Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity

Best Practices in Diversity Strategic Planning Workshop

March 27, 2009

Workshop Notes

Introductory Remarks by Dr. W. Terrell Jones, Vice Provost for Educational Equity

Dr. W. Terrell Jones welcomed the participants and thanked Victoria Sanchez, Mike Blanco, Barbara Welshofer, Sheila Barlock, Kim Frankenfield-Pro, Kathy Putt and Carol Ahmed for their assistance in putting this workshop together.

Dr. Jones announced the agenda for the morning session: the workshop began with a presentation by Dr. Daryl Smith, followed by a panel discussion. The panelists have been very involved with the *Framework* process, as have many of the attendees. Attendees were asked to raise their hands and identify themselves so that Dr. Jones could adapt his comments to the audience.

Dr. Jones then spoke about some of the things that are currently happening at Penn State that point to successes of our diversity efforts.

- This weekend is Achievers Weekend – six different buses arrived from six different areas of Pennsylvania, bringing 500 students of color from urban areas. The colleges use the weekend to recruit talented young people.
- Both undergraduate and graduate numbers have improved, as well as other indicators of success. However, Dr. Jones wanted to turn that discussion over to the guest speaker. He remarked that he is pleased with all that we have done as well as the direction we are taking.

Success of the *Framework*

- Penn State is recognized as a national leader in diversity strategic planning. The public accessibility of the process (on the Educational Equity Web site) lends itself to both internal and external examination. Several other institutions have visited us (most recently Clemson, Auburn, and LSU) to take a closer look at what makes our process "tick." They all left knowing that we enjoy the visible—and vocal—support of our top administrators. The *Framework* process could not succeed without the commitment of President Graham Spanier and Provost Erickson.

- Dr. Jones realizes that the audience today is receptive and aware of the value of diversity strategic planning. He pointed out that there is value in "preaching to the choir." "Without all of the audience's contributions and support, the accomplishments realized under the *Framework* would not have been possible.

Current Direction and Next Steps

- The 2004-09 *Framework* is wrapping up; final reports under the 2004-09 plans are being compiled simultaneously with the process of creating new plans for the 2010-15 *Framework.* The process continues to grow more inclusive and comprehensive. Next spring, six review

teams will examine the work of forty-four diversity strategic planning units, including the most recent addition of the School of Nursing.

Best Practices Defined

- Best Practices are a collection of practices gleaned from unit reports that are most productive in enhancing their ability to reach the University's diversity goals. Potential best practices were identified by *Framework* review team members, then reviewed by Educational Equity staff for quantifiable validity. From this collection, a few themes have emerged as essential:

    o   active, visible support from executive leadership
    o   broad participation in diversity planning, implementation, and reporting
    o   sustaining momentum throughout the planning cycle
    o   use of collaborative approaches
    o   alignment of diversity planning with general strategic planning
    o   use of appropriate measures
    o   broad and inclusive communication strategies

Introduction of Visitors

Sean Bennett, director, North Star Center for Academic Success and Cultural Affairs

Rochester Institute of Technology, representing colleagues Alfreda Brown and Kim White

Introduction of Daryl Smith

Dr. Daryl Smith, professor of education and psychology, The Claremont Graduate University. Penn State borrowed heavily from the research of Dr. Smith—in particular, the organization of the *Framework* around dimensions and key questions—in the development of the *Framework*, so it is with great appreciation that we welcome her here today. Dr. Smith earned her bachelor's degree in mathematics from Cornell University, a master's degree in student personnel and counseling from Stanford University, and a Ph.D. in psychology and higher education from The Claremont Graduate School. Prior to assuming her current position on the Claremont faculty in 1986, Dr. Smith served as a college administrator for two decades in planning, institutional research, and student affairs. Her research, publications, and teaching focus primarily on diversity in higher education and include organizational implications of diversity, developing capacity to evaluate diversity initiatives, and faculty diversity. Her topic today is "Imperative of Diversity for Institutional Viability: Building Capacity for a Pluralistic Society."

Ten years ago, I read my first Daryl Smith article and experienced an "aha…" moment– "This is it! This is understandable – makes sense to us!" What you see in the *Framework* has been compiled from Dr. Smith's many years of research and publications. When I talked with Daryl Smith last year, I told her, "We have taken all your stuff, can you come too?"

What she has done with her research and publications is best summed up by Charles Mingus:

"Making the simple complicated is commonplace; making the complicated simple, awesomely simple, that's creativity."

Morning Session with Dr. Smith

Dr. Smith said she was honored to join us today; she has spent numerous years in higher education administration as well as held many faculty positions. She is looking forward to moving the next generation forward. Focus: how can we make this imperative? How do you know you are making progress? Imperative of diversity is the focus. There is much going on. The Proliferation of programs is trying to compensate for forty years. Leaders have to mark progress. This morning's presentation is on the nuts and bolts of marking progress. Her afternoon session will discuss moving the work of diversity to the next generation.

Using a framework is a manageable way to think about diversity. How can we build institutional capacity to where success in diversity serves each unit? Capacity building is essential for a working pluralistic society. So many issues emerge. We can no longer think of addressing every issue by creating a program; this episodic approach is not an effective strategy.

How do we know we are making progress? Audits and intelligent metric metaphors, leaders measuring progress and standing up to note progress where others note a lack of progress were part of the details noted; however, not all details are needed for meaningful metrics. Strategies should address urgent issues and target specific diversity issues. For example: disaggregated graduation rates at one University Smith visited showed twenty-five percent of African American students did not graduate; however, the diversity program was proud of their work. We need to target areas where we're not making progress; no blaming, no more reasons, and no more excuses. Link the mission to capacity, strategic planning, program review, and accreditation self-studies.

Organizational learning style vs. bureaucratic approach was discussed with organizational learning being the preferred way to think about data. Provide ongoing information about the implementation so that mid-course corrections can be instituted. Build the capacity of campuses to assess and learn from their own progress so they can monitor key goals and elements for their unit. Identify and provide opportunities for campuses to share problems and solutions as well as focus on institutional issues. Avoid frustrating narratives. Using institutional data to inform progress and not compliance thus interrupting the usual were a few of the points covered under organizational learning.

Moving to the next level—key principles. Locate diversity as part of the mission. It should be part of the core. Move beyond projectitis toward synergy and coordination. Building synergy among many efforts on campus is woven into the organizational learning structure. With regard to monitoring progress and how do we know; key goals and key elements for each unit should focus on institutional change, not so much on programs and project-specific issues; this is what is meant by projectitis. We have a framework, now move beyond. Diversity is part of the core indicators of success. Diversity is inclusive and differentiated.

