

20th Anniversary Report of the Equal Opportunity Planning Committee

Fall 2003

Executive Summary

Since 1983 the Equal Opportunity Planning Committee (EOPC) has been the major funding source for diversity programs and initiatives that augment educational and professional opportunities for Penn State students, faculty, and staff. This report is issued as part of the 20th anniversary recognition of EOPC and summarizes the history and accomplishments of EOPC since its inception.

EOPC was formed in the wake of *Adams v. Richardson*, a 1973 federal court decision in which the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania was cited, along with numbers of other states, for operating a system of higher education that practiced *de facto* segregation. The impact of this decision on Penn State was delayed until 1983 when the court ordered the desegregation of not only all state-owned but also of all state-related institutions of higher education in Pennsylvania. In order to comply with the order, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania was required to publish desegregation or “equal opportunity” plans, and each public university in Pennsylvania had to submit a separate plan to augment the plans developed by the Commonwealth. Accordingly, the press release that announced the formation of EOPC indicated that the role of EOPC was to “implement the obligations set forth in Penn State’s own equal opportunity plan.” The committee would accomplish this task by overseeing and distributing University and Commonwealth funds for programs and initiatives that supported Penn State’s plan.

Funding for programs began immediately, and within a few years after its formation, EOPC was supporting upwards of eighty programs per year. Initially, the focus of EOPC programs was on recruiting and graduating African American students, especially those who were Pennsylvania residents. As the legal environment surrounding the *Adams* case changed, the EOPC mission broadened to include other multicultural groups, women, those with disabilities, and the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) community at Penn State. EOPC funding categories presently parallel the seven challenges identified in Penn State’s diversity strategic plan, *A Framework to Foster Diversity at Penn State: 1998-2003*.

EOPC programs have had a significant impact on the diversity goals of Penn State. Some programs have brought hundreds of multicultural students to Penn State and boast high graduation rates among its participants. Other programs support faculty and staff training regarding disability issues, improve the climate for the LGBT community, and provide opportunities for women to explore careers in science and engineering. One of the principal funding strategies used by EOPC has been to provide “seed” funding, with the expectation that units would find funds to support successful programs independent of EOPC, and several programs initiated with EOPC funding continue today without EOPC support.

While this report looks back on the history and accomplishments of EOPC, the principal purpose is to help the University community focus on the future of diversity at Penn State. The theme for EOPC's 20th anniversary is "recognizing our progress along the path." Penn State has come far, but it still has a long distance to travel on the road to becoming a truly multicultural institution. Hopefully, the 20th anniversary recognition of the contributions of EOPC and this report will provide some perspectives on the past that will translate into effective diversity goals and initiatives at Penn State over the next twenty years.

Introduction

Each year, EOPC supports numerous programs and initiatives that increase the recruitment and retention of multicultural students; improve the environment for all students, especially those who are the focus of acts of intolerance; provide access to programs and facilities for disabled students; augment opportunities for women in fields that have traditionally been dominated by men; and other programs that seek to make Penn State a more welcoming and equitable university.

The theme for the EOPC 20th anniversary is "recognizing our progress along the path." Penn State has made significant progress towards its diversity goals over the past twenty years. Graduation rates at University Park for undergraduate African American and Latino/Hispanic students are among the highest in the nation for public research universities. Women now constitute half of medical and law school students. Support and resources for LGBT people have increased significantly. Penn State is a leader in federally-funded programs for disadvantaged students. New facilities and support structures for disabled students provide access to opportunities that simply did not exist twenty years ago. Obviously, EOPC alone did not "cause" any of these accomplishments at Penn State. Substantive change occurs best with multiple levels of support, and many offices, programs, and initiatives provide a rich infrastructure for diversity at Penn State. EOPC's unique role is to provide funding for programs that will support the University's diversity goals. EOPC's success is tangible and consistent evidence of Penn State's commitment to equal opportunity in higher education.

