

Making Excellence INCLUSIVE

Preparing Students and Campuses for an Era of Greater Expectations

Achieving Equitable Educational Outcomes with All Students: The Institution's Roles and Responsibilities

By Georgia L. Bauman, Leticia Tomas Bustillos,
Estela Mara Bensimon, M. Christopher Brown II,
and RoSusan D. Bartee

One in a series of three papers commissioned as part of the Making Excellence Inclusive initiative



Association
of American
Colleges and
Universities

Table of Contents

<i>Acknowledgments</i>	ii
<i>Introduction to the Series</i>	iii
<i>Achieving Equitable Educational Outcomes with All Students: The Institution's Roles and Responsibilities</i>	
Introduction	2
The Achievement Gap: <i>What is it?</i>	3
Diversity and the Gap in Achievement	9
Equity and Inclusive Excellence	10
Recognizing Inequities	13
The Diversity Scorecard	14
Loyola Marymount University	16
Institutional Factors to Help Achieve Equity	34
Conclusion	38
References	42
<i>About AAC&U/About the Authors</i>	55

Acknowledgments

AAC&U would like to thank the following groups for their contributions to these papers.

- *The authors*, for carefully working through the connections between their areas of research and the overarching goals of the Making Excellence Inclusive initiative.
- *The educators, students and community members* who participated in the Inclusive Excellence forums across the country; *the members of the pilot campuses* who reviewed and provided feedback on earlier drafts of the papers; and *the 2005 Greater Expectations Summer Institute participants* who used insights from these papers to enhance their educational action plans.
- *AAC&U staff*, especially Nancy O’Neill, who edited the papers and coordinated the production process.

Introduction to the Series

Background

The educational environment following the recent Supreme Court decisions on affirmative action calls for colleges and universities to connect their educational quality and inclusion efforts more fundamentally and comprehensively than ever before. This challenge, however, presents a set of difficult questions. What will the next generation of work on inclusion and excellence look like? How will both our thinking and our actions need to shift? Who will need to be involved? How will we know we are accomplishing our goals?

This introduction prefaces three papers commissioned by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) to respond to these questions and to provide an intellectual backdrop for its new initiative, Making Excellence Inclusive.¹ With initial funding from the Ford Foundation, this multiyear initiative is designed to help campuses: (a) integrate their diversity and quality efforts, (b) situate this work at the core of institutional functioning, and (c) realize the educational benefits available to students and to the institution when this integration is done well and is sustained over time. We feel strongly, and evidence is beginning to show, that integrating diversity and quality initiatives—as with the forging of elements into an alloy—produces something that is both different than its constituent elements *and* stronger and more durable.

As an “alloy,” Inclusive Excellence re-envisioned both quality and diversity. It reflects a striving for excellence in higher education that has been made more inclusive by decades of work to infuse diversity into recruiting, admissions, and hiring; into the curriculum and cocurriculum; and into administrative structures and practices. It also embraces newer forms of excellence, and expanded ways to measure excellence, that take into account research on learning and brain functioning, the assessment movement, and more nuanced accountability structures. Likewise, diversity and inclusion efforts move beyond numbers of students or numbers of programs as end goals. Instead, they are multilayered processes through which we achieve excellence in learning; research and teaching; student development; local and global community engagement; workforce development; and more.

¹ We also use the term “Inclusive Excellence” to capture this notion.

Mapping the Future of Inclusion and Excellence

Each of the three commissioned papers—*Making Diversity Work on Campus: A Research-Based Perspective*; *Achieving Equitable Educational Outcomes with All Students: The Institution’s Roles and Responsibilities*; and *Toward a Model of Inclusive Excellence and Change in Postsecondary Institutions*—addresses one or more aspects of the work that is needed to comprehensively link diversity and quality. Collectively, they offer readers fresh perspectives on, and evidence-based approaches to, embedding this work into campus culture and sustaining this work over time.

In the first paper, *Making Diversity Work on Campus: A Research-Based Perspective*, Jeffrey Milem, Mitchell Chang, and Anthony Antonio discuss recent empirical evidence that demonstrates the educational benefits of diverse learning environments. The evidence, gathered on behalf of the University of Michigan in its defense of its affirmative action policies before the Supreme Court, indicates that diversity must be carried out in intentional ways in order to accrue educational benefits for students and for the institution. The authors argue persuasively for *a conception of diversity as a process toward better learning* rather than as an outcome—a certain percentage of students of color, a certain number of programs—to be checked off a list. They also provide numerous suggestions for how to “engage” diversity in the service of learning, ranging from recruiting a compositionally diverse student body, faculty, and staff; to developing a positive campus climate; to transforming curriculum, cocurriculum, and pedagogy to reflect and support goals for inclusion and excellence.

In the second paper, *Achieving Equitable Educational Outcomes with All Students: The Institution’s Roles and Responsibilities*, Georgia Bauman, Leticia Tomas Bustillos, Estela Bensimon, Christopher Brown, and RoSusan Bartee discuss the responsibility that institutions have to examine the impact that traditional higher education practices have on those students historically underserved by higher education, including African American, Latino/a, and American Indian students. With the persistent achievement gap facing African American and Latino/a students as a starting point, the authors argue that if we do not commit to discovering what does and does not work for historically underserved students, we run the very real risk of failing a significant portion of today’s college students—*even as we diversify our campuses to a greater extent than ever before*. To demonstrate the kind of institutional commitment that is

needed, the authors present one campus's process for systematically monitoring and addressing the inequities they discovered.

In the third paper, *Toward a Model of Inclusive Excellence in Postsecondary Institutions*, Damon Williams, Joseph Berger, and Shederick McClendon offer a framework for comprehensive organizational change to help campuses achieve Inclusive Excellence. The authors review several dimensions of organizational culture that must be engaged to achieve this goal and discuss a method to help campuses monitor changes that might come from introducing new systems and new practices. The resulting framework, perhaps most importantly, helps campus leaders focus simultaneously on the “big picture”—an academy *that systematically leverages diversity for student learning and institutional excellence*—and the myriad individual pieces that contribute to that picture (see box 1).

Box 1. From diversity as an isolated initiative to diversity as a catalyst for educational excellence

Isolated Initiative: Increase racial/ethnic diversity of student body

Responds to:

- Calls from business and community leaders to strengthen workforce diversity
- Desire to redress past societal inequities
- General feeling that diversifying student body is the “right thing to do”

But does not address:

- Compositional diversity of other parts of campus community (faculty, staff, administrators)
- Differences between predominantly white institutions and predominantly minority-serving institutions
- Campus climate once students and others arrive on campus
- Students' multiple identities: race and ethnicity intersecting with gender, class, sexual orientation, national/regional origin, ability, and religion
- Curriculum transformation to include perspectives, sources, and modes of inquiry heretofore left out of the academy
- How compositional diversity influences classroom and cocurricular practices, and ultimately, student learning

Catalyst for Educational Excellence: Increase racial/ethnic diversity of student body as part of comprehensive plan to make excellence inclusive

Also responds to:

- Need to enact diversity in intentional ways that enhance students' intercultural competency, cognitive complexity, and ability to work in diverse groups (Milem et al.)
- Need to address equity in academic achievement for all students, with particular attention paid to groups historically underrepresented in higher education (Bauman et al.)
- Need to engage entire campus community in conceiving of, carrying out, and assessing a comprehensive process to enact diverse learning environments (Williams et al.)

Defining “Inclusive Excellence”

At the outset of this initiative, AAC&U advanced an operational definition of Inclusive Excellence. This definition is intended to be flexible enough to be “localized” by a campus while also retaining basic principles to guide a national movement and to connect campuses in these efforts. The definition consists of four primary elements:

1. *A focus on student intellectual and social development.* Academically, it means offering the best possible course of study for the context in which the education is offered.²
2. *A purposeful development and utilization of organizational resources to enhance student learning.* Organizationally, it means establishing an environment that challenges each student to achieve academically at high levels and each member of the campus to contribute to learning and knowledge development.
3. *Attention to the cultural differences learners bring to the educational experience and that enhance the enterprise.*³
4. *A welcoming community that engages all of its diversity in the service of student and organizational learning.*

Each set of authors received this definition when they were commissioned to write the papers, and each connected it to existing and emerging research on subjects as varied as the educational benefits of diversity, the achievement gap, and organizational change. We expect this reworking to occur in the field also, as campus leaders juxtapose the definition against institutional mission, policies, and practices. At the same time, we believe the definition is incomplete without all four elements in play, and the large questions posed at the beginning of this introduction cannot be answered without having all four present.

Why Now?

Making Excellence Inclusive builds on major AAC&U initiatives—most notably, Greater Expectations and American Commitments—and ties together the association’s long-standing interest in educational quality in the undergraduate curriculum, in diversity and civic

² “Best” here implies the provision of qualified instructors and sufficient resources—including other learners—as well as a sequence of study that is coherent and challenging, and one that comprehensively addresses the student learning goals of the particular institution. Contexts vary from preschool to postgraduate education, by affiliation (e.g., religious or secular), and by sector (e.g., elementary, high schools, community colleges, research universities).

³ Cultural differences include race/ethnicity (e.g., Latino, Caucasian, Asian/Pacific Islander, African American, American Indian), class, gender, sexual orientation, national origin, first language, physical and learning ability, and learning style.

engagement, and in preparing faculty to deepen students' learning. It is designed to address the following four dilemmas confronting higher education today.

Islands of Innovations with Too Little Influence on Institutional Structures

Hardly any campus is without some tangible, and often impressive, number of initiatives to help create more inclusive environments, more expansive intellectual horizons, or more opportunities for outreach to the larger community. Yet how does a campus coordinate these multiple efforts so they have a greater impact on all students, and on the institution as a whole? One frequently can identify educational innovations, but rarely can one detect structures that link them. Accordingly, the impact of these innovations is isolated rather than pervasive. And with so many individual diversity initiatives springing up like daffodils in springtime, people long for coherence, cohesion, and collaboration. They also want to figure out how to “get it right” as they move through this astounding transition to an inclusive academy that strives for diversity *and* excellence.