With diversity as part of the core of the mission, which is centered in the middle of the framework chart, please note the following four connecting dimensions:

1) Access and Success of historically underrepresented groups—the heart and soul of diversity work.

2) Climate and Intergroup Relations—the climate for underrepresented groups/ intergroup relations. The capacity to talk to each other about difficult issues.

3) Education and Scholarship—what kind of capacity does the institution have to educate students on these issues?

4) Institutional Viability and Capacity—what is the institution's capacity to function in a pluralistic society?

Institutional success, institutional accountability, and institutional capacity assist in monitoring progress.

For intelligent metrics we begin with disaggregated metrics. When Daryl visits a university to present, she typically requests these metrics; therefore, she reviewed some of Penn State's metrics provided by Dr. Michael Blanco of the Educational Equity office. A disaggregated graduation metric chart was provided that included University Park, all Penn State campuses, and campuses. Achievement gaps in graduation rates were noted. While there is a tendency to blame K-12 for individuals not being prepared academically for college courses, this can no longer be accepted. We must know these metrics and the data. The issue is, is it okay to have four out of six or four out of ten African Americans not reach graduation? Is it okay to have so few Native American students that tracking each one is less than 1 percent? What are we doing to improve this? Are these data okay? Is it sufficient? What feels right to you? Who is graduating on campus and across units? What are some of the gateway courses? Too few intersections such as race and gender will not yield the data necessary to reflect progress. Disaggregating the metrics is critically important.

Climate and Intergroup Relations indicators are the next slide being discussed. This is where one begins to look at overall satisfaction. Would you refer other students to attend this university? Is there a perception of commitment to diversity and an engagement with others? What is the type and quality of interaction among groups? Is there a quality of experience and engagement on campus? Is diversity in the core of the plan? With regard to faculty diversity at Penn State—the number of faculty members is increasing and one-third to one-half of the faculty can be replaced over a five year span due to turnover and retirement. This is a hugely urgent area where change can occur. Who we hire now sets the tone for the next thirty years.

The next slide discussed was education and scholarship. Availability, experience, learning, and faculty capacity were reviewed. This quickly brought about the next slide of Institutional Viability and Vitality. When comparing University Park faculty demographics from 2003 and 2008, historically underrepresented groups look about the same and the Asian population has gone down. Considering the Asian population is one of the fastest growing international populations one might ask, "Are the faculty growing as well?" The real growth appears to be in international faculty. More research on hiring would be beneficial. It would be positive to pay close attention to retention and dual career issues. Individuals leave for different reasons; how does one get the truth about why people leave? If faculty hiring is so difficult, you don't want to lose people for the wrong reasons; most people don't want to leave.

The faculty turnover quotient was reviewed. TQ = [1 - (end of period URM – start period URM divided by the new URM hires)] times 100. For example: 5 Latino faculty in 2003 hired 5 should have 10; but have 7. This represents a 3/5 (60 percent) turnover quotient. On many campuses, the turnover quotient is 60 percent for underrepresented groups. Daryl reemphasized the importance of getting the story. Why are faculty leaving? Is there a dual career issue? Get the truth about retention. The first step is to identify if you have this issue. To gather this information, have reporting mechanisms in place and use intelligent metrics. Report the findings and tell the story. Ask yourself who shapes the story and who gets to hear the story? Who validates and provides feedback about the story? A process needs to be in place! A

balanced analysis that emphasizes the good, the bad, and the ugly should also exist. Next Dr. Smith spoke of connecting the findings with the overall institutional mission.

While the Framework is positive, intelligent metrics are needed to assist in monitoring progress. One might ask, "Are there implications for leadership at all levels?" Is it an inclusive and differentiated approach and is it central to the mission? This leads us to asking the question on her next slide, "What makes you attractive as an institution or as a department or as a program?" You will note that she discussed success, inclusiveness, interesting work, and a good reputation.

In conclusion, the emphasis was placed on the urgency of the situation. How do you know if you are making progress? If we're not strategic and intelligent about how we monitor progress, then we will continue to react to incidents as they occur. We must stop that process. This afternoon we will look at the increasing urgency with the critical element being to take the work going on and monitor progress.

Panel Discussion

> **Louise Sandmeyer**, executive director, Office of Planning and Institutional Assessment, served as a team chair at the 1998-2003 midpoint update review, and the 1998-2003 final update/2004-09 plan review, and has been intimately involved in the *Framework* process from its inception through present

> **Curtiss Porter**, chancellor, Penn State Greater Allegheny, served as a review team chair at the midpoint of the 1998-2003 *Framework*

> **Karen Wiley Sandler**, chancellor, Penn State Abington, has been involved in developing Abington's *Framework* diversity plan and updates for both the 1998-2003 and 2004-09 *Frameworks*

> **Dan Larson**, dean, Eberly College of Science, served as a review team chair at the midpoint of the 2004-09 *Framework*

Introduction

Louise Sandmeyer

The goal of the panel discussion is to have a conversation on how the *Framework* has contributed to the progress that Penn State has made toward its diversity goals and how to best move forward from here. The panelists will share how *Framework* planning has helped their units to develop some best practices and to catalyze their efforts to enhance progress. We will begin with each panelist giving a brief introduction on his or her experience with the *Framework*, then we'll proceed with the questions.

Karen Wiley Sandler

What has worked well? Having the seven Challenges has provided an excellent infrastructure; the data provided by Educational Equity has helped in planning and assessment of our progress. Involving many voices through the peer review process has also been helpful. What has not worked so well? The data has driven the focus more toward numbers than toward concepts; planning tends to focus mainly on policy and procedure, rather than on embedding diversity into the culture. To improve, we need to

move to the conceptualization of multiculturalism as an end point instead of getting caught up in specific processes and projects.

Dan Larson

The most important part of the *Framework* is the process itself. These are not simple problems. People of good intention have been working hard. Some things should have happened before they did, but the *Framework* process keeps us at it. An important part of the whole process is analyzing what progress has been made, then doing it over and over again. We need to get to the point where we integrate this process with our overall strategic planning process. The *Framework* has had some flavor of something done *to* the units instead of *by* the units. We have to get to the point where it's truly *by* the units and fully embedded into the University. We have to go beyond the *Framework* and add the scaffolding that will allow us to build capacity and sustain institutional practices. Wouldn't it be great if every individual at the University could get engaged in the *Framework* process to enhance the engagement? Is this process scalable?

