

THE UNIVERSITY OF
SCRANTON
A JESUIT UNIVERSITY

DIVERSITY AUDITS

June 1, 1999 - May 31, 2000

June 1, 1999 - May 31, 2000

DIVERSITY AUDITS

Prepared for:

*Joseph M. McShane, S.J.
President
The University of Scranton*

Submitted by:

*Rosemary Gray Bundy, Ed.D.
Equity and Diversity Officer
The University of Scranton*

May 31, 2000

"Things are changing in every part of the world. . . These events are bound to affect us. Distances have shrunk; communication is easier. This affects our national security. Unfortunately, Americans have always felt that we can withdraw from world affairs or involve ourselves at will . . ."

-Henry Kissinger
Former Nobel Peace Prize winner
and Secretary of State
Speech, Pasadena Civic Center, April 21, 2000

As we move into the next millennium, aspects of the current context continue to present pressure for progress as well as introduce new challenges in meeting diversity goals. Demographic and economic imperatives, various legal initiatives designed to remedy or challenge discrimination, and the political context for planning development are all aspects of an institution's external environment that require clarification of goals for diversity. Demographic and economic imperatives provide pressures and, depending on institutional responses, new opportunities for institutions to achieve diversity and globalization goals. Even with the threat of legal challenges, campuses retain significant autonomy in achieving diversity goals that are consistent with sound educational practice and are part of a well-articulated plan. In such uncertain times, campuses must clarify their goals for diversity, communicate their goals and practices to the campus community, and articulate their vision of the multicultural community they would like to achieve. Although for different reasons, each of these contexts may exert pressures on the institution to consider how diversity and globalization goals are central to the educational mission of the institution.

Contexts That Present New Challenges to Meeting Diversity and Globalization Goals

Demographics Imperative

Changing U.S. ethnic demographics present new challenges to meeting diversity and globalization goals of The University. Currently, 33% of the U.S. population is made up of ethnic minority groups. From 1980 to 1990, the U.S. Asian American population grew 108%, Hispanic 53%, African American 13%, and European American 6%.

White Americans are the minority in over 2000 U.S. cities and towns. White men are 35% of the U.S. population, White people are less than 15% of the world population, White male Americans are just over 1% of the world population.

More people became naturalized citizens of the U.S. in 1997 than in any previous year. Since 1960, Whites have dropped from 93% of total net immigrants to 55%. Even if immigration ended completely, the proportion of the U.S. that is non-Hispanic White would continue to decrease.

By the year 2025, 50% of public school children in the U.S. will be members of ethnic minority groups. Currently, in the state of Texas, ½ of the children in grade school are members of ethnic minority groups. All 30 of the largest public school districts in the country have majority minority enrollment.

The U.S. Hispanic population is the fastest-growing U.S. ethnic group. In 2050 Hispanics will outnumber all other minority groups combined and will be 25% of the total U.S. population.

Of the new workers entering the labor force this year, only 15% will be White men, and the rest either White women, members of U.S. ethnic minority groups, or immigrants. Fifty-five percent of the world's population is of Asian ancestry. More than 33% of the world's population lives in India and China.

It is projected that by 2010 one out of every three Americans will be Latino, African American, Asian American, or American Indian. This projection, however, does not reflect the rapid growth of racial/ethnic populations, which are fast becoming the majority in various states.

Because the demographic and economic imperative is consistent with higher education's central mission to replenish the workforce, institutions should plan to educate a diverse student body in order to ensure that more college graduates have the appropriate technical and human relations skills that are sure to be useful in the future. We face a society that will consist of diverse work and educational environments, making it ever more important to provide all students with the skills necessary for success in an increasingly diverse world. Diversity needs to be reflected in the student body, faculty, and staff, approaches to teaching, and research in higher education.

Disparities in higher education are almost certain to result in the perpetuation of different economic futures for these groups, which in turn will have a direct impact on state economies where the disparities among groups are the greatest. Many institutions have devised specific programs and services to address these issues, but the demographic and economic pressures for tangible institutional progress are even greater. Public and private businesses largely depend on higher education institutions to produce a diverse, college-educated workforce that can respond to an expanding constituency. The achievement of diversity and globalization goals becomes economically important to both the institution and the communities it seeks to serve.