The Disconnect between Diversity and Educational Excellence

Although we know meaningful engagement with diversity benefits students educationally, little has been done to create a comprehensive framework for excellence that incorporates diversity at its core. Similarly, new research about how to help diverse and differentially prepared students succeed has not yet provoked widespread change across higher education. And diversity is not typically a focus at any level in “quality improvement” efforts. As a result, education leaders routinely work on diversity initiatives within one committee on campus and work on strengthening the quality of the educational experience within another. This disconnect serves students—and all of education—poorly.

Disparities in Academic Success across Groups

There has been significant progress in expanding access to college for underrepresented students. Yet many of these students experience differential retention rates and inequities in academic achievement. This troubling achievement gap, especially across specific racial and ethnic groups and across different income levels, signals failure, not only for the individual

students affected but also for the colleges and universities they attend and for the educational system as a whole.

The “Post-Michigan” Environment

The U.S. Supreme Court’s landmark decisions in the recent University of Michigan cases affirm the value of diversity when tied to the educational purpose and mission of an institution. At this historic juncture, it is imperative that higher education leaders seize the opportunity to help colleges and universities—and the public—better understand how diversity and educational quality are intertwined. Despite the Court’s affirmation, those opposed to affirmative action continue to bring lawsuits, organize anti-affirmative action referenda, and influence public opinion. While many campuses feel pressure to move into “compliance mode,” AAC&U aims to help institutions establish diversity as a core component in achieving desired student learning outcomes and put diversity and inclusion efforts at the center of their decision-making. In order to reach this academic higher ground, diversity, inclusion, and equity initiatives must be so fundamentally linked to educational mission that to ignore them in everyday practice would jeopardize institutional vitality.

A Comprehensive Response

Initially, Making Excellence Inclusive seeks to bring about comprehensive educational reform based on research and theory not only about “what works” to help *all* students achieve new forms and levels of excellence, but also about what makes for responsive, educationally powerful colleges and universities. In addition to commissioning these three papers, AAC&U has organized several other “foundational” activities. We have held thirteen forums around the country where key education stakeholders discussed how our conception of Inclusive Excellence can serve as a catalyst for institutional renewal and to identify promising practices toward that end. We launched a pilot project with nine institutions to test the usefulness of new frameworks for inclusion and institutional change, and we are starting to build a collection of practical resources to help campuses enact these frameworks.

Looking ahead, we plan to work with a broad range of postsecondary institutions to make Inclusive Excellence a signature element of America’s best colleges and universities. We will engage campus leaders in refining our current definition of Inclusive Excellence and ask them to

document their challenges and successes as we work together to make excellence inclusive. In the process, we will continue to build our resource collection by featuring campus “success stories” and developing tools that reflect the latest research “what works” in fostering inclusive and educationally powerful learning environments.

Conclusion

The three papers, taken together, form a rich dialogue where similarities and dissimilarities arise and information that is gleaned from one is made richer by the others. We hope they will engender this same kind of interplay between people on campuses, as well as provide them with practical evidence, support, and guidance for this ongoing work. The efforts needed to make excellence inclusive cannot be done by any person, unit, or campus alone. Nor will it look the same everywhere. What individuals and institutions *will* share are its hallmarks—an ongoing, systemic awareness of the “state of the campus” and the “state of higher education” regarding the interconnectedness of diversity and quality, an active process of engaging diversity in the service of learning, and the courage to reflect on our efforts and to improve them where needed. Please visit AAC&U’s Web site (www.aacu.org) for updates about the Making Excellence Inclusive initiative, including the evolving resource collection that will support our shared endeavor of helping all students develop the intellectual, social, emotional, cultural, and civic capacities needed to lead in this new century.

Alma Clayton-Pedersen

Vice President for Education and Institutional Renewal

Caryn McTighe Musil

Senior Vice President and Vice President for Diversity, Equity, and Global Initiatives

*Achieving Equitable Educational Outcomes with All Students:
The Institution's Roles and Responsibilities*

**Georgia L. Bauman
Leticia Tomas Bustillos
Estela Mara Bensimon**

Center for Urban Education
Rossier School of Education, University of Southern California

**M. Christopher Brown II
RoSusan D. Bartee**
Frederick D. Patterson Research Institute

The preparation of this paper was supported by a grant from the James Irvine Foundation. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the James Irvine Foundation, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

The authors are grateful to Father Robert Lawton, president of Loyola Marymount University, and the members of the LMU Diversity Scorecard Team, Drs. Abbie Robinson-Armstrong, Brian Hu, David Killoran, and Mr. Marshall Saucedo, for their collaborative work with the Center for Urban Education within the University of Southern California Rossier School of Education, and for granting us permission to feature their efforts to bring about equitable educational outcomes for underrepresented students.



*Commissioned by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U)
with generous support from the Ford Foundation*

Introduction

In a stirring speech delivered at Howard University shortly after the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, President Lyndon B. Johnson proclaimed, “We seek not just freedom, but opportunity. We seek not just legal equality but human ability. Not just equality as a right and a theory, but equality as a fact and equality as a result” (Johnson 1965). For the intended beneficiaries of the act, “equality as a fact and equality as a result” remains mostly unrealized. On virtually every indicator of economic and social well-being, students historically underrepresented in higher education—by which we mean African American, Latino/a, and Native American students¹—lag well behind white students and also some Asian American students.² In spite of encouraging headlines about record numbers of African Americans and Latino/as enrolling in college, the reality is that, in terms of access as well as degree completion, the gap is now larger than it was at the time of Johnson’s famous declaration (Renner 2003). Evidence of these inequities has been revealed in numerous research studies that report bleak outcomes in higher education as well as bleak future prospects for African Americans and Latino/as in the United States (Barton 2003; Carnevale and Fry 2000; Fry 2002).

For those of us who witnessed the birth of the civil rights movement and viewed education as the prime engine for social as well as economic mobility in the United States, these trends are both appalling and frustrating. One is moved to ask, how is it that forty years later, in spite of initiatives of all kinds, progress toward equality in higher education participation and completion has been so slow and so small? How is it that institutions take pride in the racial and ethnic diversity of their student bodies yet are incapable of producing equitable results for some of the very students who make diversity possible?

In this paper, we regard the challenge of narrowing the college education gap and achieving equitable educational outcomes for historically underrepresented students as a problem of institutional responsibility and performance rather than as a problem that is exclusively related to student accountability, motivation, and academic preparation. We have chosen to emphasize inequality as a question of institutional responsibility because the majority of studies on college student success take the opposite perspective. These studies focus on characteristics such as students’ social and academic integration (Braxton and Lein

¹ Generally, we use the term “historically underrepresented students” to describe these three groups. In places, we focus on the status of African American and Latino/a students in particular to parallel an action research project we describe later in the paper.

² We use the terms “African American,” “Latino/a,” “Native American,” “white,” and “Asian American” throughout the paper, except where source materials use alternative terms.

2000; Tinto 1987), student involvement (Astin 1999), intensity of their high school curriculum (Adelman 1999), lack of cultural capital (Bourdieu 1985), and other risk factors associated with poor performance. Because of this, we tend to accept the findings at face value without considering the possibility of deficits at the *institutional* level. While we agree that students must accept responsibility for their own success or failure, we also believe that institutional actors, particularly faculty members, also bear individual and collective responsibility for student outcomes.³

This paper describes:

- key national indicators of a race/ethnicity-based achievement gap;
- one tool to help college and university leaders assess and rectify race/ethnicity-based achievement gaps on their campuses.

Our premise is that gathering evidence of student outcomes disaggregated by race/ ethnicity can be an effective and powerful means of raising awareness of a problem and motivating institutional actors to seek a solution. To illustrate the connection between evidence and such institutional motivation, we provide a case study of Loyola Marymount University (LMU), a Jesuit institution located in Los Angeles, California. LMU is one of fourteen initial partner campuses in an action research project on equitable educational outcomes. The project is supported by a grant from The James Irvine Foundation and directed by the Center for Urban Education⁴ at the University of Southern California.

The Achievement Gap: *What is it?*

The achievement gap is a phenomenon that occurs early in childhood and persists through adulthood. In *The Black–White Test Score Gap*, Jencks and Phillips (1998) point out that the achievement gap between African American and white students is evident prior to entering kindergarten and continues through secondary and postsecondary educational levels. Second- and third-grade test scores and grades reveal that African American and Latino/a students trail behind white and Asian students (College Board 1999). The most recent National Assessment of Educational Progress test (NAEP 2003), which is given to fourth and eighth graders nationwide, indicates that African Americans and Latino/as continue to lag behind their white and Asian peers in both reading and mathematics. As Derek Bok notes,

³ The concept of collective responsibility for student learning is derived from Lee and Loeb's (1996) construct.


⁴ The Center for Urban Education is an action research center located at the Rossier School of Education in the University of Southern California. The mission of the center is to create educational environments that produce equitable educational outcomes for children, youth, and adults from historically disenfranchised communities.

“the [achievement] gap is nationwide, it is substantial, and it has not diminished in the last 15 years” (2003, 20).

In fact, the American Council on Education’s *Minorities in Higher Education 2002–2003: 20th Annual Status Report* (Harvey 2003) clearly illustrates a *growing* achievement gap between minority and white students in higher education. Some of the key findings indicate that while the total college enrollment of minority students has increased by 122 percent in the past twenty years, the gap in college participation between white students and particular groups of minority students has widened. In 1978–1980, among white, Latino/a, and African American 18–24 year old high school graduates, the college participation rate for each group was approximately 30 percent. By 1998–2000, the college participation rate for white high school graduates in this age bracket had risen to 46 percent, compared to 40 percent for African Americans and 34 percent for Latino/as in this same age bracket (Harvey 2003). In a press release for the report, author William B. Harvey, vice president of the American Council on Education (ACE) and director of the Center for Advancement of Racial and Ethnic Equity (formerly the ACE Office of Minorities in Higher Education), notes, “The 20th anniversary *Status Report* challenges us to recognize the demographic, political, and social realities of the 21st century. The data tell us how far we have come in our quest for educational excellence for all students, but also caution us that equity in education for all Americans remains a goal that we must strive to reach” (American Council on Education 2003).

Figure 1 shows the percentages of students enrolled in college the October following their high school graduation in the years 1972–2001. The figure shows a much more erratic pattern of college enrollment for African American and Latino/a students than for white students. For example, in 1993 and 1997, the gap in enrollment between white and Latino/a students nearly closed, but significant drops in enrollment occurred for Latino/as following each of these years. In 2000, Latino/as had an approximate 10 percent increase in enrollment, but they nonetheless remained below the percentages of white students enrolled.