Curtiss Porter

The good news is that the plan was being driven by the institution. Unless there's institutional commitment, it will die on the vine. The challenge is managing the paradox of a top-down approach and having people engage fully. Greater Allegheny has been successful. It is the second most diverse campus – 20 percent. Both domestic minorities and international minorities have increased. The biggest challenge is getting everyone to buy in to the process as organizational learning. We need to keep it on the radar screen to avoid institutional inertia.

Questions from the moderator:

Question:

Louise Sandmeyer – As we all know, a "one shoe fits all" approach does not work well in an environment as complex as Penn State. For example, diversity is often experienced quite differently based on whether a person is a student, faculty, staff, or administrator. What are some of the specific challenges you face in implementing the *Framework* within your unit and what strategies have you employed to accomplish those *Framework* goals that are most critical to your campus?

Answer:

Curtiss Porter – The biggest challenge for Greater Allegheny is location and a sixty year history. We are located in an area that considers itself the center of the universe. People consider themselves to be location-bound. There is a cultural embedment of the region on campus, described as "we all get along." We get along in elementary school, we get along in high school. By the time we get to college, we're getting along as long as we're in the same space and not bothering each other. Everyone is in their place. One institutional notion is that we're getting along fine. . .we have a black chancellor! That doesn't work. We must work against that notion.

Answer:

Dan Larson – Disaggregation is very important. I remember meeting with the college executive committee about minority representation on the faculty. I was given data, and told we're doing fine. Twenty-four percent of the faculty are underrepresented minorities by federal standards. But when

disaggregated, 19 percent are Asian. Only 4.3 percent of the faculty are African American or Latino/a, and that's progress.

There are cultural challenges within the discipline. Faculty were asked, "Are you interested in quality or diversity?" We must change the "*or*" to "*and*." No one has asked that question of me for several years, but it's a real issue.

Demographics within the discipline are also a problem. In 2006, 1,400 Ph.D.'s in Physics were granted in the United States. Only 600 of them went to American citizens, and of those, only 11 went to African Americans. This problem has existed for a long time. We've been trying to diversify the Physics community for fifteen years, and progress is painfully slow.

The nature of the discipline itself is also problematic. How do we integrate diversity into a curriculum that doesn't engage in the study of culture?

Answer:

Karen Wiley Sandler – *note:* Kudos to Dan for changing the discussion from "or" to "and." We need to say that we can't have quality without diversity.

We have a diverse student body at Penn State Abington. What does this mean for hiring a diverse staff and faculty? Based on location, our figures should be higher. How can you provide a quality education to a diverse student body without a diverse faculty?

Being a commuter campus presents a challenge. We have to find a way to fit "24/7" learning into forty hours per week. We have an excellent student life staff who try to get diversity learning opportunities into daily life. We want to have diversity on our advisory board, on the alumni board, in our commencement speakers, and in the awards we give. It should be in our consciousness. Everything in our control should include diversity.

Answer:

Curtiss Porter – We are in a nation that is pluralistic by virtue of demographics. We have managerial responsibility to deal with this.

Question:

Louise – A follow-up question for Dan: The number of undergraduate women students in Science has increased. How has this shift in demographics influenced the college?

Answer:

Dan Larson – Women now represent 50 percent of the undergraduate students in the college, but there are areas of concern. Ten years ago, 11 percent of tenure-line faculty were women. We didn't have role models to encourage students; it was clear we had a lot of work to do. With structural incentives and continued attention, we've made slow, but steady progress. Now, 20 percent of tenure-line faculty are women. We didn't have enough funds in the Physical Plant budget for mass infrastructure improvements. President Spanier is fixing it incrementally. Do a bit more each year. We need to take the same approach to this problem—bit by bit. We'll get there.

Questions from the audience:

Question:

It seems as though we don't have adequate representation of underrepresented minorities on the faculty. Do you have any experience with placing key personnel in gateway courses? Take someone who is a favorite among students, and place that person in a gateway course where he/she can engage students. The typical student in science has been western male. The idea is to place key personnel not on the basis of their expertise, but on their ability to engage students.

Answer:

Dan Larson – Our retention rate for minority students is not very good. It's one of the issues we're beginning to confront very seriously. We haven't thought about it in the way you articulated, though. We do try to put our most engaging teachers in those courses to enhance success, but haven't thought about it in terms of encouraging women and minority students.

Question:

What are your perspectives on holding people accountable, in particular, when we know they don't want to be doing something?

Answer:

Curtiss Porter – It's important to have committed leadership. There is something unique about who we are as a land-grant institution. Then there's the challenge of the pipeline. We can't find the people to fill these positions, yet we're surrounded by communities where these people live and work. It might behoove the University in a reach-back mode to take another look at the land-grant mission and help these folks. We're going to be influencing more and more young people to be engaged with the University as students, faculty, or administrators. We have a societal responsibility to reach back and be of particular assistance to the public education system.

Question:

How do we hold people accountable?

Answer:

Karen Wiley Sandler – There are always people who don't want to change, but there are also people who do want to change. Make sure they're *empowered* to change and *rewarded* for it. Don't go to a faculty person and ask them to change their curriculum because it's the right thing to do. Tell them it's no longer accurate. Then you have their attention. Engagement from the grass-roots up.

Answer:

Dan Larson – To deal with accountability of academic departments and faculty you have to set up structures and processes in which people are working in the interest of their departments. We've guided them in ways that serve the common good and the goals of the institution. A modest example is the President's Opportunity Fund to support hires of minorities and women. In Science, we've put funds from the college in there as well. Now there is incentive to find excellent women and minority faculty, because you can build your department that way.

Answer:

Karen Wiley Sandler – Accountability begins with us. Does your mission state your values? I need to be the person to stand up and acknowledge where we didn't do well.

Question:

There seems to be a fear of asking important questions of our faculty. Do we have faculty exit data? Do we interview candidates who choose not to come? Do we conduct regular climate surveys? How often? What do you do with the data?

Answer:

Karen Wiley Sandler – We do climate surveys every two or three years. The questions are good. The survey was developed by our multicultural climate committee. They report to the administration. We have not done exit interviews.

Answer:

Dan Larson – We haven't had a long tradition of climate surveys, but we did one last year and intend to continue it every few years. The survey asks tough questions. My personal reaction to survey tools is that they get too long.