Economic Imperatives

A growing body of scholarship reveals that diverse work environments can be more organizationally effective and result in economic advantage. For example, research literature on organizations suggests that heterogeneous work teams promote creativity and innovation, improved problem solving and decision making, organizational flexibility, and tolerance for ambiguity. To avoid potential misunderstandings, conflict, and excessive time consumed with decision making, work groups must be managed so as to "maximize the potential benefits of diversity". In the business literature, the goal of managing diversity is to maximize "the ability of

all employees to contribute to organizational goals and to achieve their full potential unhindered by group identity” such as race/ethnicity, gender, or age. For example, diverse planning committees are essential to resolve problems that hinder progress toward diversity goals as well as other key institutional goals that require joint problem solving and decision making. This may be particularly important when institutional goals require clarification in preparation and planning for anticipated budget constraints. Organizational effectiveness can be enhanced by higher education leaders who understand and know how to maximize the benefits of a diverse student, faculty, and staff for the institution.

Legal Imperatives

Legislation, executive orders, and court-ordered mandates have undoubtedly created immediate pressures for diversifying higher education in the past. They are likely to continue to challenge institutions in the future. While some groups included in a campus’s definition of diversity are the target of many state and federal legal initiatives – women, racial/ethnic minorities, and disabled students and employees – it is important to note that there exists no legal mandate for other groups as well as controversy regarding their status as a “protected class.” Individual institutional policy determines the extent to which those who continue to be the target of discrimination are to be included in statements prohibiting discrimination. The institutional definition of diversity or globalization will influence its policies. The influence of legal initiatives or mandates may vary depending on the target group, the stated mission of the institution, and/or legal conditions of the campus that obligate them to plan responses to such pressures. Campuses may be compelled to engage in diversity planning, particularly when a court or agency finds evidence of discrimination. At the same time, institutions can participate voluntarily in determining how to achieve fairness and equity for its constituencies.

Both private and public campuses that receive federal funding are compelled to adhere to policies and practices of nondiscrimination according to Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the 1990 Americans with Disabilities Act, Title VI and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and subsequent executive orders, which all prohibit discrimination on the basis of disability, race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

Campuses are expected to provide reasonable accommodations for disabled employees and students and act affirmatively to provide opportunities for individuals from under represented groups.

In the coming years, universities may need to reexamine its pedagogical practices to meet its mission of educating both men and women and all of its student population to serve them better.

Legal cases have raised important points regarding institutional goal setting in relation to achieving diversity. First, the use of racial preferences to achieve diversity goals is subject to a high standard of judicial review, meaning that the program must serve a “compelling interest” or goal for the institution and be narrowly tailored to the achievement of that goal. Therefore, institutions must clarify their goals and carefully design strategies to meet these goals. Second, racial preferences can be used in college admissions and in awarding scholarships as acceptable

strategies for achieving diversity where there is evidence of past discrimination, present effects, or conditions at the institution attributable to such a history, and/or where diversity is articulated as a desired educational policy.

Those campuses denying their history of discrimination, taking little interest in documenting the problems of inequity on campus, and not embracing diversity as having an important educational function are not likely to withstand legal challenges-nor are they likely to achieve diversity goals. Third, the Bakke case actually supported institutional autonomy in the area of policy commitments to diversity by affirming the right of institutions to select their student body and include race as a factor, but not the sole determinant, in admissions if it is intended to serve an educational purpose. Even with the threat of legal challenges, campuses can retain significant autonomy in achieving diversity goals that are consistent with sound educational practice and are part of a well-articulated plan.

Political Context

Approaches taken by institutions toward meeting diversity goals have encountered resistance in some states and on particular campuses in the 1990's. Opposition to affirmative action has been motivated by politics and fueled by a general misconception of institutional practice. Affirmative action describes those practices that attempt to correct past or present discrimination and prevent future occurrences of discrimination. As a strategy, affirmative action is intended to meet the spirit of state and federal laws and subsequent executive orders in terms of attempting to increase the representation of previously excluded groups in settings that receive federal funding. New approaches to achieve diversity should be economically sound and sufficient for educating an increasingly diverse population, with usually a shrinking budget, and with some risk of review for federal compliance. The affirmative action controversy emerged in a political context where state rights are being reasserted over federal control, economic uncertainties exist, and demographic and social transformations produce questions related to the majority culture's values. In such uncertain times, campuses must clarify their goals for diversity, communicate their goals and practices to the campus community, and articulate their vision of the multicultural community they would like to achieve.