The recognition of progress must occur alongside an honest acknowledgement of ongoing challenges that call for a redoubling of our institutional efforts to continue down the path towards full opportunity and equity for all of Penn State's constituents. The real significance of the 20th anniversary recognition and this report lies not in the past but in our future.

EOPC History

Adams v. Richardson

In 1970 the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) initiated a lawsuit, *Adams v. Richardson*, against the federal government, charging federal officials with illegally providing funds to states that maintained dual systems of higher education that effected *de facto* segregation in their public colleges and universities. Pennsylvania, along with several other states, was cited in the case. Pennsylvania was the only traditional "northern" state that

was cited. This suit was predicated upon an investigation in 1969 by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW), which concluded that these states were operating dual systems. In 1973, the courts ordered HEW to dismantle these systems. HEW's Office for Civil Rights (OCR) was charged with overseeing this task. A major component of OCR's enforcement of the suit was to require states to submit desegregation plans that identified programs and initiatives designed to dismantle their dual systems.

Initially, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania maintained that the suit applied only to state-owned colleges and universities. However, in 1978, prompted further by action from the NAACP, OCR challenged this position and sought a plan from Pennsylvania that would include all state-owned and state-related institutions. Penn State, recognizing that it might one day fall within the scope of the 1973 decision, began to collect data that would conform to OCR reporting requirements.

Further legal action resulted in a federal appeals court decision in March 1983, which instructed OCR to initiate enforcement proceedings against Pennsylvania unless a comprehensive desegregation plan had been submitted and approved by July 22, 1983. By late June, Penn State presented its *Plan for Equal Opportunity for Public Higher Education in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania: Report of The Pennsylvania State University* (henceforth, Equal Opportunity Plan) to the Commonwealth, which was used in developing Pennsylvania's *Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Plan for Equal Opportunity in the State-Supported Institutions of Higher Education*. The focus of the Equal Opportunity Plan was to recruit African American¹ students, especially those who were Pennsylvania residents, retain them at the University and, within a reasonable time frame, to see them graduate.

In 1988, the court vacated the *Adams* suit because, in its judgment, the plaintiffs failed to show that cutting off federal education funds would cause discriminatory institutions to change. However, after the case was dismissed, Dr. Bryce Jordan, Penn State's president from 1983-1990, declared that the University's commitment to affirmative action would continue. At this point, the University's actions regarding diversity moved from a mandate of law to a mandate of conscience.

The Inauguration of EOPC

Although some diversity structures were in place prior to 1983, such as the Commission for Women, which was established in 1981, these initiatives were largely ad hoc and functioned without any central coordination. As early as July 1983, Penn State began to consider how to develop its own internal structures for best responding to its obligations under the *Adams* decision. One proposal called for a "Coordinator for Implementation of the Equal Opportunity Plan," who would report directly to Dr. Jordan and oversee an "Equal Opportunity Plan Implementation Committee." This person would also represent Penn State on the Commonwealth's Equal Educational Opportunity Coordination/Articulation Committee. Several task forces were also proposed for this committee, such as Medical Curriculum and Articulation, Cheyney-Penn State, Lincoln-Penn State, Retention, and Recruitment. This structure was eventually adopted with a chair instead of a coordinator.

On August 17, 1983, Dr. Jordan formally announced the formation of the Equal Opportunity Planning Committee. Mr. William Asbury, executive assistant to the president for administration at the time, was appointed as chair. Other members of the committee included John Brugel, director of student aid; Carol Cartwright, associate dean, Commonwealth Educational System; Donald Dickason, dean of admissions; Laurie Gunter, professor of nursing; Marshall Jones, head of the Department of Behavioral Science at The Milton S. Hershey Medical Center; Harold Levy, acting affirmative action officer; Gregory Lozier, associate director for planning and research; and James Stewart, assistant professor of economics and director, Black Studies Program. By fall 1984, the Committee had increased to sixteen members. EOPC had responsibilities for developing task forces; establishing articulation programs with other state-related institutions, including Cheyney and Lincoln; and overseeing activities that supported the implementation of the University's Equal Opportunity Plan.

