute focused on diversity is a good start but extending this training to other faculty on campus should be a goal). Junior faculty need mentoring programs and senior faculty need to feel supported and excited about remaining at the institution. Finding ways to prevent the "revolving-door syndrome" when it comes to recruitment of faculty, students, and staff will be the next phase after increasing the number of diverse individuals is achieved. In short, continuous work is required to achieve diverse learning and work environments.

Campuses that begin to institutionalize diversity initiatives help to ensure that they become a lasting form of institutional commitment that is demonstrated to external and internal communities. Sustained and intentional initiatives integrated with daily activities provide the best approach to diversity, otherwise it is considered an "add on" rather than a part of the core activity of a unit.

There are many additional lessons to be learned from other institutions. The literature on institutional change in response to diversity is growing. DiversityWeb and *Diversity Digest* are good places to start. The selection of institutions for examples of innovation should be strategic. For example, the University of Massachusetts Boston is an urban commuter institution that has made significant progress with curriculum reform. The University of Maryland College Park has developed a strategy for communicating more effectively with internal and external publics about diversity issues and has produced a manual documenting its diversity experience entitled *Diversity Blueprint*. Other publications, *Diversity Works (AAC&U)* and *Enacting Diverse Learning Environments (Hurtado, et al. 1999)*, examine the literature on the impact of diversity on student learning. ACE has just published a new study of this phenomenon, available at ACE's website. These resources are easy to obtain.

**2. What internal structures work best in addressing issues of diversity? Faculty focused? Student focused? Integrated structure?**

First, it is important to identify existing structures and understand how diversity goals are furthered in daily operations. For example, making additional resources available is key to encouraging units to aggressively seek individuals who will enhance the excellence and diversity of the unit and institution overall. Resource allocation can

achieve the twin goals of excellence and diversity but in a decentralized budgeting system, it is also necessary to have Deans, Department Chairs, and Unit Heads in place who can articulate the need for diverse personnel and make the case for outstanding candidates.

At the same time some new structures may be needed to address curricular issues, provide learning opportunities for students, and provide training for staff in intergroup relations. Such structures can create greater awareness and improve the climate for intergroup relations, by providing individuals with skills to manage conflict, understand concepts and differences in background, and improve opportunities to interact ethically in a diverse society. The Intergroup Relations Center at Arizona State University (Office of the Provost) is an example of such a structure. Sometimes these results can be achieved through greater coordination of existing structures, but collaboration across units (or across academic and student affairs) does not readily occur without support from decision-makers.

We would caution that there are probably no “best structures” for dealing with diversity that can be determined outside the context of a comprehensive strategic plan. Diversity is rich and complex. It occupies multiple domains of thought and practice. The structures should be crafted to sustain the continuous process established in the plan. In the case of IUPUI, the establishment of the Diversity Cabinet seems very promising. It creates a leadership group that can become conversant with the domains of diversity discourse and create mechanisms for facilitating the discourse institution wide. It is in a position to encourage the several schools to continue the self-inquiry that began with the comprehensive self-study, to revisit the questions, identify areas where progress is

needed, and develop a plan for achieving it, including benchmarks and a process of self-assessment. .

**3. What are best ways of initiating and sustaining off-campus community involvement?**

The best way to think of the institution in alliance with communities is to think of the campus and community as a network that draws people in, extends itself outward, and connects both individuals and organizations. This network model blurs the boundaries between "on campus" and "off-campus." The network is maintained by the development of relationships that are sustained through regular events, constant information flow in all directions, the establishment of mutual goals (e.g. improving baccalaureate attainment and economic development in the city), and the creation of narratives that tell the story of what the network is accomplishing for the university and the community.

The institution needs to assign responsibility for nurturing the network and guiding its transformation into an authentic partnership. Some institutions are utilizing clinical-track appointments to develop community-based initiatives to complement research collaborations, develop internships for students in the community, and organize regular activities that bring people together to focus on common goals. At the University of Michigan, the Ginsberg Center offers a sophisticated approach to creating meaningful partnerships with the community.