Figure 1. Percentage of high school completers enrolled in college, by race/ethnicity: October 1972–2001




Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, October Current Population Surveys, 1972–2001, in NCES 2003. *The Condition of Education*, 127. Available at <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2003/2003067.pdf>.

In 1987, the enrollment gap between African American and white students was similar to the gap that existed in 1980, but in the intervening years, the gap was significantly wider—at a time when white student enrollment stayed above 50 percent and, in many years, increased. By 2001, the gap between African Americans and whites was approximately 9 percent. Overall, although Latino/as and African Americans have demonstrated gains in enrollment at various points in the last thirty years, the gains have not been sustained. Throughout this period, there were no major drops in the enrollment rates for whites.

Figure 2 shows the bachelor’s degree completion of African Americans and Latino/as lagging appreciably behind whites. Overall, in the last thirty years, the number of degrees conferred to African Americans went up by approximately 8 percent and the number conferred to Latino/as went up by approximately 7 percent. White student degree attainment was considerably larger than African Americans and Latino/as by a difference of 15–20 percent, with white students making significant gains in the last eight years in particular.


Figure 2. Percentage of the 25- to 29-year-old population with a Bachelor’s degree or higher, by race/ethnicity: March 1971–2000



Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, March Current Population Surveys, 1971–2001, in NCES 2002. *The Condition of Education*, 174. Available at <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2002/2002025.pdf>.

When confronted with data that show differences in educational outcomes by race, a visceral reaction, based on the assumption that the gaps reflect differences in students’ educational backgrounds, is to ask whether “input” measures were considered. Although we do not dispute the fact that minority students concentrated in underfunded and segregated school districts have a high likelihood of being underprepared for college, there are data to show that gaps may persist regardless of academic preparation. One of the clearest representations of the magnitude of the achievement gap can be found in Bowen and Bok’s widely cited *The Shape of the River* (1998), in which the authors compare the class graduation ranks of whites and African Americans who entered college with the same SAT scores. The bar graph reproduced below as Figure 3 shows that African American and white students with comparable SAT scores ended up with very unequal class rankings. Bowen and Bok’s most discouraging finding was that white students with SAT scores below 1000 earned higher GPAs on average than African Americans with SAT scores of 1300 and higher.

Figure 3. Differences in college class rank between white and African American students who were in the same interval of combined SAT scores upon entering college



Source: Bowen, W. G., and D. Bok. 1998. *The shape of the river: Long-term consequences of considering race in college and university admissions*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Another aspect of the gap that is becoming increasingly critical is the difference in college enrollment between females and males. Almost 8 million women participate in higher education at all levels annually, compared to only 6.3 million men (King 2000). African American students are particularly affected by this growing trend in enrollment. Table 1 shows the enrollment increases of African American and white students according to gender. Since 1976, African American women have demonstrated significant gains in undergraduate, graduate, and professional enrollments. Comparatively, African American males have demonstrated only nominal increases over the last twenty-five years.

Table 1. Higher education enrollment increases by race, gender, and level of study, 1976–2000

Degree Level	African American Women	African American Men	White Women	White Men
Undergraduate	+94%	+36%	+38%	-1%
Graduate	+69%	+21%	+16%	-24%
Professional	+236%	+36%	+58%	-25%

Source: Frederick D. Patterson Research Institute analysis of IPEDS data, 2002.
www.patterson-uncf.org/home.htm

In recent years, as table 2 indicates, women consistently represented approximately 60 percent of the total African American student population at all institutions, including

historically black colleges and universities (Hurst 2002). In 2000, African American women attending all institutions represented 63 percent of the total African American student enrollment, while they represented 61 and 60 percent of the total African American enrollment at historically black colleges and universities and United Negro College Fund member institutions, respectively.

Table 2. Enrollment of African American college students at all institutions and at historically black colleges and universities and College Fund institutions, by gender: Fall 1990, 1995, and 2000

African Americans Attending:	1990		1995		2000	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
All Institutions						
Number	484,700	762,300	555,911	917,761	640,354	1,099,934
Percent	39%	61%	38%	62%	37%	63%
Historically Black Colleges and Universities						
Number	82,897	125,785	90,130	136,391	86,410	134,958
Percent	40%	60%	40%	60%	39%	61%
College Fund Institutions						
Number	20,484	29,375	20,143	31,069	23,066	35,121
Percent	41%	59%	39%	61%	40%	60%
Source: <i>United Negro College Fund 2001 Statistical Report</i> , Frederick D. Patterson Research Institute, 2002.						

One explanation for the continuing gender gap is that African American women are more likely to be financially independent with dependents of their own, and therefore more eligible for (and in need of) financial assistance than are African American men. Cohen and Nee (2000) found that African American women are more likely to receive financial aid from most types of institutions. Trent (1991) notes that funding policies that constrict educational access overall are clearly more restrictive for African Americans, and they are most severe for African American males at the early degree levels. Thus, there is some evidence that, for African American men considering a college education, the cost may outweigh the perceived benefits.

Yet earnings research demonstrates the economic benefits to be derived from postsecondary degree attainment. African Americans, whites, and Latino/as—both male and female—had higher median earnings with higher levels of educational attainment. In 2000, for example, the difference between median earnings for African American males with a high school diploma and no college and those for African American males with a bachelor's degree or higher was \$17,000 (NCES 2003). In the same year, the difference between median

earning for African American females with a high school diploma and no college and those for African American females with a bachelor's degree or higher was \$20,000 (National Center for Education Statistics 2003).⁵

Diversity and the Gap in Achievement

The civil rights movement and particular changes in national policies in the 1960s ushered in an era in which the greater inclusion of minorities in mainstream society was paramount (Massey et al. 2003). The passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the call for “affirmative action” in federal contracts led to the dismantlement of “de jure and de facto mechanisms” (Massey et al. 2003, 1) that excluded minority groups from fully participating within the public sphere. As more efforts were focused on increasing opportunities for African Americans and Latinos/as in society, institutions of higher education began to recruit students from minority populations more aggressively (Massey et al. 2003). Then, over time, recruitment practices initially designed to rectify racial discrimination and exclusion changed to encompass a more diversity-oriented approach. As Massey and others (2003) suggest, “as immigration from Asia and Latin America transformed the United States, the rationale [for recruitment] shifted from righting past wrongs to representing racial and ethnic ‘diversity’ for its own sake” (1). Bowen and Bok (1998, 7) identify two reasons that motivated colleges and universities to diversify:

To begin with, [colleges and universities] sought to enrich the education of all their students by including race as another element in assembling a diverse student body of varying talents, backgrounds, and perspectives. In addition, perceiving a widely recognized need for more members of minority groups in business, government, and the professions, [colleges and universities] acted on the conviction that minority students would have a special opportunity to become leaders in all walks of life.

Efforts to increase the diversity of the student body, coupled with the proliferation of community colleges in the 1960s,⁶ produced a tremendous increase in the number of African Americans, Latino/as, Native Americans, and Asian Americans going to college over the last four decades. Yet as noted earlier in this paper, in spite of greater emphasis on campus diversity and launching myriad programs to make formerly all-white campuses more

⁵ This research highlights some persistent equity issues as well. In 2000, median earnings for African American and Latino males were lower than those of white males at all education levels (NCES 2003). However, no statistically significant differences were detected between the median incomes of African American and white females at any educational level. African American males had higher median earnings than African American females at every education level, as did males in all groups in relation to their female peers.

⁶ See “Community Colleges Past to Present,” available at www.aacc.nche.edu.

inclusive, the gaps in college participation and completion between whites and African Americans and between whites and Latino/as grew larger. As Massey and others (2003, 2) point out

Despite a variety of retention efforts—increased financial aid, remedial education, special tutoring, peer advising, culturally sensitive dorms, and ethnically supportive student unions—once admitted to institutions of higher education, African Americans and Latino/as continually under perform relative to their white and Asian counterparts, earning lower grades, progressing at a slower pace, and dropping out at higher rates.

This achievement gap will continue to widen unless campus leaders recognize that diversity and equity are different goals requiring different strategies. Unlike public elementary and secondary schools, most colleges and universities are not subject to comprehensive accountability systems that require the reporting of student outcomes data disaggregated by race/ethnicity, gender, special education, and so on. Consequently, even though stratification based on race/ethnicity is a reality within the majority of institutions of higher education—whether they are highly selective and predominantly white or open-access or classified as Hispanic-serving—the details of this stratification are largely invisible to institutional actors.

Indeed, equity in educational outcomes is not a measure of postsecondary institutional performance that is tracked continuously at the national, state, or local levels. With respect to historically underrepresented student populations in the K–12 public schools, the central concern of educators and scholars has been the academic achievement gap, particularly in mathematics, reading, and writing. In contrast, the central concern in higher education, at least since the 1980s, has been diversity and affirmative action. While most campuses today have diversity statements, programs, and staff positions, the monitoring of equity in student outcomes is rarely an integral component of diversity efforts. Yet, it is our belief that a campus with a diversity agenda that does not incorporate equity into its educational outcomes as a measurable goal cannot truly be inclusive. Moreover, an institution that does not produce equitable educational outcomes and has not made equity a priority cannot truly be educationally excellent.

Equity and Inclusive Excellence

Disparity in academic achievement across racial/ethnic groups is a major dilemma facing higher education today and one of four that fueled the Association of American

Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) call for institutions to make excellence inclusive.⁷ AAC&U’s conception of inclusive excellence—found in the introduction to this series of papers—differs from ours. It points to more expansive notions of inclusion and excellence than are generally embraced in the academy today.

Our conception of inclusion focuses on specific groups who comprise “involuntary” minorities (Ogbu 1978), that is, groups whose historical connection to the United States is a consequence of enslavement, colonization, or the forced annexation of territory. These groups are historically underrepresented in higher education and include African Americans, Latino/as, and Native Americans. We stress the need for attention to these groups because of our concern over the persistent achievement gap that we see evidenced in our research and work with campuses. AAC&U’s notion of inclusion also recognizes the fundamental need to redress inequities, but it then also challenges campuses to help *all* students examine and understand differences—their own and others—and actively engage these differences for learning.