Answer:

Curtiss Porter – The most important part of the question is "what do you do with the data?" I distribute it across the campus for people to reflect on. What does it say about us? This gets back to the question of accountability. Obviously we need to do something different because we are where we are. Unless we can *interrupt the ordinary*, things tend to go back to the usual. Diversity is more effective when there is managerial accountability.

Answer:

Daryl Smith – We tend to collect stuff and not use it. It's very important *how* you interpret the data. You need to have enough diversity around the table so that the data is interpreted in a meaningful way. If you don't have these surveys, take the ones you do have and disaggregate them. That's a simple use of key things you're already doing. The data is dead if you don't disaggregate it.

Question:

How would you go about partnering with a minority-serving institution?

Answer:

Dan Larson – One of our goals is to increase the number of minorities in graduate school. We came to the conclusion that partnering with HBCUs and Hispanic-serving institutions is a good strategy. We're bringing faculty and students to Penn State in the summer. We've seen a recent increase in African American and Hispanic/Latino graduate students. It's a combination of those efforts and the commitment on the part of some of our faculty. The question of quality or diversity often comes up in graduate admissions. A possible approach is to use thresholds rather than SATs and GREs.

Final comments from the panelists:

Curtiss Porter – I'd like to see Penn State have minority mentoring programs to address the K – 12 problem; we should expand our outreach and impact.

Dan Larson – This conversation has been very useful; it shouldn't just be the people who are already engaged, though.

Karen Wiley Sandler – What would an institution that has diversity embedded look like? We're starting to look that way because we're asking the right questions.

Daryl Smith – Think about higher education's role. Think of it as the beginning of the pipeline, not the elite end of a pipeline. What do you do that prepares the next leadership of our society? This is about identifying talent.

Afternoon Session with Dr. Smith

This session was recorded and is available for viewing at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=snOnIxbjyV0&feature=channel_page>

At several points in the notes below you will find a "minute marker" that indicates where you can find the words within the video to aid if you should decide to follow along.

Introduction by Victoria Sanchez: "You are in for a treat!" From the discussion with Dr. Smith this morning, it is extremely helpful and extremely empowering to find that the directions that we are thinking of taking the newest iteration of the *Framework* are a good fit as we move forward. Penn State borrowed heavily from the research of Dr. Daryl Smith—in particular, the organization of the *Framework to Foster Diversity* around dimensions and key questions--so it is with great appreciation that we welcome her here today. Dr. Smith earned her bachelor's degree in mathematics from Cornell University, a master's degree in student personnel and counseling from Stanford University, and a Ph.D. in psychology and higher education from The Claremont Graduate School. Prior to assuming her current position on the Claremont faculty in 1986, Dr. Smith served as a college administrator for two decades in planning, institutional research, and student affairs. Her research, publications, and teaching focus primarily on diversity in higher education and include organizational implications of diversity, developing capacity to evaluate diversity initiatives, and faculty diversity. Her topic today is "Imperative of Diversity for Institutional Viability: Building Capacity for a Pluralistic Society."

Dr. Daryl Smith: "I am delighted to be here!" Dr. Smith was excited to acknowledge colleagues that she has known for years but has never seen "on their own turf." Penn State is a frontrunner – in its support of the leadership, in its capacity of the staff within the Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity, in its leadership commitment, and in taking the lead with the next generation of this work.

Dr. Smith offered a translation of the title: "Imperative of Diversity for Institutional Viability: Building Capacity for a Pluralistic Society." She indicated that " the question that drives me is: How can we build our institutions' capacity to be effective, high-performing places where diversity of many kinds applies, and where success in diversity serves the mission?"

"I have been feeling increasingly urgent about this for a long time. We are going to talk about multiplicity a lot. We are in an academic environment, so we are not into dichotomies, "either/or" thinking."

Dr. Smith offered her observation of what she referred to as the "First Multiplicity:"

> ***The forty years of 'unfinished business' plus the next generation of diversity work, adds new complexities in what we think of when we think about diversity.***

The forty years of unfinished business is the heart and soul of equity and deals mainly with history and historically underrepresented minorities. That work is now more urgent in part because of changing demographics in our society. We see progress in some domains, but if you look at the data: health gaps, educational gaps, quality of life issues, urban issues, and so on, are increasingly demanding, but have also been around for forty years. The changing demographics creating the increasing domains for diversity are not trivial and deserve equal emphasis and importance.

Dr. Smith offered the role of religion after 9/11 as an example. Most institutions caught unprepared to deal with questions of Islam were met with ignorance and stereotypes, which had implications not only for Muslim students, faculty, and staff, but additionally, had at its core an implication that most campuses were severely constrained in their ability to broach the subject of what was going on in the world because we have no expertise to speak of on most campuses about Islam. The role of religion becomes extremely important and complicated as it intersects with traditional notions of diversity.

Diversity has profound implications for political structures and access to power, international as well as domestic implications. Who has access to power around the world has a lot to do with political stability. A number of political scientists have researched stability as a function of economic gaps within societies. They found that unstable regions correlate with economic gaps throughout the world. Presently, economic gaps have increased, creating more instability. Human rights and equity are increasingly central to issues of diversity, both internationally and domestically. Domestically, we can ask who is in prison, who gets arrested for drug use? These same issues of the intersection of economics and political power are found throughout the world.

We also have no capacity to deal with our historic issues of injustice. South Africa's *Truth and Reconciliation Commission* and President Mandela's insight taught us that we need to name the histories of injustice in order to move forward. In this country, we have a "That was then, this is now, forget about it" mentality – but we have learned, through the successes realized with the Mandela presidency that history lives in the present. Our capacity as institutions and as a nation to discuss tribal issues, civil rights, slavery, histories of violence and injustice will be one of the ways the country can move forward. South Africa provided a wonderful model, but right now the dominant reaction to attempts at discourse is "That's just being negative."

Stories of civil rights and the history of civil rights have not become a dominant discourse within the United States, but rather are told within communities of color during Black History month. The dominant narrative is parallel to civil rights and has always been about democracy and our greatness as a nation. During the inauguration of President Obama, civil rights and democracy narratives finally intersected with stories about the people who built the White House (see http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=99353053) – and there was a celebration of both civil rights and democracy simultaneously for the first time. Why could we do this so easily? It may be that this was a moment of success and thus, we were freer to talk about the past with more comfort.

One of the questions that came out after the election was speculation that we are done with race issues—and it is clear that we are not. We can name our successes, but we still have work to do.