Educational Imperatives

Many campuses today have come to recognize diversity as an educational model, which is based on a philosophy and plan and goals consistent with the overall educational objectives of the institution. Research on college students and their educational environments now reveals that progress toward institutional diversity goals can have an impact on students' educational experiences. In a national longitudinal study of college students and faculty at their respective institutions, results revealed that an institutional emphasis on diversity goals was significantly associated with increased levels of cultural awareness and commitment to promoting racial understanding among students after four years of college. Approaches to integrating knowledge regarding diversity into the academic program also have an impact. Students tended to be more satisfied with instruction and their overall undergraduate experience, had higher levels of trust in

the college administration, and perceived a distinct emphasis on multiculturalism on their campus. A strong institutional emphasis on diversity goals showed consistently positive effects on students' undergraduate experiences and outcomes.

Research also supports the development of a diverse community, in terms of increased numerical representation of various groups, to achieve specific educational goals for all students. Specifically, campuses with high proportions of White students provide limited opportunities for interaction across race/ethnicity and limit student learning experiences with diverse groups in society.

The lack of interracial contact clearly influences students' views toward others as well as support for campus initiatives. One study found that White students who had the least social interaction with someone of a different background were less likely to hold positive attitudes toward multiculturalism on campus. In order to prepare students as participants in a more heterogeneous college environment, and as citizens in a global community, program planners, administrators, managers, and supervisors need to recognize deficiencies in cultural sensitivity and build on the multicultural awareness that students do have. The educational imperative stresses the importance of a diverse community and educational programming that improves social interaction, eliminates stereotypes, and enhances educational outcomes for undergraduate and graduate students. Its emphasis is a multi-level approach to achieving a multicultural community and strategies for change.

Sources:

USN&WR

U.S. Census Bureau

Minorities in Higher Education, M.J. Justiz, R. Wilson, and L.G. Bjork (eds.), 1994

Cultural Diversity in Organizations: Theory, Research, and Practice, T. Cox, Jr., 1993.

Affirmative Action's Testament of Hope: Strategies for a New Era, M. Garcia (ed.), 1997.

What Matters in College? Four Critical Years Revisited, A.W. Astin, 1993.

"Social Interaction and Multiculturalism." Globetti, G., Brown, C.L., and Smith, R.E. *NASPA Journal*, 1993.

**Review of University of Scranton Diversity Climate
Students, Faculty, and Staff
1996-1999
April 2000**

Basic Points Found

What They Are

Why Important

A. Development of Identity for Minority and Majority Students

Social Experiences

Development by Interaction, Exposure to Different Points of View

B. History of Minimal Interaction of Ethnic Students with Majority Students and Vice Versa

Relationship of Ethnic Groups to Larger Society and Vice Versa

Affects Identity Development, Aspirations, Expectations of Ethnic Students and Majority Students; Shows Ethnic Dualism of Racial Groups

C. Intercultural Communication

Communicating Across Cultures

Powerful in Everyday Life, Protection for Self and Mentoring

D. Race, Sex, Class

Determiners

Impacts Quality of Life for All Members of Campus Community, Multiple Options

E. Educational Goals of Minority Students and Majority Students

High Expectations, Aspirations; Low Satisfaction

Awareness, Lessons from Misconceptions, Perceptions

Basic Points Found

What They Are

Why Important

F. Faculty and Staff

Self-Evaluation

**Improves
Minority
Matriculation;
Improves
Majority and
and Minority
Expectations,
Aspirations, and
Satisfaction**

**G. Behavior,
Psychological
Functioning of
Campus
Community
Members**

**Orientation to
University History,
Culture, and
Mission**

**Indication for
Increasing Visual
Image, Self-Image,
Direction for
Education**

**H. Historical,
Structural,
Behavioral, and
Psychological
Climate**

**Internal and
External Locus of
Control,
Orientation to
History, Culture, and
Mission**

**Determines
Stages of
Historical,
Structural,
Behavioral,
and Psychological
Consciousness at
Time of
Matriculation;
Can Determine
Directions for
Development and
Growth**