Shortly after Penn State submitted the Equal Opportunity Plan to the Commonwealth, University administrators began developing a budget to support programs and activities that would provide for the implementation of the Plan. This budget came under the stewardship of EOPC. Initially, \$400,000 was allocated with an additional \$200,000 contributed by the Commonwealth. However, as the scope of the task became more apparent, the University recognized that a more substantial commitment was needed and increased its allotment to \$500,000. An additional \$100,000 was added for fiscal year 1984-85 by the Budget Task Force to bring the total funding to \$800,000.

Early Activities of EOPC

From the beginning, much of the work of EOPC revolved around its task forces. In addition to those originally planned, a task force was established for Graduate Programs and Faculty Development. The Cheyney-Penn State and Lincoln-Penn State task forces were combined and the recruitment task force was subdivided, one task force each for graduate and undergraduate students. These task forces were chaired by EOPC members and were sometimes larger than EOPC itself. Further, some task forces broke down further into subcommittees. By November 1984, the recruitment task force had eight subcommittees. Task force membership by early 1984 consisted of more than eighty faculty, staff, and administrators from across the University.

These task forces became a major conduit for funding programs and initiatives designed to implement the Equal Opportunity Plan. EOPC decided that the best way to utilize its funds was to invite proposals from faculty and staff across the University that would contribute to the Plan. This approach allowed for broad participation in the implementation of the Plan. Proposal criteria were established and, in order to optimize the evaluation process, EOPC prepared standardized rating sheets for reviewing proposals. As proposals came to EOPC, they were assigned, as appropriate, to specific task forces. These task forces then provided funding recommendations back to EOPC on all of their assigned proposals. Final funding decisions were made by the whole Committee.

Funding for programs began immediately. During its first year, EOPC utilized more than \$650,000 of its \$700,000 allocation on special projects and initiatives, and the remainder carried over for the next fiscal year. Summer programs emphasized recruitment and "pipeline building," often targeting high school students and occasionally students from primary and middle schools.

Academic year programs focused on Penn State students, faculty, and staff. Some funds went to administrative units, such as Admissions and Student Aid, to enhance their efforts at recruiting and retaining students. Other funds went to academic units at University Park and other campus locations. EOPC allocations varied from \$200,000 for renovations at the Paul Robeson Cultural Center to as little as \$500 for a “cultural awareness workshop.” For the 1984-85 fiscal year, scores of proposals came forth from faculty and staff across Penn State. The retention task force alone evaluated twenty-four proposals for that fiscal year.

EOPC did not limit its activities to funding proposals. Ad hoc committees of EOPC issued reports to the University on specific topics that were critical to the success of the Equal Opportunity Plan. EOPC provided funding to support such projects to faculty, staff, students, or to external teams that were charged to review Penn State’s diversity programs. Reports titled, “Meeting the Academic Needs of Black Students under Title VI: A Faculty Guide” and “Away from ‘The Park’: An Assessment of Progress in Retaining Black Students at Targeted Commonwealth Campuses and Behrend College,” were issued as early as 1985 and 1986 respectively. In 1987, as EOPC began to consider the needs of other multicultural students, a subcommittee delivered its final report, “The Conditions of Hispanics at The Pennsylvania State University.” One of the most widely-distributed EOPC-funded reports, which had its roots in the faculty guide mentioned above, also came out in 1987 and was titled, “‘A Penn State Mind is a Terrible Thing to Waste’: The Role of the Faculty in Black Student Retention.”

EOPC Reorganization

Within a few years after the establishment of EOPC, Penn State officials began to recognize the need to broaden the University’s efforts to provide educational and employment opportunities for groups other than African Americans, especially for women and Latino/Hispanic Americans. Also, Penn State had evolved in ways that called for changes in the original goals and structures of EOPC. Several offices and other University bodies had been established that were now working towards specific goals that were part of EOPC’s original mission, such as the Multicultural Resource Center, the Office of Minority Admissions and Community Affairs, the Office of Graduate Educational Equity, and the President’s Council on Undergraduate Retention.² Indeed, as early as 1986, EOPC had discontinued its task force structure in response to some of these changes. Some of the innovations had come about, at least in part, due to recommendations made by EOPC.