How do we do that? At Brown University, they decided to deal with slavery – what are its implications, past and present? See http://www.brown.edu/Research/Slavery_Justice/. Penn State has a history as well, and our institutions must develop the capacity to engage in discourse and explore the present implications of past injustices. The health and well being of our society, political stability, economic viability, and the future of our society are going to rest with how we deal with diversity – especially with changing demographics.

Historic and longstanding inequities continue to grow and in addition to these inequities, there are new issues based on emerging groups: Transgender issues, LGBT, new race/ethnicity issues because of immigration of groups that were historically not here, etc. The next wave of immigration will play out in some interesting of ways. We need to deal with that; institutionally, academically, and educationally.

Second Multiplicity: Multiple and intersecting identities.

Identities are salient because of the social and historical contexts of identity. The reality is that we've had a hard time engaging this notion of multiplicities of identity and intersections of identity. Race and gender are acknowledged in reports from higher education; we know there are race and gender things going on, but we need to be able to handle the intersections. We have to look at the data to determine what story is being told at the intersection of race and gender. A favorite ethnic/black studies book, *But Some of us are Brave: All the Women are White, All the Blacks are Men: Black Women's Studies* (Paperback) by Gloria T. Hull (Editor), Patricia Bell Scott (Editor), Barbara Smith (Editor) highlights the story of black women studies.

Indigenous communities get lost and in different parts of the country this issue is very salient, but the numbers are so small that we "forget" about them. Dealing with the future, the sovereignty, the visibility and viability of native communities is becoming an issue around the world (USA, Canada, Australia, South Africa, New Zealand, China). Dealing with the history of indigenous peoples within those contexts is very, very important.

Third multiplicity: Science and technology field data.

Dr. Smith used graphs to explore data points within the STEM fields: Who gets doctorates in this country? The graph shows that 87 percent of Asians (2006) with Ph.D.'s are non-citizens, which has implications for our domestic capacity. Asian Americans are getting fewer Ph.D.'s than African Americans. Are we doing the work to produce the domestic capacity to participate in the STEM fields? This is hugely urgent. Higher education in the STEM fields is relying on noncitizens when hiring faculty. With VISA problems affecting the ability to bring people and keep them here, the urgency to develop domestic capacity is increasing. A California report shows that the state of California is going to have to import labor from other states because its educational system does not have the capacity to develop the workforce it needs for technology in California. This is happening all around the country.

Across the country, demographic shifts are creating vast changes; different parts of the country are different demographically. The graph in the PowerPoint was developed to show the demographics and projection of public high school graduates by state – and the graph for Pennsylvania was displayed. The innermost circle of the graph projects for the year 2014, so these projected differences are not in the distant future. The bottom line for Pennsylvania is that 25 percent of the population is not white and the 75 percent of the population that is white is declining. In addition, when Dr. Smith had the opportunity

to work with folks in Ohio, she found that higher education institutions are forced to recruit in California. The question then becomes, "Just how attractive is Ohio as a place to live for someone from Los Angeles? Attractiveness, capacity, and knowledge become very important considerations.

Educational Equity also gathered data for Dr. Smith for her to analyze. Undergraduate student data at Penn State show that 9 percent of the population is underrepresented minorities and 14 percent when Asian Americans are also included. International students comprise 24 percent of Penn State graduate students. Again, this is not about the value or desirability of international students, but rather, about higher education's capacity to build knowledge in our domestic populations.

What are the present trends regarding diversity on our campuses? Rhetoric is dominating the discourse, and we are getting increasingly more concerned. The list of identities constituting diversity is increasing and questions about a core definition of diversity creates anxiety. For example, if the definition is about race, then no one else counts. Conversely, if the definition includes everybody, then historic issues become irrelevant. Forgetting the history is not okay, especially in light of the fact that Penn State's "*Framework*" was developed to address historic issues of intentional segregation and continuing gaps in enrollment.

Another aspect that contributes to the overall picture is both the growth of programs and projects even while higher education institutions are experiencing burn out of staff, and diversity task force reports read like they could have been written forty years ago. Staff decide "If the institution is not serious about this work, I am out of here!" and so human capacity is not necessarily growing.

Another consideration for comprehensive diversity planning is the perception that will be created with the rapid growth of populations of diverse undergraduate students combined with the lack of growth in other areas. Our campuses will begin to look like South Africa, where students are students of color and everyone else is white. We need to be careful about the message such an image would send if we are not careful about growing our diversity in all areas.

In addition, diversity leadership on many campuses is coming from people whose positions are about diversity; there is frustration that diversity is often not yet at the core of what the institution does. The diversity leadership sees and defines progress, which competes with the perception of activists who focus on and point out deficiencies. Campuses then become places of competing rhetoric, while it would be more productive to deal in multiplicities. Campuses should build the capacity to both acknowledge the progress while simultaneously identifying areas that have not adequately progressed. The goal of Penn State's *Framework*, with its emphasis on monitoring of progress, allows the University to deal with these multiplicities.

Issues on campuses lacking capacity:

Dr. Smith talked about common problems that occur on campuses that have not begun to address the multiplicities inherent in moving forward with strategic planning and capacity building, as Penn State has done with its *Framework*.

Campuses where diversity efforts largely run parallel to core functions rather than being included as central considerations (for example, diversity is not part of the catalogue mission statement , strategic plans, accreditation, unit plans, program reviews) create episodic responses to diversity—in other words, diversity efforts are mobilized only in a crisis. All it takes is a noose incident and people will be engaging in sit-ins and protests and demands much like those which occurred forty years ago. It takes a strategic process to get ahead of incidents. Taskforces or diversity committees are struggling with

overload or lack of direction in programs (what Dr. Smith refers to as "projectitis"), especially in an atmosphere of financial struggles, where budgetary and staffing considerations are reducing the capacity to provide multiple programs. And now, with increased emphasis on international initiatives, leaders are challenged to be mindful of the frustrations this causes for domestic diversity workers. When new international programs are launched with a lot of fanfare and senior level support, diversity workers will feel discouraged that the forty years of historic diversity issues that remain unresolved through no lack of effort on their part, are just going to be swept aside yet again in favor of new global initiatives.

Metaphor of Technological Imperative

"Not if, *now*!" The changes that our institutions are experiencing are imperative. As a metaphor, look at the vast resources and attitudinal changes that took place within institutions to address the need to build capacity for the reality of technology.

How do we educate people to live in a technological world? In the present environment—to remain viable institutions—we must build capacity to become technologically advanced.