From our perspective, “inclusive excellence” is achieved when these historically underrepresented students exhibit traditional academic characteristics of high achievers, such as high grade point averages, honors, high class rankings, and so on. We emphasize traditional measures of academic excellence because for too long, institutions of higher education have approached the college participation of historically underrepresented students as a matter of producing “survivors,”—students who persist and graduate—largely disregarding the institution’s responsibility and effectiveness in producing “leaders” (Gándara 1999). To illustrate our point: if the presidents or provosts of Ivy League colleges or universities were asked, “Of your most recent bachelor’s degree recipients ranked in the top 10 percent, what percentage are African American or Latino/a?”, they probably would not know the answer. Most institutions evaluate their effectiveness in serving historically underrepresented students in terms of access, to a lesser extent in terms of persistence and completion, and rarely ever in terms of high achievement among specific groups.

While recognizing that traditional measures of educational excellence currently serve as the academy’s most common proxy for educational quality and student learning, AAC&U contends that these measures are inadequate to assess the new levels of learning espoused in its report, *Greater Expectations: A New Vision for Learning as a Nation Goes to College*

⁷ The four dilemmas, described in the introduction to this series of papers, are: (1) islands of innovations with too little influence on institutional structures, (2) the disconnect between diversity and educational excellence, (3) disparities in academic success across groups, and (4) the “post-Michigan” environment. For more on AAC&U’s Making Excellence Inclusive initiative, see www.aacu.org/inclusive_excellence/index.cfm.

(2002). Still, we all agree that however indirect or incomplete many of these traditional measures may be, disparities in these measures along racial/ethnic lines point to a major breakdown in our quest to serve all students currently entering higher education.

Fundamentally, we and AAC&U both seek to provide mechanisms for *institutional* action to address the achievement gap. They agree with our contention that to truly make excellence inclusive, institutions must be committed to identifying and monitoring indicators of excellence disaggregated by race/ethnicity. Paraphrasing John Dewey, to form relevant and effective ideals, we must first be acquainted with and take notice of actual conditions; otherwise our ideals become vacuous or else filled with Utopian content. Unless colleges and universities create structures to monitor educational achievement among *all* students—African American, Latino/a, Native American, Asian American, white—the ideal of inclusive excellence will be meaningless.

We believe that an institution takes inclusive excellence seriously if it (1) accepts the responsibility for producing equitable educational outcomes for students from historically underrepresented groups and (2) monitors the development of high achievement among students from these groups. Furthermore, institutional personnel, such as faculty, deans, and counselors, must demonstrate personal responsibility for the educational outcomes of students from historically underrepresented groups. Rather than attributing underperformance among historically underrepresented students to “dysfunctional” backgrounds, “not knowing how to be a student,” or lack of motivation, faculty members who take inclusive excellence seriously must internalize the responsibility for equitable educational outcomes.

For example, a dean must recognize that, even though the student body may be as “diverse as the United Nations,” diversity in and of itself does not guarantee that all students are equally well served by the institution. Indeed, as we mentioned earlier, race/ethnicity-based disparity in educational outcomes is the norm at virtually every institution of higher education that is not a historically black college or university, a tribal college, or one that is located in Puerto Rico.

For the most part, these disparities are not noticed because equity is missing from external and internal accountability structures. Accrediting associations proclaim the merits of evidence-based cultures but fail to require evidence of equitable outcomes broken down by race/ethnicity or other dimensions, such as gender. The majority of states have some type of accountability system for higher education (Burke and Minassians 2003), but very few hold institutions accountable for the outcomes of historically underrepresented students, in either the aggregate or disaggregate (Bensimon et al. forthcoming). Significantly, the biennial

national report card, *Measuring Up* (National Center for Public Policy in Higher Education 2000, 2002), which grades states on several education indicators, does not include a student enrollment indicator based on race and ethnicity. Commenting on this absence, Burke and Minassians (2003, 106) observe, “in an age when ethnic groups have already attained—or will soon attain—majority status in the population, an indicator comparing the racial composition of the state population and student enrollment seems desirable as a performance measure in the category of participation.”

Recognizing Inequities

A plethora of data is currently available at most institutions of higher education. College and university leaders have made considerable investments in technology and training to develop the capacity for collecting all sorts of information about their institution and their students—from incoming grade point averages (GPAs), to every course taken, to graduating GPAs. The Knight Higher Education Collaborative (2000, 5), made up of educational leaders and researchers, notes

Today, universities and colleges expend more time, effort, and money than ever before in gathering data... [Yet] for all that, higher education institutions still have not learned to organize and use data effectively for internal decisions or public accountability...most institutions have yet to learn how to use data strategically.

Many questions can be answered through the use of data. Who starts but does not finish, and why? What is being learned, and for what purpose? Answers to such questions, found in part through the examination of institutional data, provide new knowledge about institutional effectiveness and performance and promote organizational learning. Too often, individuals make decisions and judgments on the basis of their own experiences and what they believe to be true of their institution and its students. They feel that the students they have encountered could benefit from a particular program, and therefore they implement that program without examining institutional data or other sources of information in their own contexts. For example, if students are not doing well in mathematics, this must mean that an institution needs a tutoring program; if engineering students are changing to other majors, it must mean that the campus needs a summer bridge program. The issue is not that tutoring or bridge programs are bad ideas, but rather that there is a tendency to assume a problem is understood and to come up with solutions that may do nothing to address it.

In sum, institutional actors may claim that inclusiveness and diversity are important goals but fail to notice that the ideals of “equality in fact and equality in results”—which gave

rise to affirmative action and later to diversity efforts—are far from being attained on their own campuses. In 2000, concerned about the chasm between what the higher education community espouses and how we act, researchers at the Center for Urban Education, supported by grants from the James Irvine Foundation and in partnership with fourteen campuses in the Los Angeles metropolitan area, developed and began field testing a tool—called the Diversity Scorecard⁸—designed to help campuses increase institutional capacity to produce equality in results for African American and Latino/a students.⁹ Work with the fourteen initial partner campuses continues, and the project is expanding to include additional colleges and universities from around the country.

The Diversity Scorecard

The Diversity Scorecard is a mechanism to help campuses put existing institutional data to good use by using them to identify inequities in educational outcomes for African American and Latino/a students in postsecondary education. The goal of the Scorecard is for campus leaders to establish indicators and scales that will enable them to assess their institution's effectiveness in improving access, retention, institutional receptivity, and excellence for these historically underrepresented students.

The Diversity Scorecard is theory-based, practical, and cost-effective and allows institutions of higher education to hold themselves accountable for race/ethnicity-based equitable educational outcomes. One of the tool's important aspects is that it was designed to be adaptable to particular institutional circumstances and to build internal capacity to address the problem of unequal results. Neither a best practice nor a packaged intervention, the Scorecard is a *process*—built upon theories of organizational and individual learning—that is intended to bring about institutional and individual ownership of the problem of race/ethnicity-based inequality. Key to this approach is the core principle that individual practitioners are far more likely to examine their practices, attitudes, and beliefs to find the causes of and remedies for unequal results if they are in charge of defining the problem.

Institutional Accountability for Student Outcomes

⁸ The tool has been renamed the Equity Scorecard, but we retain the original name in this paper for clarity. For more detailed information about the project, including a listing of the participating institutions, see www.usc.edu/dept/education/CUE. For a discussion of the theory behind the project, see “Research that Makes a Difference” in the *Journal of Higher Education* (Bensimon et al. 2004), and for a description of the implementation steps, see “A Learning Approach to Institutional Change” in *Change* (Bensimon 2004).

⁹ The project focuses on African American and Latino/a students because it is being field tested at institutions that have a very high representation of students from each of these groups. However, the methods of this project can be applied to any population that has a history of inequality.

The Diversity Scorecard is based on two premises. First, the prevalence of inequitable educational outcomes for African American, Latino/a, and other historically underrepresented students needs to be viewed as a problem in institutional performance. Typically, higher education leaders have sought ways to change or influence “at-risk” students so that these students can succeed at institutions that remain relatively static. In contrast, we believe that both students and institutions need to be held accountable for educational outcomes and be open to examining, and possibly changing, their practices. While there is an extensive literature on what historically underrepresented students lack and how they can change to better meet the rigors of college, in this paper we introduce an approach that focuses on change on the part of the institution.

Second, individuals’ awareness of the importance of equity in student outcomes is a necessary prerequisite for institutional change. In this sense, the Diversity Scorecard is based on the principles of organizational learning. Individuals can develop a new or deeper awareness of equity in educational outcomes by engaging in and learning from routine data analysis.

Turning Data into Knowledge

We maintain that in order to bring about change in an institution, individuals must see for themselves, and as clearly as possible, the magnitude of the inequities affecting students from historically underrepresented groups. With the Diversity Scorecard project, the opportunity for learning is cultivated by involving campus teams in the examination of data that is disaggregated by race/ethnicity¹⁰ and that reflects educational outcomes at their respective institutions. For example, at most institutions in the project, Latinas tend to be overrepresented in education majors and severely underrepresented in science, mathematics, engineering, and technology majors. However, many faculty members, counselors, and deans were not fully aware of the unbalanced distribution of Latinas across majors because such data are not typically disaggregated or routinely reported. When individuals examine data together and discuss what they notice and what it might mean, they construct new knowledge. Through their conversation, they translate tables of raw numbers into knowledge that can then be acted upon to bring about positive changes for students. Becoming aware that Latinas are underrepresented in certain fields can motivate a deeper inquiry into why this is so.

¹⁰ Many of the campuses also disaggregated their data by gender to investigate possible differences in outcomes within particular racial/ethnic groups.

The Diversity Scorecard's Conceptualization of Institutional Change

In order to bring about institutional change, individuals have to see for themselves, as clearly as possible, the magnitude of inequities (awareness); and they have to integrate the meaning of these inequities (interpretation), so that they are moved to act upon them (action).

It is through this learning experience that an individual's consciousness is raised, and this is how change—beginning at the individual level—can spread throughout an institution. Here, this process of learning and change is illustrated through the experience of one of the project's partner institutions, Loyola Marymount University (LMU).