During our interviews with community representatives and alumni, it was suggested that IUPUI might serve as the neutral ground for divergent views and groups to

address important issues in the city. It was also noted that some schools make good use of the alumni network in communities to aid in student recruitment, faculty partnerships with the community, and returning individuals to IUPUI for additional training. It was also observed that Chancellor Bepko has made connections with the community. These are important building blocks for initiating and sustaining community involvement.

In summary, IUPUI should invite the community to participate in creating the crossroads where institutional identity and community identity intersect with honest social history. This is, of course, like everything historiographical, continuous and iterative. It entails the creation of institutional and community narratives that serve to illuminate the histories, express the identities, and chart action pathways. This activity should be construed as both high-level and grass roots, involving acknowledged community leaders and community practitioners grappling with real problems. Finding ways to blur or eliminate organizational boundaries, status differences, and develop relationships based on common goals makes for a successful network.

**4. Do monetary incentives for faculty recruitment assist with minority recruitment and retention? What repercussions are possible from other faculty?**

Salary, space, research facilities, and access to collegial support of their intellectual interests contribute most to faculty feelings of satisfaction with the academic environment. These resources are often used in the recruitment and retention of faculty "stars" and therefore, the precedent is set for some faculty receiving more support than others in these areas. But monetary incentives are a mixed blessing. They can cause resentment when faculty come to feel that they are undervalued, an issue quite apart from

racial issues that arise in such cases. To the extent possible, monetary incentives should be distributed in a way that emphasizes retention and the competitive market for unique qualities brought by candidates. It is also important to recognize that the lived experience of faculty members in respect to their identities, rather than the labels themselves, is what the University values and wishes to retain. For example, a minority faculty member may observe that her lived experience as a minority woman draws her to a line of research that is undervalued by some institutions. A strategy for the University might be to provide additional support for the work because of its value to the University's educational enterprise.

Some institutions have begun to attract groups of faculty whose work focuses on issues that contribute directly to the long-term goals of the institution. In the case of IUPUI, urban issues, including issues of diversity and inclusion, might be a primary focus. These cluster hires are designed to create intellectual communities that sustain faculty work and retain them. Another approach, that can be less costly, would be to build on identified areas where a few additional hires can make a real impact on the scholarship and intellectual community for the study of diverse populations.

**5. What are the most effective ways of engaging “resistant” faculty in the campus diversity initiatives?**

Faculty may be resistant to change represented by diversity for a variety of reasons, and it is important to explore and identify the specific sources of resistance. The key here is to demonstrate that participation by faculty will benefit what they value, that it will reward them intellectually and professionally, that it will advance the enterprise to which they have devoted their professional lives. Faculty should be rewarded for their

participation, and they should be encouraged to recruit additional colleagues. It is becoming increasingly easy to “market” diversity because it “sells” itself, demographically, ethically, intellectually, economically. These market incentives should be identified and utilized in a deliberate strategy to get a critical mass of faculty, staff, students, alumni, indeed, all the constituencies important to the institution, to “buy in”.

Identifying ways that make diversity initiatives consistent with faculty roles can encourage faculty involvement. Some institutions use undergraduate research programs for underrepresented groups to encourage faculty to engage students in the faculty members’ own research. This engages faculty and students in a more substantial mentoring relationship, than occasional meetings provide in some types of “mentorship” programs.

Faculty development programs have proven to be the most important single approach to encouraging faculty involvement in diversity initiatives. The best programs focus on curricular innovation and improvement in teaching practices. They encourage "peer" collaboration, experiential and community-based learning, and active learning techniques. The FACET Summer Institute is a good beginning, but these conversations need to be sustained with other faculty throughout the year. (A wealth of information about faculty development initiatives is available in the publications of the Association of American Colleges and Universities and at DiversityWeb. The University of Michigan has recently added a new position to its teaching/learning center that supports multicultural pedagogy and teaching).

In many disciplines, some of the most exciting new scholarship and pedagogical advances address issues of diversity. Experts in these areas should be brought to campus

to work with faculty. Finally, the institution needs to provide the sense that “the diversity train is leaving the station,” and that being on board will be better than staying behind.