In response to these developments, a proposal was formulated in early 1987 to restructure EOPC. This restructuring was put in place by fall 1987 and included some significant modifications. First, EOPC would now function as an executive committee, with membership limited to chairs of selected standing committees, special advisory committees, commissions, or representatives of selected University offices.³ Additionally, graduate and undergraduate students were appointed, along with a faculty/staff member who could be an effective voice for Latino/Hispanic American constituents. Next, EOPC was given additional responsibilities, which included recommending policies and procedures that promoted the recruitment and retention of African American, Latino/Hispanic American, and female students and employees; advising the Affirmative Action Office; coordinating all equal opportunity planning activities, including the review of quarterly activity reports from strategic planning units; and being a contact point for internal and external agencies and individuals regarding issues of equal opportunity. Dr. Carol Cartwright, dean for

undergraduate programs and vice provost, and chair of the President's Council on Undergraduate Retention, was appointed chair of EOPC in May 1987.

Consistent with its new charge, EOPC now began accepting proposals that would focus on African American, Latino/Hispanic American, and female students and employees. Within a year after EOPC was restructured, members were added to EOPC to represent the interests of Asian & Pacific American and American Indian/Alaskan Native constituents. In order to support the expanded mission of EOPC, an additional \$200,000 per year was added to the budget, which brought the total annual budget to \$1,000,000.

Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity

In July 1990 Penn State launched a new administrative unit that would have broad responsibilities for advancing the University's diversity initiatives. This unit was eventually named the Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity. Dr. James B. Stewart, professor of labor studies and industrial relations and African and African American studies, was appointed vice provost. Upon its inception, Educational Equity was charged with providing administrative support for EOPC, the Commission for Women, and the Commission on Racial/Ethnic Diversity, which was formed in 1989. Prior to his appointment as vice provost, Dr. Stewart had been the EOPC chair. Dr. W. Terrell Jones was appointed deputy vice provost and became the new EOPC chair. Additional funds again supplemented the EOPC budget, which now stood at \$1,150,000.

Educational Equity's mission was, by design, broad-based. As further administrative refinements occurred, units such as the Multicultural Resource Center, Office for Disability Services, and Office for Veterans Affairs joined Educational Equity. These units provided academic support for their respective constituencies. Also, in 1991, the Committee (later Commission) on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Equity was created, and it also was provided administrative support through Educational Equity. EOPC's goals, too, had begun to gravitate towards broader concerns while maintaining an emphasis on its historical mission. Accordingly, while race and ethnicity continued to be prominent, along with programs for women, EOPC added other funding categories for programs in support of people with disabilities and the LGBT community at Penn State.

With commissions in place to focus on women, racial/ethnic diversity, and the LGBT community, along with other University offices that had related missions, by the mid-1990s EOPC was one among many University bodies whose purpose was to further Penn State's diversity goals. Accordingly, EOPC's focus shifted to its core responsibility, namely, optimizing the EOPC proposal and program evaluation process and utilizing funds so as to deliver their maximum impact. Also, during this time period, OCR renewed its efforts to promote compliance with the spirit of the original *Adams* decision, and positive changes at Penn State, in part due to the work of EOPC programs, contributed to OCR's favorable assessment of the University's progress.

In 1998 Dr. Stewart stepped down as vice provost to return full-time to the faculty. Dr. Jones was promoted to vice provost, and Dr. Thomas G. Poole, associate vice provost for educational equity, became the EOPC chair.