Loyola Marymount University

Founded in 1911 and located in Los Angeles, LMU is one of twenty-eight Jesuit universities in the United States. The student body consists of 5,465 undergraduates; 1,639 graduate students, largely majoring in education; and 1,377 law students. Among the undergraduates, Latino/as constitute the largest minority group (19 percent), followed by Asian/Pacific Americans (11 percent), African Americans (6 percent), and American Indians (less than 1 percent), while European Americans¹¹ account for 50 percent of the student population. There are also 534 students (11 percent) who declined to report their racial/ethnic background. Interestingly, the lattermost group is twice as large as it was in 1997, reflecting a curious trend that has occurred in other private institutions.

LMU is organized into four colleges—Liberal Arts, Business Administration, Communication and Fine Arts, and Science and Engineering—and two schools—the School of Education and the School of Film and Television. Its mission statement reads

Loyola Marymount University understands and declares its purpose to be: the encouragement of learning, the education of the whole person, the service of faith and the promotion of justice.

LMU's Evidence Team

In 2000, the presidents of the fourteen initial partner campuses were asked to each appoint a group of people to work with the USC researchers, with one person in each group coming from the office of institutional research. The composition of the fourteen teams differs, but collectively they include deans, vice presidents, assistants to the president,

¹¹ These are the terms used by LMU to describe the racial/ethnic identities of students.

counselors, and faculty members in various disciplines, including English, philosophy, psychology, ethnic studies, and mathematics. The USC researchers call these groups “evidence teams” because their role in the project is to hold up a mirror to their respective institutions and reflect the status of underrepresented students on basic educational outcomes.

On most campuses, data are collected and organized into reports by an office of institutional research. Very few individuals see these reports, and even fewer actually discuss them. To raise the teams’ awareness of inequities, the USC researchers asked them to take on the role of researcher—team members would become responsible for developing equity indicators and actively analyzing data. In a change from customary practice, the USC researchers did not undertake the data gathering or analysis but rather served as facilitators of the process and as resource people for the teams.

The evidence team at LMU included team leader Dr. Abbie Robinson-Armstrong, special assistant to the president for intercultural affairs; Dr. Brian Hu, director of institutional research; Dr. David Killoran, professor of English and department chair; and Mr. Marshall Saucedo, associate dean of ethnic and intercultural services. In terms of diversity, LMU’s evidence team included an African American female, an Asian American male, a Latino male, and a white male.

At the start, some of the LMU team members were skeptical about the value of the Diversity Scorecard project. Their skepticism seemed to originate primarily from previous experiences with assessment-related, data-driven initiatives that never made any difference. Several months after the project started, Dr. Killoran admitted his initial dubiousness. “I don’t know whether I was ever a disbeliever in assessment,” he said, “[but] you would do it, then they would throw it away and things would go on; and when changes occurred, it was because somebody intuited that change was needed, not because they had a lot of evidence for it.”

Dr. Robinson-Armstrong came to LMU from the University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana a few months after the project started. Hired as a special assistant to the president for intercultural affairs, she immediately became the leader of the evidence team. Before she joined the group, the other members felt they did not have the power or influence to set equity goals for their institution. The consensus was that “everything we do, we have to ask them before we do it.”

After Dr. Robinson-Armstrong joined the team, the sense of powerlessness diminished considerably. As one of the members observed, “now that people know that she [Robinson-Armstrong] has the ear of the president, she’s permanent, and she has a lot of guts,

people stand up and take notice.” The combination of her title, her collegial leadership style, and her confidence seemed to empower the group. Undoubtedly, she was critical to this team’s success because she provided the space and opportunity for each member to be the expert in his or her area of specialization. As the project proceeded and the team members became more and more involved in data analysis, we saw them overcome their initial reticence and passive detachment to form a highly effective team.

Vital Signs and Disaggregating Data

To start their work, the teams from the fourteen initial partner campuses were directed to collect what are called “vital signs” data. Like blood pressure and temperature, these are particular indicators that every institution uses and reports as baseline measures of institutional “health” and/or status. The most critical aspect of this exercise was that the data were disaggregated by race/ethnicity and, in many cases, gender. The purpose of this was for each team to look for potential differences in outcomes between groups. In many instances, the teams looked at data from more than one year in order to detect trends.

The indicators used at LMU included enrollment by race/ethnicity, enrollment in major or college by race/ethnicity, retention from freshman to sophomore year by race/ethnicity, retention to graduation by race/ethnicity, and the number of tenured and tenure-track faculty by race/ethnicity. From studying these data, the evidence team at LMU was able to formulate follow-up questions and to request new data from Dr. Hu, the director of institutional research.

In reviewing LMU’s vital signs data, the team members became aware that the percentages of African American and Latino/a students had decreased over the preceding five years (see table 3), even though the undergraduate population had increased by 21 percent, from 4,113 students in 1997 to 4,959 students in 2001. Between 1997 and 2001, the African American population decreased from 7.8 to 6.4 percent, and the Latino/a population decreased from 20.6 to 18.5 percent. European American students represented 67 percent of the increase in undergraduate students.

Table 3: Undergraduate student enrollment by race/ethnicity, 1997 and 2001

	1997		2001		
	N	% of total	N	% of total	
African American	321	7.8%	317	6.4%	↓
American Indian	38	0.9%	39	0.8%	↓
Asian/Pacific American	575	14.0%	545	11.0%	↓
European American	1946	47.3%	2516	50.7%	↑
Latino/a	847	20.6%	918	18.5%	↓
International	155	3.8%	90	1.8%	↓
Decline to State	231	5.6%	534	10.8%	↑
Total	4113	100.0%	4959	100.0%	↑

Once they learned about the declining enrollment of African Americans and Latino/as, the LMU team generated new questions. For example, a team member wondered whether the proportion of male versus female minority students had changed over time. This led the team to examine the gender composition for each group (see table 4).

Table 4: Undergraduate student enrollment by race/ethnicity and gender, fall 1997

	Male		Female		Total
	N	%	N	%	N
African American	107	33.3%	214	66.7%	321
American Indian	23	60.5%	15	39.5%	38
Asian/Pacific American	245	42.6%	330	57.4%	575
European American	867	44.6%	1079	55.4%	1946
Latino/a	311	36.7%	536	63.3%	847
International	88	56.8%	67	43.2%	155
Decline to state	108	46.8%	123	53.2%	231
Total	1749	42.5%	2364	57.5%	4113

By examining the data presented in table 4, the team learned that more than 60 percent of the African American and Latino/a students on campus were women, while the gender distribution was more balanced in other groups.

Next, the team decided to examine the distribution of students across the four academic colleges. Their findings are shown in table 5.

Table 5: Undergraduate degrees conferred by college and race/ethnicity, 2000/2001

College	European American		Asian/Pacific American		African American		Latino/a		American Indian		Non-Res.		Decline to State		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Business Adm.	135	39.7	65	19.1	22	6.5	58	17.1	2	0.6	36	10.6	22	6.5	340	31.4%
Comm. & Fine Arts	146	55.7	29	11.1	21	8.0	32	12.2	6	2.3	8	3.1	20	7.6	262	24.2%
Liberal Arts	192	52.3	37	10.1	15	4.1	89	24.3	3	0.8	11	3.0	20	5.4	367	33.9%
Sci. & Eng.	42	36.5	28	24.3	7	6.1	27	23.5	1	0.9	3	2.6	7	6.1	115	10.6%
Total	515	47.5	159	14.7	65	6.0	206	19.0	12	1.1	58	5.4	69	6.4	1084	100.0%

The data presented in table 5 led to additional questions. For example, how do minority students end up being concentrated in particular colleges? Are they migrating out of their original majors or applying to particular majors? Questions such as these led to the collection of additional data, which in turn provided the foundation for LMU’s Diversity Scorecard. The disaggregated data turned out to be “eye-opening” for most LMU team members—even the skeptics.

The Diversity Scorecard’s Four Perspectives on Equity

Each evidence team in the project examines institutional data concurrently from four perspectives on equity in educational outcomes: access, retention, excellence, and institutional receptivity. These four perspectives form the Scorecard’s framework.¹² While each team interprets the four perspectives differently to reflect the needs and priorities of their respective institutions, the following general definitions were used.

Access perspective. Access refers to programs and resources that can significantly improve life opportunities for historically underrepresented students. Indicators in the access perspective are concerned with questions such as the following:

¹² This framework was adapted from Kaplan and Norton’s (1992) “balanced scorecard” for use in institutions of higher education by O’Neil et al. (1999) as the “academic scorecard.” Bensimon then adapted the framework for the Diversity Scorecard.

- To what programs/majors do underrepresented students have access?
- Do the programs/majors to which underrepresented students have access lead to high-demand, high-paying career opportunities?
- Do underrepresented students have access to select academic and socialization programs, such as special internships or fellowships?
- What access do underrepresented students have to financial support?
- What access do community college students have to four-year colleges?
- What access do community college students have to “hot” programs, for example, programs leading to fields with the highest starting salaries?
- What access do underrepresented students have to graduate and professional schools?

Retention. Retention refers to continued attendance from one year to the next and/or to degree completion. Retention can also refer to continued progress toward degrees in competitive majors. Equity indicators within the retention perspective provide answers to questions such as the following:

- What are the retention rates for underrepresented students according to program types?
- What are the drop-out patterns for underrepresented students from particular “hot” programs, for example, engineering and computer sciences?
- What are the completion rates for underrepresented students in basic skills courses?
- What are completion rates for associate’s degrees, bachelor’s degrees, and credential/certificate programs?

Excellence. Within these four perspectives, excellence refers to measurements of achievement for historically underrepresented students. Such indicators help answer questions such as the following:

- Might different majors or courses function as “gatekeepers” for some students and “gateways” for others? (For example, is there racial/ethnic bias in physics and mathematics? Is there a Western culture bias in the humanities?)
- Are historically underrepresented students concentrated in particular majors?
- What are the underrepresented student completion rates in highly competitive programs?
- What percentage of historically underrepresented students graduate with a GPA of 3.5 or higher?

- What is the size of the pool of high-achieving, underrepresented students who are eligible for graduate study in the full range of academic disciplines?
- What percentage of underrepresented students graduate in the top 10 percent of their class?

Institutional receptivity. Institutional receptivity refers to goals and measures of institutional support that have been found to be influential in the creation of affirming campus environments for historically underrepresented students. Receptivity indicators provide information to answer questions such as the following:

- Do new appointments enhance the racial and ethnic diversity of faculty, administrators, and staff?
- Does the racial and ethnic composition of the faculty reflect that of the student body?