**I. University Students
and Female Faculty**

**Willing to Confront
Insensitive Behaviors in
Social and Educational
Settings; More Levels
of Social Comfort with
Peers of Same Culture**

**Recruitment of
Minority Students,
Faculty, and Staff;
Need for More
Diverse Curricula;
Need for More
Co-Curricular and
Curricular
Relationships;
Need for More
Opportunities for Intercultural
Experiences**

Basic Points Found

**J. Receptivity of
Global and Diversity
Goals at All Levels
of University**

**K. Perceptions of
Diversity Programs
and Services**

**L. Student Success
and Satisfaction**

What They Are

Diversity Education

**Embraced by Minority
Students, Embraced
by Women; Fear or
Uncomfortableness
By Majority Students and
Minority Students**

**Ambition, Effort,
Self-Evaluation,
Discipline,
Support of Faculty,
Ability, Curricular and
Co-Curricular Experiences**

Why Important

**Indication for
Institutionalizing
Diversity and
Globalization**

**Recruitment,
Mentoring,
Sensitivity for
Support Services
and Intercultural
Events**

**College
Expectations,
Identity
Development,
Immersion and
Institutionalization
of Diversity and
Globalization**

University Awareness for Cultural Togetherness (U-ACT)
The University of Scranton
Summer, Fall, Spring
1999-2000

In 1999, The University adopted *A Community of Scholars A Culture of Excellence* as the first piece of The University's planning process. One of its ten strategic planning themes "Diversity and Globalization" was adopted in an effort to increase higher education participation among under represented groups. The five-year plan provides goals, objectives, and strategies for meeting this vital challenge. The University of Scranton has undertaken a number of initiatives during the last several years to improve the recruitment, retention, and graduation of its culturally diverse population. In addition, there is an ongoing effort to identify and document issues related to the ethnic and racial diversity that actively fosters within its students, faculty, and staff an understanding of and respect for issues of gender and for cultures other than their own. To further enhance diversity initiatives, Father Joseph M. McShane, S.J., President, established the Office of Equity and Diversity. One of its responsibilities is to accurately assess the racial, ethnic, and gender issues at The University from the perspective of the members of the campus community. To begin to meet this responsibility, the Equity and Diversity Officer met with a number of diverse campus groups, read the reports of studies that had been conducted, and formed U-ACT.

National Background:

The California Postsecondary Education Commission defined campus climate as "the formal and informal environment -- both institutional and community-based -- in which individuals learn, teach, work, and live in a post-secondary setting." The Commission argued that a major goal of every educational institution should be to ensure an equitable environment for all students. An assessment of the campus climate in general and the racial climate in particular, will facilitate achieving such an environment.

A report on campus climate by the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities summarized conditions cited by minority students as primary sources of racial stress and conflict on college campuses across the nation:

- ◆ ignorance and insensitivity about circumstances, feelings and needs of culturally diverse students;
- ◆ isolation and alienation of culturally diverse students from the larger campus community;
- ◆ stereotyping;

- ◆ too few culturally diverse faculty role models;
- ◆ inclination of institutions to address needs and concerns of culturally diverse students through a single office;
- ◆ the separation/integration dilemma of students of color; and
- ◆ bewilderment, confusion, and sometimes resentment on the part of White students over what they perceive as the excessive sensitivity of minority students.

Regional Background:

The Northeastern Pennsylvania Diversity Education Consortium Campus Diversity Survey reports the following regional student survey results from the campuses of five private schools of the consortium, as well as those from Pennsylvania State University/Wilkes-Barre, a local two-year public institution:

- ◆ less open and accepting attitudes toward gay and lesbian persons;
- ◆ a declining level of comfort with people of diverse backgrounds as social involvement increased;
- ◆ less exposure to members of diverse backgrounds prior to campus experience;
- ◆ hearing insensitive remarks about members of subgroups on campus by either other students or employees;
- ◆ identified students or faculty as the primary source of feeling discriminated against or harassed;
- ◆ identified issues related to disability as not being addressed thoroughly; and
- ◆ less visible leadership on campus to foster diversity from the President and other administrators.