Some institutions reward diversity work by bestowing Diversity Awards on individuals each year in recognition of their outstanding contributions to diversity scholarship, practice, or service to communities. Schools and colleges or relevant staff units are asked to prepare a folders on the nominee that document the contributions. In this process, Deans and Unit Heads become better acquainted with the contributions of individuals in this area. Nominees are reviewed by a special campus-wide committee that includes past winners of the award. A social event or dinner is then held to present awards. This helps to create a network of individuals (in a decentralized environment) that are engaged in important diversity work on campus.

**6. Should campus diversity training programs include integrated audiences of faculty, students, and staff, or should each group have its own specific training?**

Diversity training programs should be developed based on careful needs assessment. Some probably should be integrated, others targeted to specific needs. The Intergroup Relations Center at Arizona State University is an example of an agency that provides training services tailored to the diverse needs of various constituencies within the university. An important point about diversity training is that these should not be “one shot” sensitivity training but should be part of a sustained educational activity. Many campuses utilize intergroup dialogues extended over several weeks because it takes almost one session to dispel stereotypes and subsequent sessions to build understanding and mutual problem-solving. Peer facilitation is also often utilized in this approach.

**7. Can a campus overemphasize diversity and create a backlash? If yes, how can an adverse reaction be avoided?**

If diversity is demographic reality, if it is difference in the context of unity, if it is social justice, education, the defining characteristic of democracy, civic competence, a management imperative, the dynamic of identity, and the crossroads where identity and social history intersect, it is hardly likely to suffer from over-emphasis. An adverse reaction to diversity is avoided by investing diversity with these rich meanings and underscoring how diversity can contribute to the richness of life, individually, institutionally, and in the community.

**8. How long should a campus have a focus on diversity?**

A campus should focus on diversity as long as it considers the conceptual domains that diversity occupies important to its institutional life. For example, democracy must forever ask the insistent questions, who's included, who's not, why, why not? When it fails to ask these questions, it is preparing for its demise. So it is with diversity.

If IUPUI defines diversity as an essential part of the preparation of undergraduates and if it is linked with community economic and social development, and if IUPUI expects to join metropolitan Indianapolis in an authentic partnership, a diversity focus must be ever present. Engagement of diversity develops in phases. The first phase illuminates key issues and increases awareness of them. In subsequent phases the institution will focus more deliberately on planning, implementation, and assessment. Most of the important diversity work begins on a campus after it has achieved a substantial level of representation of various groups.

9. **When will a campus know that it has achieved and sustained the desired level of diversity?**

There should be benchmarks along the way. When they are achieved, they should become part of the institutional narrative, part of the institution's story of its venture. But diversity must ultimately be seen as a sustained process by which an institution learns to value and deploy its human resources in increasingly enriching ways. In Goethe's masterful work, Faust was to lose his soul as soon as he achieved a moment of experiential satisfaction to which he would say, "Tarry awhile, you are so beautiful." We might suggest that our society will achieve a desired level of diversity when it perfects its democracy. Keep in mind that the "level" of diversity is a level of understanding, not merely a number.

10. **What are the most effective tools to measure success in the area of diversity?**

The array of diversity outcomes should be identified as part of the strategic planning process and become the benchmarks in the assessment process. They should grow organically out of the goals that are set. For example, a school might compare the results of its survey with those of another school that seems to be farther along. The first school might set as a benchmark the level that the second school has already achieved. Keep in mind that consistent with the domains of discourse, some goals will be numerical, some conceptual, some construed as levels of "acceptance" or "comfort," some matters of curricular content and pedagogical style, and some defined as levels of activity.

They may be as disparate as the number of minority faculty, the number of students engaged in community service, the throughput of students from the new community college, retention rates, satisfaction rates, anecdotes of success and failure, case studies of curricular reform efforts in a school or department, a photographic essay on student interaction across lines of difference, a stage performance modeled after the work of Anna Deavere Smith that depicts difficult civic dialogue on issues of current importance to the City of Indianapolis, personal and institutional stories that may eventually be organized as a coherent institutional narrative of change. Multiple methodologies should be used. Self-assessment should be promoted. Students, undergraduate and graduate should be participants in the research. Monitoring progress toward achieving benchmarks is an important part of the process. The Diversity Cabinet should have overall responsibility for this function, but it should share the responsibility in ways that encourage schools, departments, and administrative units to engage in self-assessment and move toward action.