Every four to six weeks, each team from the fourteen initial partner campuses met with two USC researchers for two hours to examine data from these four perspectives. As the data examination progressed, teams learned new things about educational outcomes and the equity gap, and many preconceived notions based on anecdote and experience were dispelled. The LMU team met with USC researchers sixteen times between January 1, 2001, and January 28, 2003.

Fine-grained Measures of Educational Outcomes

As the fourteen evidence teams delved deeper into the data, they continually asked new questions and developed new measures of equity in educational outcomes. The USC researchers refer to these as fine-grained measures. Such measures go beyond traditional indicators used by institutions and enables teams to identify problem areas more specifically. The LMU team, in particular, embarked on a second-order level of inquiry and began to examine educational *processes* as well as educational outcomes. For example, after examining the vital signs, the team became interested in access to different majors and wanted to know whether African American and Latino/a students were proportionately represented in those that lead to careers in high-demand fields, such as engineering and computer science. They also wanted to know whether these students were overrepresented in particular majors.

Initially, the LMU team looked at graduation rates by major, disaggregated by race/ethnicity. From these data, they learned that African Americans and Latino/as were underrepresented in certain majors. However, this did not help them understand the reasons

for this underrepresentation. When the team decided to track cohorts of students from their original major to the major in which they graduated, Dr. Hu proposed the following:

We can track from entry major to graduating major. This might show if students intended on majoring in one major, then changed their mind later on. If many students sign up for more economically advantageous majors, like engineering, but then graduate with majors in the humanities, this might give us an idea about access to certain majors for African American and Latino/a students.

By doing this, the evidence team found that 42 percent of the 1997 cohort of African American students who had enrolled in the College of Science and Engineering had left that college and the African American enrollment in the College of Liberal Arts had increased by 31 percent (see table 6).

Table 6: Student migration from entering major to degree major by ethnicity

European American				Asian/Pacific American			
College	Entering	Degree	Difference	College	Entering	Degree	Difference
BA	647	650	0%	BA	258	311	21%
LA	763	955	25%	LA	169	180	7%
CF	521	478	-8%	CF	79	82	4%
SE	517	365	-29%	SE	272	205	-25%
Total	2448	2448		Total	778	778	

African American				American Indian			
College	Entering	Degree	Difference	College	Entering	Degree	Difference
BA	71	67	-6%	BA	8	7	-13%
LA	71	93	31%	LA	7	7	0%
CF	49	49	0%	CF	2	4	100%
SE	43	25	-42%	SE	10	9	-10%
Total	234	234		Total	27	27	

Latino/a				Decline to State			
College	Entering	Degree	Difference	College	Entering	Degree	Difference
BA	256	269	5%	BA	18	20	11%
LA	323	387	20%	LA	30	34	13%
CF	103	94	-9%	CF	18	21	17%
SE	208	140	-33%	SE	22	13	-41%
Total	890	890		Total	88	88	

BA-Business Administration; **LA**-Liberal Arts; **CF**-Communication and Fine Arts; **SE**-Science and Engineering

By tracking the transfer of African American and Latino/a students from engineering to other majors, such as communications, the team identified courses and prerequisites that create barriers for these students. Their learning was increased through intensive investigation of the fine-grained measures of educational outcomes. This approach revealed the point at which African American and Latino/a students frequently left particular majors, a finding that will enable the faculty and counselors to intervene in a timely and more proactive manner.¹³

Keeping the Measures Simple and Manageable

The USC researchers recommended that each of the fourteen evidence teams limit the number of measures to twenty—no more than five per perspective. At first, some of the teams felt this was too limiting, but the rationale was that if there were too many measures, the scorecard would devolve into a laundry list of metrics rather than a list of actionable

¹³ While individual students may choose new majors that better suit their interests, it is in cases where disproportionate or large numbers of underrepresented students are migrating that institutional barriers may be revealed.

items. In the end, many teams used between four and twelve measures—no more than three per perspective.

In developing their Diversity Scorecard, the LMU team chose measures that complemented the university's mission, their Intercultural Vision Statement and Principles, and their new ten-year strategic plan. The following measures comprised LMU's final Diversity Scorecard:

Access.

- Undergraduate enrollment by race/ethnicity and gender, 1997 vs. 2001 cohorts
- Transfer students by race/ethnicity, 1999 vs. 2001 cohorts
- Financial aid recipients by race/ethnicity and by aid type, 2000–2001
- Student migration from entering major to degree major by school and by race/ethnicity

Retention.

- Year-by-year retention rate for first year cohorts by race/ethnicity, fall 1997 vs. fall 2001
- Graduation in 4, 5, 6, and 7+ years by race/ethnicity, 1997 vs. 2001 cohorts
- Undergraduate degrees conferred by college and by race/ethnicity, 1997 vs. 2001 cohorts


Excellence.

- Student representation in GPA intervals (i.e., those students who achieved 3.0–3.49 vs. those who achieved 2.0–2.49, etc.) by race/ethnicity, 1995–2000
- Students on the Dean's list by race/ethnicity, 1996, 1998, and 2001
- Honors students by race/ethnicity, 1995, 1998, and 2001

Institutional receptivity.

- Gender and race/ethnicity of faculty, 2001–2003
- Student-faculty ratio by race/ethnicity, 2001
- Faculty and administrative staff by rank, gender, and race/ethnicity, 2000
- Board of trustees composition vs. student composition by race/ethnicity, 2001

Diversity Scorecard Framework



Benchmarking—Equity and Improvement Targets

In the Diversity Scorecard project, the ultimate benchmark is equity—the point at which proportional representation is reached.¹⁷ For example, if 25 percent of the student body is Latino/a, equity would be reached when 25 percent of the graduates in engineering are also Latino/a. Improvement targets are annual, mid-range goals for the institutions to accomplish while striving to reach equity. For example, a team may determine that, to reach equity for Latino/as in engineering, the institution will need to increase Latino/a enrollment in calculus by 5 percent each year for five years. The LMU team explained the benchmarking in their final report to the president:

Equity is defined as the point at which the share of students of a given ethnic group with a particular academic feature is equal to that same group's share of the total student population. For example, at LMU, Latino/a students comprised 14.7 percent of the total number of students on the Dean's list in fall 2001. We then compared this number to their share of the overall student population—18.5 percent in 2001—in order to determine whether there was an equity gap. In this case the equity gap was 3.8 percent; Latino/a students are underrepresented on the Dean's list. Our data analysis helped us to determine whether we had equity of educational outcomes.

As indicated in table 7, African American, American Indian, Asian Pacific American, and Latino/a students at LMU are all underrepresented among students who have earned GPAs in the top 10 percent (red numbers indicate underrepresentation). African Americans account for 6.8 percent of the student population, but only 4.1 percent of these students have GPAs in the top category. In contrast, 62.7 percent of European Americans ranked in the top category, which is considerably higher than this group's representation in the undergraduate student population (49.5 percent). The purpose of the Diversity Scorecard is to call attention to proportional disparities such as these.

¹⁷ We remind readers that this benchmarking framework was developed specifically for the Diversity Scorecard project and does not reflect any official position of AAC&U.

Table 7. Top 10 percent students by race/ethnicity

	Number	Percent in the Top 10 Percent	Percent in the Student Population
African American	19	4.1%	6.8%
Latino/a	60	12.9%	19.9%
American Indian	2	0.4%	0.9%
Asian/Pacific American	52	11.2%	14.9%
European American	292	62.7%	49.5%
Decline to state	41	8.8%	8.8%
TOTAL	466	100%	100%

Report to the President and Campus Community

As mentioned earlier, the fourteen teams were appointed by the presidents of their institutions. Once teams identified the types of data they wanted to examine and performed their analyses, they submitted reports back to their presidents describing their findings on the state of equity in educational outcomes for African American and Latino/a students on their campuses.

The process of developing these reports was critical for the project. In writing the report, the teams had to make several commitments. First, the team members had to reach a consensus on which of the many equity indicators they had examined would be included in the final Scorecard and report. What were the most important indicators of inequity in educational outcomes? Which were aligned with institutional priorities? What were the advantages and disadvantages of presenting certain indicators? Who might react defensively?

The teams understood that they had to choose the indicators and data carefully in order for the report to gain acceptance and to prompt others to take action. Their role was to present the evidence in such a way that it would motivate faculty members and administrators to eliminate the inequities that were now apparent to all team members. However, as a member of one of the teams acknowledged, the statistics could lead to political problems.

The teams also had made a commitment to share their findings with their campus communities as well as their presidents. Documenting and describing the magnitude of the inequities in educational outcomes on campus is an unenviable task, and in almost every case, the teams were the bearers of bad news. At the ends of their reports, each team made recommendations for action, such as volunteering to continue their data analysis as a group, seeking involvement from other departments, and encouraging the use of institutional resources

(e.g., employee time and/or budgetary allocations) to eradicate the existing inequities. In addition, the teams had to review and summarize all they had learned in months of data analysis and reflection.

After receiving the report and the request for a meeting with the LMU evidence team, Father Robert Lawton, the president of LMU, convened a “town hall” meeting to which everyone on campus was invited. Faculty, deans, and staff attended. Copies of the report were provided for everyone in attendance, and it was available on the institution’s internal Web site as well.¹⁸ The meeting was opened by the provost, who described it as “an important gathering,” praised the team’s work, and reiterated the importance of disaggregating institutional data by race/ethnicity and gender. Each team member presented a section of the report, using a PowerPoint presentation to display the data and indicators so that the audience could easily see the inequities they had discovered. At the conclusion of the presentation, the team leader told the audience that “everyone has to commit to being evidence monitors” and reminded them that “equal access does not guarantee equity in success.”

In the introduction to the report, the LMU team recalled their early reactions to the project. “The LMU Scorecard team initially believed that the project would be quick and easy. We had data to demonstrate that LMU could improve the opportunities and academic achievement for underrepresented students. We simply needed to bring the problem to the attention of the appropriate administrators, and offer solutions.” It did not take long for the team to realize that this strategy would not work. They could present the evidence and offer solutions, but they could not develop programs to meet demonstrated needs and establish assessment measures for the various units of the university. Therefore, the team stated that “if we wanted the best results, we needed to rely on the experts who worked in these areas. We further realized we needed their commitment. The Diversity Scorecard had to be their project. They needed to be part of the team, and we had to work to facilitate their efforts on behalf of LMU’s underrepresented students.”