Campus Background:

Several on campus studies and research reports have been conducted which provide information related to the racial climate on campus. These studies provide significant perception data of the campus environment. Culturally different faculty and staff and women were strongly consistent in their perceptions of experiences and support received through various interactions at The University. These faculty, staff, and women report concerns related to their treatment in the work environment by their peers and supervisors; the lack of in-depth diverse curricula, as opposed to titular courses; the lack of opportunities for the integration of multiple backgrounds, experiences, and perspectives with their peers; and the need for more multicultural programs and events. These faculty report that their scholarship is not accepted at the same level; they have difficulty publishing in journals they are interested in publishing in; there is no understanding from colleagues on the "cultural tax"-being called on to do things that take them away from research; and they receive less resources and support.

However, more efforts have been focused on the culturally different faculty and staff than on the majority. The majority faculty, staff, and student experience is not well documented, and the reports that are available do not explain and describe their sentiment on the issue.

A university, such as The University of Scranton, is comprised of at least two major populations. The more “permanent” population usually includes majority faculty, staff, and administrators whose presence on campus is usually longer than the combined years spent by the more culturally different faculty, staff, and administrators. Although there is a difference in years spent at The University, while they are on campus they are both the beneficiaries and the recipients of the campus culture that develops over the years. As such, all members experience the traditions of a campus and are in good positions to communicate their feelings and sentiments regarding a welcoming climate at The University of Scranton.

Recommendations from U-ACT:

As a result of meetings with University Awareness for Cultural Togetherness (U-ACT) groups, the Office of Equity and Diversity should conduct an ongoing welcoming climate assessment for The University of Scranton that accurately assesses and documents both majority and minority group perceptions of the following:

- ◆ current intercultural climate as students, faculty, and staff view the campus, especially the majority population;
- ◆ issues facing culturally diverse students, faculty, and staff;
- ◆ issues facing women; and
- ◆ suggestions for improvement.

This assessment will provide guidance for efforts to improve the environment for all members of the campus community and the findings will serve as instruments for social change and tools for dialogue.

Additionally, the Equity and Diversity Officer will serve as a facilitator for U-ACT groups in assisting them in meeting their goals.

Recommendations for a Diverse Supportive Environment May 31, 2000

SUMMARY REPORTS

Campus Community Survey (Students)	Spring 1996
Students' Attitudes Toward Cultural Diversity at The University of Scranton	March 1998
Northeastern Pennsylvania Diversity Education Consortium	
University of Scranton Campus Diversity Survey (Students)	April 1998
(Employees)	September 1998
Female Faculty Members' Attitudes Towards Cultural Diversity at The University of Scranton	May 1999
Town Hall Meeting on Diversity (Students, Faculty, Staff)	October 1999
The 1998 Senior Survey at The University of Scranton Highlights Report	
The 1998-99 Higher Education Research Institute (HERI)	
Inaugural Women's Forum	April 2000
University Awareness for Cultural Togetherness	Summer, Fall, Spring 1999-2000

As noted in prior Summary Reports of The University of Scranton's diversity assessments and reports from self-selected groups, the Committee on Assessment of Diversity conducted a detailed and extensive review of diversity assessments with student, faculty, and staff to insure that the committee's conclusions and recommendations would be based in fact, not on their own assumptions. The design of the questions prepared for use in the assessments and the results of diverse group discussions directed our approach. The responses to focus group questions, surveys, and group dialogues were powerful and revealed a complex mine field of difficulties in relationships among intercultural campus groups. On a positive side, we were also pleased to learn that all groups expressed a desire to understand each other better and to interact more regularly and more successfully.

From our data, we found several major problem areas and we make the following suggestions for addressing each area. Some of the recommendations came from students, faculty, or staff. Others were generated in committee discussion.

◆ Minimal interaction

Students report distinct segregation in their activities outside the classroom. They are not persistent in approaching each other or attending social activities because they feel that diverse activities or programs are not generally known to be for "everyone". They find it difficult to cross cultural lines to join their peers in organizations. They feel ostracized by their peers who are culturally different. They are afraid of not being accepted by a group other than their own. One student described the situation by saying "To interact with those people, I have to go out of my way to find activities and events." The students' comments reveal a stunning lack of ability to interact comfortably with each other and a desire to relate to their peers: "We need more activities that would bring the whole student body together."