Table 1 provides an initial starting point for discussion of potential outcomes IUPUI may wish to monitor. Many of these outcomes are probably already regularly monitored. Regular reporting on a broad set of outcomes and goals helps to ensure progress toward long term and short term goals.

**Table 1. Diversity-Related Outcomes/Activities by Level**

Institutionalization and Overall Performance Level	Student Level	Faculty Level
<p><i>Broad Leadership</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of activity among campus leadership taking broad institutional responsibility for diversity</li> <li>Strategic plans for diversity</li> <li>Resource allocation</li> </ul>	<p><i>Student Success/Progress</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Learning Outcomes                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Critical thinking</li> <li>Cognitive complexity</li> <li>Engagement and motivation</li> </ul> </li> <li>Academic Achievement</li> <li>Persistence/Retention</li> </ul>	<p><i>Faculty Roles and Activities</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Curricular transformation</li> <li>Service/Outreach to underserved communities</li> <li>Research addressing issues of racial/ethnic/gender/economic diversity</li> </ul>
<p><i>Indicators of Diversification</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level of Curricular Transformation                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>individual courses</li> <li>area studies programs</li> <li>academic programs/depts.</li> <li>general education</li> </ul> </li> <li>Increased Structural Diversity (e.g. monitor diverse students, faculty, and administration/staff)</li> <li>Evidence of Programmatic Responses (e.g. mentoring, intergroup relations activity, undergraduate research)</li> </ul>	<p><i>Skills for Living in a Diverse Society</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Perspective-taking skills</li> <li>Tolerance and comfort with diversity</li> <li>Concern for the public good</li> <li>Ability to handle conflict</li> <li>Commonality of values with diverse others</li> <li>Civic commitment and awareness of social issues (poverty, inequality, social justice)</li> <li>Comfort and experience interacting with diverse peers</li> <li>Communication skills</li> </ul>	<p><i>Changing Attitudes and Behaviors</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greater engagement with students                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interaction with students of color</li> <li>Attitudes towards diverse students</li> <li>Beliefs about student ability</li> </ul> </li> <li>Attitudes towards diversity and learning</li> <li>Ability to handle conflict and "hot bottom" issues</li> <li>Pedagogical techniques in a diverse classroom</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Service/Outreach to underserved communities</li> <li>Rewards for progress toward diversity</li> <li>Faculty development initiatives</li> <li>Tenure and promotion of diverse faculty</li> <li>Access and aid policies</li> </ul>	<p><i>Environmental Assessment</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Satisfaction</li> <li>Perceptions of campus climate for diversity</li> <li>Sense of belonging</li> <li>Perceptions of quality of the learning environment</li> <li>Perceptions of institutional commitment</li> </ul>	<p><i>Environmental Assessment</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Career development of junior faculty of color/women</li> <li>Perceptions of reward structure</li> <li>Perceptions of the departmental climate and support</li> <li>Perceptions of institutional commitment</li> </ul>
<p><i>Overall Institutional Commitment</i></p>	<p><i>Occupational Outcomes</i></p>	<p><i>Overall Faculty Commitment</i></p>

**Recommendations**

- Develop a strategic plan that utilizes the conceptual framework suggested above and the recommended top down and bottom up strategies for clarifying, aligning, and percolating mission. The plan should have the following characteristics:
  - It should reflect the Chancellor’s vision of diversity at IUPUI as an educational asset.

- It should resonate with the institution's statement of mission.
- It should explain the rationale for action and estimate the expected benefits.
- It should link the objectives of each organizational unit within the institution to the vision and the mission, and articulate the relevance of diversity to the linkage.
- It should identify specific diversity objectives, both quantitative and qualitative, and engage all units in considering this contribution
- It should establish benchmarks of progress and regular progress reports.