In the section on recommendations, the team wrote, “we assumed responsibility for raising awareness of the current situation at LMU by providing statistical evidence. We saw ourselves as both ‘evidence monitors’ and a group that could provide resources and facilitate continuing work in this area. Now it is time for broader campus involvement in the work of being ‘evidence monitors.’” Accordingly, at the town hall meeting, the LMU team recommended

¹⁸ LMU’s report is available online at www.lmu.edu/pages/6546.asp.

that each college within the university and several other programs and departments, such as admissions and the Honors program, create their own Diversity Scorecards. The president accepted this recommendation and asked the deans and program heads to build on the report and develop Diversity Scorecards.

There were a number of important findings in the LMU team's report to the president:

- Latino/as had the highest final graduation rate, with 81 percent graduating in seven or more years. The comparable figures for African Americans and European Americans were 54.5 percent and 75.4 percent, respectively.
- In fall 2001, out of 105 students in the honors program, seven were Latino/as and two were African Americans. Almost three-fourths of the honors students were European Americans.
- Both Latino/as and African Americans were underrepresented among the students who earned GPAs of 3.7 and above at the end of their first year.
- Between 1997 and 2002, forty-two new, full-time faculty members were hired, of whom eight were African Americans, nine were Latino/as, nine were Asian/Pacific Islanders, and two were American Indians. Overall, faculty of color constitute 67 percent of the new faculty.

Organizational Learning at LMU

The Diversity Scorecard approach is based on theories of organizational learning. Like “evidence-based cultures,” “organizational learning” is currently a popular term on college campuses. However, what these terms mean in real action or behaviors is not always understood or specified. Because the words “organization” and “learning” are assumed to be self-explanatory, there is a tendency to oversimplify organizational learning by regarding it simply as a data collection method. Indeed, empirical studies of organizational learning in general are very scarce, and those that deal specifically with higher education are even rarer (Bauman 2002).

The USC researchers were keenly aware that many projects said to be guided by the principles of organizational learning often pay no heed to the importance of empirical documentation. Consequently, an important goal of this project was to observe and document organizational learning in real time from start to finish. In particular, the USC researchers wanted to have sound empirical evidence for their claims to successful (or unsuccessful) organizational

learning. Therefore, they observed the meetings of the evidence teams over two years and documented their conversations in order to capture learning as it occurred.¹⁹

Four major strands of learning took place among most of the teams. First and foremost, the teams in the project identified inequities in educational outcomes. The LMU team, specifically, learned that African American women were the most “at risk” student population in terms of retention; that females accounted for two-thirds of the growth in African American and Latino/a student enrollment; that minority students tended to leave science and engineering at higher rates than any of the other colleges; and how the size of the gap in faculty diversity compared to that of the gap in student diversity in particular colleges.

Second, the project teams learned what it means to develop a culture of evidence as well as the importance of data in terms of shaping one’s work and making institutional decisions. At one of the team meetings, LMU’s Dr. Killoran, who had been skeptical of the project at first, said

We have a chance to look at where we are. We can make arguments supported with the numbers. Maybe we could even ask some new questions. For instance, I never knew to ask the institutional research department to disaggregate the data for the English department. I didn’t have a reason. I had mentioned in meetings that our students were really, really white, but now I have proof that the department is white. It has been obvious to me, but I haven’t been able to get some of my white colleagues to acknowledge this.

Third, the members of the teams in the project became empowered and developed agency at the individual level. After learning so much from analyzing the data with colleagues, many felt sufficiently well “armed” with information to advocate institutional change in ways that they would not have attempted before. Dr. Hu, the director of institutional research at LMU, felt that, as a member of a minority group, he could not have brought up these issues previously. Now the Diversity Scorecard project has given him the “permission” to do so. “Doing the Diversity Scorecard gives us a good opportunity to have dialogues. Now we can raise issues. I, myself, am a minority. I could not generate this profile on my own. People might have asked why or would have been suspicious of my data. Now I can say, look at this report I did for the Diversity Scorecard project.”

¹⁹ Several research-oriented publications that address various aspects of organizational learning are forthcoming, and they will be accessible via the Center for Urban Education’s Web site, www.usc.edu/dept/education/CUE.

Finally, team members across the project developed a sense of institutional responsibility for the inequities that occurred on their campuses and communicated this responsibility to others in the institution. Dr. Robinson-Armstrong, LMU's team leader, said that "if we have a problem, we have to own up to it, 'fess up to it.'" She went on to say that she will engage in "other kinds of ways that will tell them [the campus community] that this is not going to go away." Marshall Saucedo, associate dean of ethnic and intercultural services at LMU, said that, between foundation grants aimed at diversity and accreditation efforts, "the university is making diversity a campus-wide priority. The timing is right for LMU to change. Before, it's been a program here and a program there, but not with universal buy-in."

Sustaining and Spreading the Diversity Scorecard

Among the biggest challenges faced by the project's campuses is how to sustain the Scorecard's impact and broaden its reach. For LMU, it was important that awareness about inequities in educational outcomes be spread to others on campus; otherwise, it would not be possible to bring about systematic change. The LMU team recommended that each school and program develop its own Diversity Scorecard. The LMU evidence team members coached these units on how to construct their own Scorecards. In total, LMU created ten new teams. Using the original report to the president as their point of departure, each of the new teams identified one measure to investigate more thoroughly in their own college.

For example, in response to the findings reported in table 5, the College of Science and Engineering set out to review grades in what might be considered "gateway" courses—courses, such as calculus, required to advance in the major. The director of the University Honors Program developed a Scorecard to address the problem of underrepresentation among Latino/as, African Americans, and Asian Pacific Americans. As a result, she discovered that underrepresentation among these groups was a function of the process used to recruit students, and that there were more students who qualified than had been selected for the program. Each new Diversity Scorecard evidence team at LMU presented its findings and recommendations to the president at another town hall meeting, thirteen months after the original report was issued.²⁰

Most campuses tend to treat diversity efforts in an ad hoc manner, and these efforts rarely become a central part of institutional decision making. Provosts bring deans together to consider questions of enrollments, retention, program review, student assessment, and so on, but even

²⁰ The reports from each of these teams are available on LMU's Web site, www.lmu.edu.

though diversity and equity are integral to each of these topics, they are rarely taken into account. Furthermore, academic decision makers do not typically assess the impact of new initiatives *from the perspective of equity*.

Given the ad hoc status of equity efforts on most college campuses, the second town hall meeting at LMU—convened by the president to discuss the scorecards developed by each academic unit—was impressive. Upon entering the room in which the meeting was held, one’s attention was immediately drawn to the large stack of three-ring binders labeled “DIVERSITY SCORECARD REPORTS.” Deans, directors, and faculty members made brief individual presentations of their findings. In most cases, the recommendations for addressing inequities involved changing internal practices, rather than creating new programs or other initiatives that would require additional funding. For example, the Beyond LMU international study program found some interesting new information about the applicants to the Fulbright program. The person spearheading the scorecard effort for this program noted

The Diversity Scorecard [DS] got me to look at the small number of students [with whom] I work, which represents a “micro sample,” but still interesting. People who apply to the Fulbright program tend to be in the top 10 percent of their class, but really they only need a 3.0 or better GPA to qualify. In response to my DS, I am going to create a network of mentoring groups for regions and for areas of study.²¹ Students would join in their junior year. There’s a whole raft of other things they could apply for as well. There are bigger implications...the 5,000 students [nationally] who apply have a great experience just in the application process. They have a “running start” in terms of applying to graduate school and other stuff.

After all of the deans and program heads presented their Scorecard findings, one of the deans gave the president three recommendations, concerning the areas of budgeting, collaborating, and reporting. In terms of budgeting, the dean recommended that budgetary decisions be based on information such as the data the teams analyzed for their reports. Financial support ought to be provided in response to *evidence* of need and to maintain successful programs. In terms of collaborating, it was pointed out that certain deficiencies identified in the Diversity Scorecard reports could only be addressed by collaborative efforts across units. In the

²¹ Also noteworthy, there are no planned costs attached to the development of the mentoring network. The director of the international study program intends to ask for volunteers from the faculty and students who have studied abroad to help new applicants with the process.

words of the dean, “We need to collaborate across campus with those who can have an impact.” Finally, in terms of reporting, the dean noted that the institution and these teams needed to continue monitoring and reporting in this manner on a regular basis.

All of the individual Diversity Scorecard reports provided evidence of unequal results, and several of the presenters acknowledged that they were delivering bad news by saying that the experience was “like going to confession.” Following this line of thought, Father Lawton closed the meeting by saying

I want to talk about temptations. First, there is the temptation to be overwhelmed by data. I am very happy to see that you have avoided it. Second, is the temptation to relish knowledge but not allow it to lead to action. Here you’re all taking action, which is great. Third, is the temptation to do too much and therefore make your efforts too diffuse. I am happy that you are taking manageable actions. I applaud you and your commitment.

Institutional Factors to Help Achieve Equity

Several of the elements in place at LMU are critical for success in working toward equity of educational outcomes for all students and, thus, for the larger project of Inclusive Excellence. These elements are: (1) committed leadership at both the institutional and the team level; (2) team member expertise; (3) openness to self-criticism; (4) motivation; (5) credibility; and (6) resources.

Committed Leadership

Presidential. To a great extent, the success of the Diversity Scorecard project at LMU can be attributed to the president. Father Lawton, as one might say colloquially, “walks the walk” and “talks the talk.” His genuine commitment to inclusive excellence is demonstrated through the appointment of Dr. Robinson-Armstrong as his special assistant and through his willingness to examine data that had the potential for creating discomfort within the university.