Students do report positive interaction in diverse classrooms: "There are different people in the class, and you get to hear their ideas. We learn from each other."; and when attending diverse social activities: "Now, I really feel like I'm in college. Everyone was there."

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Work with Student Affairs to establish orientation groups for entering first-year students that are mixed by cultural background and by gender. Keep the groups together for some meetings and activities throughout the first year, perhaps including discussion of sensitive campus issues.
2. Work with Student Affairs to continue activities such as the first-year orientation throughout the four years. Students report learning about commonalities and differences during events that bring them together.
3. Work with Student Affairs to mix roommate assignments for first-year students, for those who are willing.
4. Work with departments to offer a Dismantling Racism Workshop on a regular basis.
5. When faculty are comfortable in doing so, make assignments, either in or out of the classroom, that require face-to-face encounters with people from different backgrounds and ethnicities. Work with departments to offer a Learning Styles Workshop, as needed.
6. Work with Admissions to continue to recruit more culturally different students so that meaningful interactions among diverse individuals will be likely and so that all students can develop and maintain strong cross-cultural relationships.
7. Work with the University of Success Program to identify more culturally different students early in middle school and help them become capable of succeeding in university work.
8. Work with the Provost and the Director of Human Resources to continue to recruit more culturally different faculty and staff members.
9. Work with Student Affairs to create a Student Affairs Diversity Task Force to critically examine the division's programs and services to see where they could begin to improve in the areas of diversity.
10. Work with the President and the Provost to implement required annual diversity training for all staff.

◆ **Faculty and Staff Interaction**

Faculty and staff of color and women report similar isolation. They are often subjected to harassment and disrespect by other colleagues, peers, or supervisors. They are not seriously respected as decision makers and problem solvers. A female faculty member noted: "I'm relatively new at being an authority figure, and I have a different vision of how that might work than men do." Some faculty and staff of color feel their negative experiences occur because of racism that is both overt and covert: "The issue does not get voiced, and it gets ignored." "I feel I am being harassed because of my race."

Both faculty and staff of color and women report feelings of fear and a lack of respect. They also report a need for support networks and a need to address the issues of access and equity.

Recommendations

1. Work with the Provost to implement required annual diversity training for all faculty.
2. Work with the Provost to create a Diversity Education Faculty Advisory Committee to provide suggestions for the development of a Diversity Education Program which meets the needs of faculty members at The University.
3. Continue U-ACT groups, including the Ad Hoc Committee for Black Employees, Faculty Women of Color Network, Women's Forum, Asian Faculty Group, and Student Women of Color Group.

◆ **Treatment by faculty, staff, and administrators**

Student groups and faculty and staff of color generally agreed that there is a difference in the way culturally different students and faculty are treated by some students, faculty, staff, and administrators. One study showed that the staff, faculty, and administrators do not say disparaging remarks about these groups as often as students; however, they do say them. Some students of color say that professors have lower expectations of them, call on others more in class, or conversely, single them out in class discussion. Students claim that students, faculty, and staff who are culturally different are mistreated by faculty. In another comment, female and male students were specifically cited as receiving poor treatment by female and male faculty. Even when the special attention is meant to be helpful, non-culturally different students sometimes feel uncomfortable with the treatment of diverse groups: "I had a faculty person talking in class about marketing to minorities. We all looked around at each other, but no one said anything to him. We just couldn't believe what he said."

Because The University finds an individual qualified for employment does not guarantee that the individual possesses or practices racial sensitivity; faculty and staff need training.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Work with Human Resources to institute orientation for faculty, staff, and administrators regarding cultural interaction.
2. Work with the Office of Instructional Development to develop workshops using expert

leaders to train faculty and staff in how to interact positively with minority students in the classroom. Provide ongoing training as needed.

3. Work with the Office of Instructional Development to establish a diversity component as part of the mentoring program for new faculty.
5. Work with Human Resources and Vice President's Offices to provide common professional development opportunities for administrators, department chairs, directors, and supervisors on ways to orient and develop faculty and staff of color; conflict resolution; inclusive leadership, and how to develop, maintain, and monitor mentoring progress.