Technology is constantly changing and evolving, and continually advancing. Technology is now pervasive: we provide wireless locations, we provide online courses for distance learning, we hire supportive technical staff to maintain and evolve everyday technology needs, we allocate generous budget resources in strategic plans. We implemented infrastructure changes to allow for increased functionality, and knowledge of technology is considered a "core competency" in hiring for *any* position. Institutional leadership now has created a position for a Chief Information Officer that brings to the table ideas for strategic allocations for technology. The expertise and resources needed to provide for advancing technology is widely accepted: at this point, we cannot imagine hiring someone who would say, "I don't do e-mail!"

Providing for advancing technology was not easy. It was not easy to move from paper and pencil to electronic records. Deciding what computers to purchase and retrofitting buildings for wireless was not easy. Providing money in the budget for technological changes was not easy—but the need was pervasive and the monies were strategically expended.

 "Are you getting my drift?"

27 minutes

There are two recent pervasive changes in our society: technological society and pluralistic society. When you think about building capacity, think about substituting the language of technological advances for the language of advancing diversity. What do we do to advance technology that we do not do to build our capacity to deal with diversity? Strategic technological considerations affect hiring practices, resource allocation, leadership capacity, and recruitment of expertise.

The need to do the same in the diversity arena is not as well embraced, but in reality, diversity is imperative for our society at a more basic level than technology. The health of our democracy depends upon it. How prepared are we as an institution to function in a pluralistic society? What do we or don't we do to advance technology that we do or don't do to advance diversity? It goes beyond how many diverse undergraduates are on campus, to the capacity of having people around the table that can think strategically and make decisions. Technological needs demanded that the universities go to unusual lengths to identify technological competency, and even high schools were tapped during the early

".com" era. The universities understood the need to recruit technological talent, even if they did not look like the rest of the folks around the table.

Technology advanced because the decision makers knew that it was *core*. The next step for diversity is to locate diversity at the core of the mission of the institution – CORE, not optional, not nice if you can get it – but CORE. Diversity becomes a parallel process if the decision makers do not understand that. It will move to the margins, especially in an age of budget cuts, hiring freezes, and resource allocation. Duplicate processes will compensate for institutional lack of capacity.

"Projectitis" is the process of adding programs in an ad hoc manner to deal with crises, and is another way of saying that diversity is not core. So, we've got to monitor progress. We need to be able to say "We are making progress here, we need more work there. . . ."

How many of you know the disaggregated graduation rates? If we don't know, then we cannot address the issue effectively. We need to think of the definition of diversity as inclusive and differentiated, and its significance should not be lost as part of a laundry list. The slide shows a different way of conceptualizing diversity within a framework, much like the *Framework* here at Penn State, with four key dimensions.

The first dimension is **Access and Success** of historically underrepresented populations, which is the heart and soul of diversity work.

The second is "**Climate and Intergroup Relations**," which has us asking "How does this place feel for the diverse populations that are here? How is this place for gay and lesbian students, or Muslim students, for Latinos, for an African American?" We do not have to pick one or the other—the experience for each needs to be disaggregated from the others.

The third dimension is "**Education and Scholarship**" –Penn State is a land-grant institution. Are the graduates researching and preparing to serve the people of Pennsylvania in areas such as health gaps, educational inequities, urban planning, urban toxicity in the environmental movement, or teacher preparation for STEM work?

The fourth dimension is "**Institutional Viability and Vitality,**" which deals with the sensitivity of the institution to community regard. Does the institution have a good reputation? If not, why would a student want to come? This dimension is critical, but which community's regard are we worried about? What is the reputation of Penn State in communities of underrepresented populations?

The slide shows recurring statements of institutional mission that are appropriate to Penn State's land-grant mission, such as: student success including in STEM fields; preparing all students for participation and leadership in a diverse society; and making a difference in society/community.

An example of language that centers diversity as core to the institutional mission:

Effectiveness and diversity: Are students from different groups succeeding? Are students being prepared to function in a diverse society? How attractive is the institution to diverse groups? What is the institution's capacity to educate successfully?

The next slide shows the six-year graduation rates (2002 cohort), disaggregated by race/ethnicity. Is this profile adequate for Penn State? Are the achievement gaps okay? The days of blaming K-12 are over because research does not support the notion that preparation and SAT scores are necessarily connected to who is graduating and who is not.

36:30 minutes

So. . .the story this data is telling is probably *not* okay.

Decision Making is Better Informed/ Knowledge for Decisions/ New Approaches and Scholarship: A common refrain for the justification of diversifying the faculty is the increasingly diverse student body, with the rationale of needing role models. However, this does not reflect how faculty culture works. The rationale put forward for diverse faculty/leadership needs a more nuanced understanding. Those persons (faculty) with multiplicities of experience and identities will push the boundaries of new knowledge by coming at an issue with completely different points of view, which could work to prevent teams of researchers from being blindsided in unexpected ways. For example: breast cancer research on white men (with the confusing rationale that "women's hormones complicate research design"); recovery differs by gender for knee replacement surgery (we now have knees designed for women); see http://archpedi.ama-assn.org/cgi/content/extract/163/2/181 Rectifying Institutional Bias in Medical Research**,** Somnath Saha, M.D., MPH, *Archives of Pediatric and Adolescent Medicine*, 2009; 163(2):181-182. Air bag designs were dangerous for women and children who tend to be much smaller than the males around whom the design was tailored; see "NHTSA's New Crash Test Dummy Family" *Annals of Emergency Medicine*, Volume 33, Issue 6, Pages 719-721 J. Runge, J. Harris, B. Jolly, J. Runge, K. Todd. Including more people, thus increasing the diversity around the table, increases the chance of someone noting "Not all the people I know, especially the women and children, are 5'10" and weigh 200 lbs." Decision-making is better informed with diversity.

Perceptions of commitment and equity: Language and perceptions of commitment are either reinforced or contradicted by who we see when we are on campus.

Providing legitimacy: For example, international faculty are recruited for legitimacy when there are international initiatives. Their presence ensures that language and cultural issues will not derail the collaboration because the university has hired people that can bridge those gaps.

Relationships with diverse communities on and off campus: A white person from a rural area may simply lack the experience to lend to recruitment within inner city schools in Philadelphia and may simply lack the capacity to effectively reach out to diverse populations.