Recent Trends

The most significant change for EOPC in recent years was prompted by the publication of *A Framework to Foster Diversity at Penn State: 1998-2003*, Penn State's first comprehensive diversity strategic plan.⁴

In response to the *Framework*, EOPC aligned its funding categories to match the seven published challenges that stand at the core of Penn State's diversity goals. This change was significant because, for the first time, EOPC broadened its approach to include implementing structural changes, such as curriculum development, leadership and management, and organizational change. The first challenge of the *Framework*, "Developing a Shared and Inclusive Understanding of Diversity," clearly marks a different impulse than the original Equal Opportunity Plan, which was tied solely to the recruitment and retention of African American students. One of Penn State's and EOPC's challenges will be to maintain an appropriate emphasis on recruiting and retaining African American students, which remains foundational to Penn State's diversity goals, while at the same time addressing broader-based concerns.

EOPC Accomplishments

Overview

Over its twenty-year history, EOPC has funded approximately 1,300 programs and initiatives. Nearly twenty programs were funded during its first year in 1983-84, and by 1987-88, the number of programs funded per year had more than quadrupled. However, EOPC accomplishments are, more than anything else, the accomplishments of the Penn State community. Penn State faculty and staff have devoted considerable talents, time, and energy in developing and implementing EOPC programs, and these efforts have helped make Penn State a more diverse, equitable, and welcoming university.

Originally, not only specific programs but also units whose missions were directly tied to the Equal Opportunity Plan received funding. For example, in 1983-84, the offices of Undergraduate Admissions and Graduate Admissions were awarded nearly \$100,000 each to initiate stronger efforts to recruit African American students. These units sometimes used EOPC funding to amplify their typical office functions and activities so as to direct extra efforts toward goals that would support the Equal Opportunity Plan (i.e., Graduate Admissions used its allotment to fund assistantships, "recruitment of graduate students," and "college support").

EOPC efforts to supplement unit activities in support of the Equal Opportunity Plan occurred alongside other University initiatives designed to improve the overall infrastructure in support of diversity. For example, in the mid-1980s, Undergraduate Admissions added a new subdivision, the Office of Minority Admissions and Community Affairs. Although EOPC funding had supplemented the recruitment activities of Undergraduate Admissions from 1983-1986, it was clear that ongoing, systematic approaches were necessary to make significant progress towards recruiting African American undergraduates to Penn State. The role of EOPC was to assist in taking up the shortfall in this critical area until appropriate institutional structures could be established. Much the same can be said about the EOPC allocation of \$200,000 for renovations

at the Paul Robeson Cultural Center in 1983-84, and even then it was evident that Penn State needed a first-rate Center located in the heart of campus. The dream of a new Center was not realized until many years later, but the EOPC renovation made a significant contribution to student life for African American students and, indeed, all students, for many years.

Nevertheless, the main role of EOPC was and still is to fund specific programs and initiatives. One of the first programs funded by EOPC was sponsored by the College of Earth and Mineral Sciences, the College of Engineering, and the Eberly College of Science and was entitled, *Pre-Freshmen Summer Program* (PREF). PREF, which is still funded by EOPC today, is designed to improve the graduation rates of African American (and now also Latino/Hispanic) students who intend on majoring in science and/or engineering at Penn State. Students come to Penn State during the summer session immediately prior to their first year and take two classes that provide them with advanced math instruction and success skills for college life. Other activities, such as workshops and social activities, occur that also help prepare students for their first year at Penn State.

“Seed Money” Funding Approach

Although the EOPC budget is substantial, Penn State is a large, complex institution, and the demand for funding would far exceed the budget if EOPC tried to fund even a portion of the many diversity activities that occur at Penn State every year. Accordingly, EOPC has emphasized its role in providing “seed money” for programs and imposed a funding window of no more than five years. Also, renewal proposals are funded in decreasing increments each year, and Penn State units that sponsor programs must match EOPC funds with unit or external funds.