◆ **General racism on campus**

As the Summary Diversity Assessments state, all groups strongly agree that there is harassment and racism on campus, but the problem lies in where to lay the responsibility. No one in the focus groups or survey groups claimed to be harassers or racists although many cited examples of friends or colleagues or peers who they described as racist or as persons who mistreated others. Students say that closed mindedness and feelings of discomfort need to be eliminated. One of the student comments illustrates a level of unconscious awareness that is negative stereotyping: "Diversity is very important to me. When I was looking at colleges, I looked at pros and cons, and cultural diversity was a con for this university." Obviously, the solution to this problem is not an easy one, although it can be minimized.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Work with departments to institute lecture/roundtable discussions on the major cultural groups, beliefs, and values, such as Native American culture, African American culture, Asian American culture, Hispanic/Latino culture, and European American culture.
2. Work with the Provost and the Vice President for Student Affairs to give more attention on campus from the campus community to Martin Luther King's birthday, such as a Winter Forum Teach-In on Civil Rights issues.
3. Work with the Provost, the Vice President for Student Affairs, and the Director of Human Resources to consider developing a Multicultural Service Council.
4. Work with the Provost, the Vice President for Student Affairs, and the Director of Human Resources to develop a theme for the year that would encourage the student body to explore diversity and to support a campus culture where people are expected to interact with those who are different from themselves. Develop lecture/discussions and class assignments that support the theme-something like *The University Embraces Difference*. A faculty-staff-student committee could develop a public relations-type strategy for implementing the plan in many areas of university life from classes to

University publications and web pages to support staff.

5. Work with the President, the Provost, the Vice President for Student Affairs, and the Director of Human Resources to institute an annual Diversity Award for students, faculty, and staff.

Conclusion

The students, faculty, and staff were enthusiastic about their participation in the assessments and often repeatedly asked for assurance that there would be visible results from the effort. The committee is encouraged by the many positive steps The University has already taken and to which students, faculty, and staff referred to as good examples of ways to improve diversity. We hope these recommendations will be helpful as The University continues to lead our region in expanding diversity and embracing difference. As one student said in a focus group, "We need cultural diversity here because without the majority of students feeling a level of comfort with people who are different, once we get out into the world, we may feel uncomfortable speaking and interacting. Understanding cultures is one thing; being comfortable with them is something else."

Committee on Assessment of Diversity:

Rosemary Gray Bundy, Ed.D.
Equity and Diversity Officer

Shirley M. Adams, Ph.D.
Dean, Dexter Hanley College

Marian Farrell, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, Nursing

DIVERSITY AUDITS
APPENDIX A
A Community of Scholars A Culture of Excellence
May 5, 2000
Campus Diversity Statistics
Fall 1999

Total Student Population	4,773
Undergraduate	4,099
Graduate	674
Male	1,970
Female	2,803
Total Minority Student Population	356
Black	28
American Indian/Alaskan	6
Asian/Pacific Islanders	74
Hispanic	87
Unknown	161
Total International Student Population	112
Undergraduate	33
Graduate	79
Total Student Population Diversity	4,773
White Students	4,305
Black Students	28
American Indian/Alaskan	6
Hispanic	87
Asian/Pacific Islanders	74
Unknown	161
Non-Resident Alien	112
Student Age Diversity	17-50+
Student Geographic Diversity/Key States	Pennsylvania New Jersey New York Connecticut Maryland

Total Faculty and Staff 1,058

Faculty	391
Staff	667
Female Faculty	153
Male Faculty	238
Female Staff	372
Male Staff	295
Full-Time Faculty	254
Part-Time Faculty	137
Full-Time Female Faculty	83
Full-Time Male Faculty	171
Part-Time Female Faculty	70
Part-Time Male Faculty	67
Full-Time Female Staff	328
Full-Time Male Staff	259
Part-Time Female Staff	44
Part-Time Male Staff	36

Total Full-Time Faculty and Staff Diversity 841

Total Full-Time Faculty Diversity	
White Faculty	228
Black Faculty	4
American Indian/Alaskan Native Faculty	1
Asian/Pacific Islander Faculty	19
Non-Resident Alien Faculty	2
Total Full-Time Staff Diversity	
White Staff	563
Black Staff	8
American Indian/Alaskan Native Staff	1
Hispanic Staff	7
Asian/Pacific Islander Staff	3
Non-Resident Alien Staff	5