Leadership development: If we are not hiring diverse faculty, then there is a whole generation of diverse faculty that is not being trained for leadership, thus preventing the administration from being replaced with diverse future leaders. When the expected retirements over the next decade are realized, there will be a real shortage of talent. While university presidents usually stepped down in their 50's, they are now tending to accept second presidencies in their 60's because there is a shortage of people to replace them. We have not developed the capacity to replace leadership to serve our institutions.

Significance of the absence of institutional attractiveness: "Students need someone who looks like them in the classroom" is an oversimplification. What makes a good mentor is complex, and because of the multiplicities of identities and perspective, there is no way to be certain where it is that people will connect. So it is actually the absence of diverse faculty that more greatly affects the climate. If you are African American and you have never seen an African American physicist, why would you think that physics is an inviting environment? Why would you want to be the first? A breakdown by race of faculty in the sciences reveals 0's and 1's in many institutions for nonwhite faculty. This is a signal of the attractiveness of the institution. Is this where people who are diverse want to be? Attractiveness is a function of diversity.

Role models: Across the board, we need more diversity in leadership. The value of role models should not be underestimated.

48 Minutes

Research on faculty – The data reveals that demographics are slowly changing. Not much progress has been made in diversifying faculty. This is causing a crisis as the next generation of faculty are being hired to replace the expected retirements. We only have about ten more years to hire faculty. A 50-60 percent turnover has occurred on most campuses within the last ten years or so, and we only have about ten more years of hiring remaining to replace retirees. Penn State's data reveal that international faculty is the fastest growing category – we *get* that we must hire faculty to compete globally. If we do not similarly emphasize domestic diversity, our credibility and viability will be at stake*.* Perception becomes very important.

Tremendous turnover issues: Dr. Smith emphasized a pipeline argument with regard to graduate student diversity. Graduate students are the next generation of faculty and if the diversity is lacking at the graduate student level, then the pool of available faculty for hire is similarly lacking. Amazingly, the two most decentralized functions on campuses are faculty hiring and graduate student admissions. As it turns out, even where a campus enjoys better rates of diversity in undergraduate population (such as Stanford), graduate student diversity is not experiencing similar increases*. **Universities are preparing their own labor force – there is no excuse.***

Myths and reasons behind hiring faculty – Common excuses: "There aren't any"; "they wouldn't want to come here"; " we can't pay them"; "and when they do come, they leave for someplace better." It was shocking to hear these excuses even from Harvard*.* There are reasons diversity recruitment is not working*.* If a vice president for development went to their president or chancellor with similar excuses that the climate simply was not good for raising money, they wouldn't have their job the following year*.* While it is not easy, while there may be reason to adjust goals, we would not accept these excuses. Diversity recruitment puts forward lots of reasons, but most of them myths.

Over and over, the story of "one good year" of effort, with a corresponding "we did it" and we are moving on creates the same outcome year after year. Four years after the fact, the campus finds itself in the same exact place demographically. The process of faculty hiring is ***fundamentally about identifying talent and interrupting the usual patterns*** – if it continues to be done the same way, then we can expect the same results.

Demographics of faculty by race and ethnicity for 2003 – 2008 for University Park: Bottom line – there is no change in historically underrepresented faculty in the last five years*.* Nonresident aliens increased from 6 percent to 9 percent - this is where we see the change*.* Again, we get how to do international – we don't get how to do domestic*.*

Faculty turnover quotient – Dr. Smith's slide showed a helpful formula that puts the focus on both retention and hiring. The turnover quotient reveals if you have a turnover issue*.* On the campuses that Dr. Smith has worked with, half of them had a quotient of 0, which means that every hire added to their diversity – while half had a quotient of 60 percent, which means that three out of five new hires went to replace people from an underrepresented group who had left*.* High turnover for white men would be expected because of retirement, but that was not the case*.* The turnover for underrepresented populations was the same and in some cases higher*.* These campuses had huge retention problems. We know that people do not make the decision to leave lightly (Dual career issues) – so how do we know the real reason why they are leaving?

Some lessons from research in other domains:

Educational Benefits - When diversity is done well, we know that it has educational benefits, such as satisfaction and retention of people. Perceptions of institutional commitment are important not just for students, but also for faculty. It is important to ask people "Do you believe your institution is committed to diversity?" If the answer isn't yes, then there is a gap between rhetoric and felt experience. If there is a big gap, it would be better for folks if the campus simply admitted that it is not committed because then people would know the score.

Directly tied to excellence and accountability – Student success numbers disaggregated show the tie of excellence and accountability. Universities are being held accountable by looking at graduation rates. Some take the easy way out and graduate everybody, but that does not serve society well. High expectations, but without the gaps, is the goal.

Identity groupings (self-segregation/clustering) **is linked to success and intergroup dialogue** - Identity groupings are critically important to student success, AND lend themselves to the capacity to engage in intergroup dialogue, which are becoming increasingly important. What is required is a sophisticated understanding of identity. It is the white students who experience the most self-segregation and clustering. We cannot continue to frame this as a problem within communities of color or LGBT communities, but rather understand the capacity of the dominant communities and the institution to function within an increasingly diverse society.

Mission, mattering, and multiplicity create healthy communities – Diversity values must be embedded in the mission. People need to feel they matter. Because students do not feel they matter in so many other places, campuses become that much more important. Students experience multiplicities of identities. The key issue is that on too many campuses, if a student is the "only one" in the classroom, they will not feel that the institution values that particular part of them and will suffer from "tokenism." For every function on campus, do we have capacity to make all feel that they matter? If they don't feel they matter, they will go somewhere where they do feel they matter.

Diversity in leadership – Diversity in leadership is critically important to the capacity to identify talent.

Implications:

This is not about affirmative action. This is about mission and excellence. The legal issues, such as what the state of Michigan has dealt with, are there, but have driven too much diversity work. What is important is excellence and capacity of our society.

Good education matters. Once students are properly educated, the importance of background characteristics fade away as relevant predictors of success, while the usual or "bad" education does not disrupt the pattern of predicting student success from background information. You decide: Does the institution want to interrupt the pattern or follow the pattern of allowing whatever background characteristics people came with dominate how that student does at the institution?

Build capacity for difficult dialogues and relationships. Campuses become paralyzed when some issues come to their campus. The University of Irvine is paralyzed whenever someone comes to campus to talk about the Middle East because they have not developed the capacity to guide Jewish students and Palestinian students to talk about the Middle East.

Take advantage of disequilibrium. An incident causes impetus for change. Do you have the capacity to take advantage of that and move forward?