Some programs have had difficulty finding adequate unit support to continue projects after the five-year limit has passed. Nevertheless, many units have been quite successful in converting their programs from EOPC funding to unit or external funding. Dr. Vernis Welmon, assistant to the dean and assistant professor in The Smeal College of Business Administration, continues to operate four programs that began with EOPC funding.⁵ These programs provide numerous services for African American and Latino/Hispanic MBA students, including supporting students to go to the National MBA conference, publishing an annual MBA résumé book, bringing prospective MBA students to campus to familiarize them with the MBA program and encourage them to come to Penn State, and bringing executives to campus to prepare students for careers in corporate America. Dr. Joy Himmel, director of the Health and Wellness Center at Penn State Altoona, has also had success in continuing programs that began with EOPC support.⁶ One program developed a Web-based interactive program for Penn State faculty and staff that is designed to enhance their level of knowledge, skills, and comfort-level when working with students and fellow employees who are disabled. Another program provides additional resources that go beyond the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), 1990 for students with learning disabilities. Some programs are able to continue on their own after only one year of EOPC support. One such program, *In Rainbow Spirits*, whose purpose was to increase campus awareness about LGBT issues and improve campus climate for LGBT students at Penn State Abington, now continues under the sponsorship of a student organization at Abington.

Program Outcomes

EOPC strongly emphasizes the importance of program outcomes. Every EOPC program must submit a formal evaluation at the completion of the program. Review teams, comprised of a cross-section of Penn State faculty and staff, assess the impact of programs based on their program evaluations. The program evaluations must document quantitative and/or qualitative outcomes.

Over the years, some programs have reported impressive results. For example, a long-standing EOPC-sponsored program, *Hispanics for Academic Progress* (HAP, now called SCOPE, *Summer College Opportunity Program in Education*), has attracted more than 200 11th grade students, primarily of Latino/Hispanic descent, to University Park during a six-week summer session. Students take two classes, one intended to strengthen their reading and writing skills and the other to provide them with an introduction to college life. Students also participate in numerous academic workshops and social activities. This program has been successful in recruiting 60 percent of its participants to Penn State. Another recruitment program, *Women in Science and Engineering*, which is an ongoing program at Penn State Erie and has served more than 250 students, has been successful in recruiting 49 percent of its participants to Penn State (20 percent into science-oriented majors). *A.R.L. Open Door*, a recruitment program for graduate students of color interested in technical majors, has a 33 percent success rate.

EOPC programs have also played an important role in retaining and graduating a diverse student body. HAP/SCOPE has a 51 percent six-year graduation rate among its participants. PREF students graduate at a 64 percent rate, with 41 percent of its participants graduating from one of the “science” colleges (Earth and Mineral Sciences, Engineering, or the Eberly College of Science). One EOPC-funded program, *Diversity Grants-in-Aid*, which is sponsored by the Office of Education Abroad, has provided access for students of color and students with disabilities to participate in study abroad opportunities. Grants, in varying amounts depending on financial need, supplement existing forms of financial aid for participants. In many cases, without these grants, program students would not have the financial means to study abroad. Since the program began in 1987, it has served more than 400 students, and more than 90 percent of its participants have gone on to graduate.

As mentioned previously, Penn State is a national leader among major research universities in graduating African American and Latino/Hispanic students.⁷ Many support services, including EOPC, play an important role in this success. Of course, the most important components of this success revolve around students themselves: their talents and abilities, initiative, hard work, and persistence.

Recruitment and retention programs have results that can be readily measured through direct, quantitative outcomes. Others, such as some educational programs, rely on qualitative measures of success, such as pre- and post-program questionnaires. In either case, EOPC requires proposals to provide evaluation plans and assesses outcomes based on these plans during the program evaluation phase of the process. Over the years, as institutional accountability has become more important at Penn State and within higher education in general, program evaluation has become increasingly vital for EOPC.

Proposal and Program Evaluation Processes

As noted, soon after its inception, EOPC developed specific criteria for proposals and provided outlines for writers and review forms for program assessment. Many of these components are still in place today.