The plan should also estimate the cost of pursuing the process and develop a funding strategy, including the institution's own investment and funding from outside sources.

What we are outlining is a strategy that would bring IUPUI close to the cutting edge in regard to understanding diversity and making it work for the institution and the community. We think there is a way to pique the interest of outside funders with this strategy. We also think that it would bring IUPUI recognition as a forward-thinking and forward-looking leader in the field.

2. The Diversity Cabinet should have overall responsibility for guiding the development of the plan and monitoring its implementation. It should have the requisite authority or find way to engage the authority to encourage compliance.
3. Transform the Diversity Cabinet into a learning community that works deliberately to become conversant with the state of discourse in all the domains of diversity and functions as stimulator and facilitator of the campus discourse on diversity. We do not mean to suggest that individual members of the Cabinet should lead the actual

discussions, but rather that they should create the mechanisms that make the discourse happen.

The Cabinet should also direct the inquiry into best practices regarding diversity and celebrate these successes. The goal should be to increase IUPUI's expertise in this area so that the institution will have improved access to growing body of knowledge about diversity understandings and practice in all the domains.

4. Assign to the Cabinet responsibility for engaging the several schools in a continuation of the survey process. The Cabinet might discuss with each school the implications of the survey results, identifying areas where progress should be made, identifying benchmarks of progress, and soliciting follow-up reports.
5. IUPUI can become the conduit for more effective movement of African American and Latino students from high schools and community colleges to IUPUI through a variety of initiatives. With the changing admissions criteria and development of new institutions in the area, IUPUI should make the goal of increasing baccalaureate attainment in Indianapolis one of its highest priorities. If the institution takes the lead in becoming the architect of a road map for baccalaureate attainment in the city, what would such programs and initiatives look like? IUPUI could devise something analogous to an educational "transportation system" that can become a model for other cities. It would require strong articulation agreements and specific programs that would ensure there is curricular progress to arrive at IUPUI more prepared to complete a degree. Some "fast lane" programs can be devised to connect a sequence of courses at the high school and community college levels that may also include a set of courses at IUPUI. It also requires a slightly different admissions philosophy. For

example, in California, students are not rejected for admission to public institutions, they are “deferred.” Students are deferred on the premise that they will eventually become eligible for admission. With new criteria introduced in admission to IUPUI, the institution should begin experimenting with ways to ensure that a greater number of students from minority communities will eventually become eligible for admission. Today, an increasing number of students attend more than one institution. If IUPUI has a general sense of student mobility and can track individuals, it can also devise pathways to keep students returning for degree attainment. We think a number of funders would be interested in an innovative plan in this area.

We also recommend that more concise studies of African American and Latino high school students’ conceptions of “college-going”, views of the differences between institutions, and plans for the future be investigated. Several researchers would be very interested in conducting this study for the institution because of their interest in Indianapolis. This would provide insight into how the new student choices will begin to influence IUPUI enrollments of talented students from diverse communities..

6. Develop a bottom up strategy for describing the activity of individual units, articulating the institutional relevance of the activity, aligning unit purpose with institutional mission, and identifying the intersection of the unit’s objectives with diversity concerns.
7. Consider the development of “career ladders” for staff, administrators, and faculty. It was clear that different types of employees require some additional assistance in helping them to grow and stay at IUPUI. Can IUPUI (or with agreements at the community college) provide more training to solve staff issues identified to impact

the quality of worklife and encourage the retention of individuals from different racial/ethnic groups? What opportunities are in place to improve English and literacy skills among custodial and groundskeepers? Are staff rewarded for significantly improving the climate for students? What types of mentoring and support do faculty need at the early stages of their career and later stages of their career to feel IUPUI is the place where they can successfully conduct their work? The concept of "career ladders" can also include educational activity so that individuals feel supported and more empowered to do their best for IUPUI and its constituencies.

In short, we articulated a select set of possibilities that can be productively explored to further institutional diversity goals. All change processes begin with self-reflection, and this phase has been significant for the community in moving the conversation into the next phase of action and re-examination. We believe IUPUI can set a significant path for other urban institutions to follow in the future.