Changing culture congruent with culture: Looking at technological advances and the fearful projections that never came to pass teaches us to look for out of the box solutions. People were resistant to change because they predicted that we would no longer have libraries and "everything would go virtual." Instead, campuses invested in libraries to create hubs complete with coffee shops and cafes. Similarly, it is also impossible to project forward in this area; we do not know what it looks like to live in a pluralistic society that works. Oftentimes, it is what we are most frightened of that gets projected. Identify what is central and core; and keep the things that matter—the things that are core—to excellence (i.e., research within the sciences that makes a contribution to the world).

Distributed leadership: This can be accomplished through recognition of what is already going on within key groups and making their role central within the university. Make central what is already going on within key groups. If the president is the only one talking about this, it will fail. The institution needs leadership at every level to move forward.

1:00 Hour

Framework and monitoring progress: Penn State has a *Framework* in place and is now working on auditing and developing intelligent metrics.

Centrality of the mission: If you are a research and engineering institution and diversity is focused only on undergraduate admissions, you have marginalized the process already.

It is going to require **leadership and communication, intentionality, and an inclusive and differentiated approach.** We can deal with multiplicities of identities, even as we maintain and make progress on recognized historical issues that remain unfinished business.

Faculty, staff, and deans; student success and learning, including STEM

- Pedagogy

- Climate of the department; student engagement

- Advising; intrusive advising

- Curriculum overall and in departments

- Expectations of student success

- Belief in students

- Support gateway courses

Dr. Smith put forward an example: A campus in Ohio had an African American ballet trained dance program. A part-time African American woman was revitalizing the program—she had multiple competencies, including ballet, modern dance, etc., and everyone loved her. When an opening came up, the department chair was experiencing political turmoil within the department, and the curriculum committee demanded a program review. The program review team that was brought in from outside lacked diversity. Their conclusion was that no dance program was worth anything without a more traditional ballet person, and the excellent instructor was gone. Everyone was frustrated and angry, and

regretted it, but no one realized that they had a cannon debate going on. Fifteen years later, the school still burns over this.

Diversity is fundamentally about attractiveness.

Urgency is increasing. "No child left behind is coming to a campus near you."

NCLB: Why did NCLB happen? K-12 spent lots of time developing "reasons" for allowing people to fail. The government had limited ability to address the issues, and as the crisis continued, created a tool to increase accountability and make people do something, thus developing the "No Child Left Behind" policy.

Accountability: Graduation rates are the most obvious way to hold institutions accountable. Achievement gaps must be eradicated and the level of education of our citizens must increase (we are presently experiencing a decrease) in the STEM fields for the viability of the country.

Health of a pluralistic society is needed to establish and maintain credibility in the world. Our credibility in the world depends upon maintaining a healthy democracy within a pluralistic society. Our credibility with the rest of the world cannot be sustained with the educational gaps as they now exist. The rest of the world is moving to mass higher education; we must do so also.

Impatience and frustration and fatigue on campus: We need to care about the people that are doing this work—and mean it. We cannot continue to develop task forces and create reports that could have been written forty years ago.

Budget and resource challenges: We need to be strategic about our resources and understand why diversity is core to the mission of the institution.

Questions:

1. Dr. Smith posed a question about Penn State's international initiatives, stating "Our boundaries are no longer clearly drawn." Do we make a distinction between first generation Mexican immigrant students vs. a Mexican student born of immigrant parents living in the United States? When I look at campuses that are building international initiatives and globalization, I find that campuses are much more comfortable going to China than to local urban communities. The changing domain of diversity, in reality, is increasingly international with regard to equity, justice, and the health and well being of democracy. We find ourselves more comfortable with the exotic. It is discouraging how much money we spend on Visas for international faculty while domestic diversity hiring remains horrible!

2. How do you build capacity with individuals who are stuck?

Dr. Smith employed the technological metaphor. We are not going to get everybody; compare this to technological naysayers. Society was changing, the levers that demanded change were in place, and the ones that did not want to play got left behind. So what is the lever for diversity? Where is diversity framed within institutional viability? The question becomes "What is our imperative for diversity?" If you disaggregate education by race in California, where there is no clear majority, the data tell a story that is appalling and frightening; thus the lever becomes more obvious demographically and economically. Even absent obvious demographics, however, the lever must be the development of a healthy pluralistic society that works.

For example: Why do we worry about diversity in Maine? It is one of the least diverse states. A closer look reveals that talent is leaving. The questions become "Where are these people going? Have their experiences within Maine's higher education institutions given them the capacity to function within their new (possibly more diverse) state?"

What are Pennsylvania's levers? Existing health care inequities and educational gaps compel similar resolve. College is thought of as the elite end of a pipeline, but college is only the *beginning* of that pipeline. We need to understand why a third grade teacher is not able to get kids excited about math. That leads to a look at the higher education institutions commitment and capacity to train these teachers. No one questions that the system we now have is not creating this capacity.

Dr. Smith advised "Don't worry about the naysayers. If you put in place key leaders and pressure to change, then the writing is on the wall." Once key things are in place, and the institution places diversity at its core, resistant faculty will simply be sent to be trained. Does the institution have the capacity to put diversity at the center?

Follow up question to Dr. Smith: What if the problem is with the leadership? What if you do not have the authority to get things done? What if you are the "only one" and the person in charge thinks everything is okay?

Key leadership becomes critical. There is no reason to push against a rock by yourself. What does leadership look like? The leader's job is to reach down to help pull that rock up (for instance, develop an accountability matrix, a framework). Leadership needs to be in place and needs to surround itself with people they can trust to do the work. Here at Penn State, there are a lot of people in place to pull the rock up. The question is: is there synergy; are there connections between key leaders and diversity workers? Or are people feeling that they are alone in pushing against the rock? Increasingly, the question is: Where are the President and the Provost? Do they question the other leadership groups and hold them accountable? If these things are not in place, diversity workers must admit "We can't work like this."

For example, one way to make diversity a core value in the STEM fields is to tie budget monies to programming aimed at development of talent in K-12. Leadership can restrict money if there is no progress in the identified focus, thus bolstering the value of work done in worrying about K– 12 or diversity. Programming can work as a band-aid; colleges are working to graduate people *in spite of* the institution. At some point, leadership must acknowledge that this is not enough. They must make a shift and take a look at the institution and its deficiencies. It is no longer feasible to look at women to place the blame for their ongoing lack of success within STEM fields.

Student activism and faculty organization can create teachable moments for leadership when they question the centrality of diversity.