A few factors have contributed to a process that is now a bit more complex than it was originally. First, as indicated above, EOPC now places more emphasis on outcomes and program evaluation than it did in recent years. For example, EOPC has developed a more formal process for student recruitment and retention programs to report on the number and percentage of program students that come to Penn State or are retained and graduate from Penn State. Budget constraints have also contributed to the need for greater detail in EOPC proposals and program evaluations. EOPC funds, as part of general University funds, have been subject to permanent budget reductions as part of Penn State's efforts, which began in the early 1990s, to take up the shortfall of increasingly stringent state funding for Penn State and other state-related and state-owned institutions of higher education.

This reduction, combined with ever-increasing costs for programs and initiatives, has altered the EOPC funding environment. EOPC review teams now must assess proposals and program evaluations with greater scrutiny than ever before to ensure that EOPC funds are optimized to deliver the greatest impact. In order to provide review teams with as much information as they need to make critical funding decisions, EOPC proposals and program evaluations require greater detail and a more standardized format.

EOPC has attempted to expedite the process by improving the delivery of proposal and program evaluation materials. All EOPC materials can now be accessed via the World Wide Web. Once the forms have been downloaded, proposal writers can fill out the cover sheet, main proposal, and budget forms on their computers.

EOPC has tried to make the process easier for everyone while, at the same time, increase its accountability to the University and the constituents it seeks to serve. EOPC continually attempts to improve its processes and, to that end, recently used a Web-based survey to assess stakeholder satisfaction. The vast majority of survey respondents indicated that the EOPC proposal and program evaluation processes were neither too complicated nor too confusing. Nevertheless, EOPC will continually improve its process to make it easier to seek funding and gather the information needed to make good funding decisions.

Conclusion

At the twenty-year mark in the history of EOPC, it is important to look back and celebrate the University's accomplishments. However, our celebration must be accompanied by renewed determination to press forward. Hopefully, despite an ever-changing political landscape and naysayers from various quarters, Penn State's successes in the next twenty years will surpass those we celebrate today.

¹ In the early 1980s, “black” and sometimes even “minority” were the terms that were typically used for African Americans. In this report, we will use contemporary terms for multicultural groups regardless of the historical context. Terminology for these groups largely complies with *Terminology Guidelines: Recommendations by the Commission on Racial/Ethnic Diversity* (<http://www.psu.edu/dept/cored/resources/term/term.html>).

² Some of these bodies had different names in 1987. For those that still exist today, the current designation is used.

³ These included the University Council on Undergraduate Recruitment, President’s Council on Undergraduate Retention, Commission for Women, Faculty and Staff Recruitment and Retention Task Force, Affirmative Action Office, Graduate Council, Medical Education Task Force, Division of Student Services, and Commonwealth Educational System.

⁴ For a copy of this plan, please contact the Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity, 314 Old Main, University Park, PA 16802, 814-865-5906, or visit <http://www.equity.psu.edu/Framework/>.

⁵ These programs are titled, “Diversity Appreciation Weekend” (formerly Minority Visitation Weekend), “National Black MBA Conference,” “MBA Résumé Book,” and “Minority Executive Interaction.”

⁶ These programs are titled, “Bridging the Gap: Improving and Expanding Services for Students” and “In their Shoes.”

⁷ According to the NCAA, the Penn State University Park latest four-class average graduation rate for African American and Latino/Hispanic undergraduate students after six years is at, respectively, 65 percent and 70 percent. By comparison, the University of California at Berkeley is at 65 percent and 72 percent; the University of Illinois, Champaign, is at 56 percent and 61 percent; the University of Michigan is at 61 percent and 71 percent; the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill is at 65 percent and 85 percent; the University of Texas at Austin is at 55 percent and 58 percent; and the University of Wisconsin at Madison is at 48 percent and 57 percent. (www.ncaa.org/grad_rates/2002/d1/index.html; these data were downloaded on 7/23/03). Among major public research universities, only the University of Virginia is significantly higher than Penn State for both African American and Latino/Hispanic students (85 percent and 92 percent).