With regard to the appointment of Dr. Robinson-Armstrong, what is important is not that a position for a special assistant for intercultural affairs exists at LMU. Such positions are now commonplace. Unfortunately, individuals who hold positions that are specifically associated with diversity and minority affairs can often be marginalized. At LMU, the president has made it clear that the position, the individual who fills it, and the work the position represents, must be taken seriously. For example, the president has spoken about the Diversity Scorecard project in his

annual convocation address; he has regularly scheduled meetings with Dr. Robinson-Armstrong; and he supported the first Diversity Scorecard's recommendation that all academic units be asked to participate in the process. When the deans and directors presented their own Diversity Scorecard findings in the second town hall meeting, Father Lawton listened attentively throughout the two-hour gathering. He also showed his commitment by giving his full attention to the implications of the Scorecards' findings for the institution.

In a post-affirmative action environment, particularly in California, there is heightened sensitivity about the examination of data disaggregated by race/ethnicity. We have found that, on the campuses where the project has been least successful, there is a general reluctance to talk about race/ethnicity and/or an institutional culture that encourages sharing of only positive information in order to reinforce a desirable image. In such institutions, the revelation of inequities in educational outcomes violates an important cultural norm. Organization learning theorists have observed that an unwillingness to look at information that challenges leaders' images of themselves as well as of their organizations is the biggest obstacle to institutional learning and change (see, for example, Argyris 1977). LMU was unusual in that no one—not the members of the team, the president, or anyone else—questioned the usefulness or appropriateness of disaggregating data by race/ethnicity. Even more unusual is the fact that campus leaders decided to post all of the Diversity Scorecards on the LMU Web site, thereby making them available to the public. The willingness to admit vulnerability is a characteristic of highly effective leaders, and Father Lawton did so without hesitation. In his most recent convocation address, Father Lawton told the LMU community that “modern corporations emphasize data. Decisions need to be, if not data-driven, then at the very least data-sensitive and data-informed. And we are becoming more data conscious as evidenced by the Diversity Scorecard.”

Team-based. Dr. Robinson-Armstrong was a driving force behind the success of the LMU project. It was evident from the start that she was committed to the notion of equity in educational outcomes and did not need to be convinced. However, she was well aware that others on the campus would resist the concept and would have to be convinced of its importance. The fact that she was able to persuade the deans and directors of ten units—some of whom may have been less than enthusiastic—to develop their own Scorecards attests to the potency of her interpersonal and political skills.

Team Member Expertise

The Diversity Scorecard consists of fine-grained measures (e.g., class rankings by race/ethnicity) that are not typically part of routine institutional reports. The ability of a team to carry out the work thus depends greatly on having an institutional researcher who is not only competent, but also willing to prepare the data in formats different from those to which he or she is accustomed. LMU's director of institutional research, Dr. Hu, was a critical asset to the team because he had the expertise and ability to produce analyses quickly. Moreover, because he was committed to the goals of the project, he did not feel overburdened or put upon by its demands.

The evidence team also had other important forms of expertise. Dr. Killoran, a long-time professor of English and chair of the department, gave the group a high degree of legitimacy with the faculty and served as a very effective ambassador for the project. He was particularly effective in representing the project because he admitted his initial skepticism and explained why he eventually changed his mind. His speaking about the value of the Scorecard to faculty members at LMU and other institutions made the project more appealing. The fourth member of the team, Marshall Saucedo, associate dean for ethnic and intercultural services, brought a strong understanding of the academic and social experiences of minority students at LMU.

Openness to Self-criticism

The willingness of institutional actors to examine themselves and their institutions critically is a prerequisite for addressing the problem of inequities based on race/ethnicity. One of the greatest obstacles to learning and change at the institutional level is a natural tendency to look past ourselves for the source of problems or to avoid examining them at all. At LMU, with the president setting the standard, there was never any question that holding up a mirror to the institution was the right thing to do.

Motivation

The members of the original LMU evidence team found the Diversity Scorecard to be a promising tool from the very start of the project. Each team member had been involved in diversity-related initiatives on campus prior to their participation in the project, and they were at the forefront of many of the institution's efforts to increase the enrollment of minority students. They were also aware that not all of their colleagues were conscious of the pressing issues facing minority students or committed to the goals of diversity. In the Diversity Scorecard, the team

found a non-threatening means for calling attention to the status of African American and Latino/a students at LMU and, in turn, motivating others to redress inequities. The LMU team members were highly motivated to complete the Scorecard because they saw it as an opportunity to connect diversity to core institutional goals, and thus, to make diversity more central to the institution's work.

The LMU team's motivation was also shown in their task orientation and enthusiasm. The team met regularly and completed individual tasks on schedule. Team members focused their discussions on the data and on the development of new questions and rarely wasted time. They were eager to share their work with the campus and at conferences. Indeed, the team members' belief in the aims of the Scorecard provided them with the energy and will to engage in a process that was new and time-consuming, and where the data results could not be known in advance.

Credibility

In appointing the evidence team, Father Lawton, the LMU president, selected individuals who enjoyed the respect of the campus community. The choice of individuals was important because it was a way of signaling to the campus at large that this was an important and serious undertaking. There were additional ways in which the credibility of the project was established. The president convened the aforementioned town hall meeting at which the evidence team presented the Scorecard results to the campus community, and he mentioned the Scorecard in his speeches. As noted, the Scorecard reports were posted on the LMU Web site, and the reports were referenced in materials for accreditation, conference proposals, and grant applications.

Resources

Two types of resources were especially valuable to the project: team members' investment of time—without additional remuneration or release time from other responsibilities—and the office of institutional research. With regard to the latter, because the Scorecard relies on data that are disaggregated by race and ethnicity (and in the case of LMU, by gender as well) and is based on fine-grained measures (e.g., the migration of students from their chosen majors), LMU's capacity to complete the project depended greatly on the willingness of their director of institutional research to run data in a variety of ways and present it in formats that were easily decipherable.

Conclusion

We have approached the persistent college achievement gap for African American and Latino/a students as a problem of institutional responsibility and performance. Within this approach, campus community members—particularly faculty—share the responsibility of rectifying inequities and striving for parity in educational outcomes for all students. Based on the USC researchers' experience with the fourteen initial partner campuses in the Scorecard project, we believe that gathering evidence about outcomes—disaggregated by race/ethnicity—is an effective and powerful means of first *raising awareness* of institutional problems and then *motivating* faculty and staff to seek solutions.

When the USC researchers began the Scorecard project in 2000, they did not fully realize how important leadership, motivation, credibility, and resources were with regard to the successful implementation of the Scorecard. The LMU team has shown us that these elements are critical. As the project expands to other institutions in California and beyond, these elements will be woven into criteria for participation.

Recent scholarship has also identified these elements as vital for change-oriented interventions to be successful in educational organizations (Coburn 2003; McLaughlin and Mitra 2001). For other campuses looking to undertake such a process of institutional transformation, there are several action items that can be derived from the observations we have made at LMU and elsewhere.

To raise *commitment*, campuses looking to undertake such a data examination process should consider

- making diversity and excellence central concepts in the hiring process of senior leaders and requiring that candidates demonstrate sustained work and commitment in these areas;
- identifying a team leader who can create a cohesive group that draws on the strengths of its members;
- selecting a team leader with sufficient campus clout who is experienced in navigating the politics of change efforts, particularly those related to diversity.

To ensure *motivation*, campuses looking to undertake such a data examination process should consider

- recruiting team members who are experienced in campus diversity work and able to introduce such work to inexperienced, and possibly skeptical, audiences;

- identifying team members who can move from discussion to action and meet deadlines;
- estimating the time commitment needed for project participation, reaching out to potential team members who can commit the necessary time, and exploring ways to free up time for participants—through mini-grants, course release time, student assistance, etc.;
- providing and supporting opportunities for team members to present their work on and off campus.

To increase *credibility*, campuses looking to undertake such a data examination process should consider

- identifying team members who have clout across campus;
- providing numerous venues, over time, for raising the visibility of Scorecard findings, formulating action plans to redress inequities that are discovered, and receiving updates and progress reports;
- incorporating results from this work into accreditation self-studies, conference proposals, and grant applications.

To ensure adequate *resources*, campuses looking to undertake such a data examination process should consider

- discovering creative ways to reward the efforts of the team(s), particularly if the service to the campus comes without additional remuneration or release time;
- exploring ways to provide release time, mini-grants, graduate assistantships, or other fiscal resources toward the project;
- identifying people from the institutional research office who can translate data into materials that are relevant, focused, and easily understood by a diverse readership.

The USC researchers have also learned that the very characteristics that make the Diversity Scorecard appealing could also defeat its purposes. Readers of this brief case study may become interested in developing a Scorecard for their campus, and the USC researchers welcome their participation. At the same time, it would be irresponsible not to acknowledge some of the potential pitfalls.

As was discussed earlier, the Scorecard has many characteristics that make it appealing. It is simple and easy to understand. Its logic is self-evident. It is manageable. It provides a

roadmap. It results in tangible evidence. However, these qualities can also cause potential users to ignore the principles of institutional change that underlie it. The Scorecard is a theory-based intervention. It is grounded in principles of organizational change, and specifically on those related to organizational learning theory and situated inquiry.

The USC researchers view the group process of constructing a Scorecard—selecting the measures, gathering and analyzing the data—as consisting of an intervention aimed at developing “equity-minded” individuals who are in positions of influence and power. Simply put, the purpose is to encourage institutions—through the beliefs, values, and actions of its members—to be equity-driven. The Scorecard is important as a means of creating a context for change, and it represents the first phase toward building equity-based academic cultures. However, the Scorecard itself—even if campuses faithfully complete it year after year—will not alter inequities in educational outcomes. One of the pitfalls of the Scorecard is the very high risk that the process will become mechanical or perfunctory. In the USC researchers’ experience, this typically occurs when campus leaders are not fully cognizant of the Scorecard’s underlying principles, or when they fail to integrate these principles into their everyday work.

The way in which most people make sense of problems such as those revealed by the Scorecard is one of the most intractable challenges to creating equitable institutions. The typical response that the Scorecard elicits from campuses is a search for a program or practice that can be applied to the students in question to make educational disparities disappear. But one of the core principles underlying the Scorecard is that the solution to the problem lies *within the institution*—in its culture and in the beliefs and values that influence the expectations and practices of individuals. The USC researchers view the process of creating the Scorecard as an *intervention* that heightens a campus community’s awareness of inequities and, hopefully, motivates the members to want to know more about how they can reduce them in a systematic and comprehensive fashion. An institution that discovers overwhelming GPA disparities between white students and African American students in certain majors, for example, may want to assess whether such disparities are at least partially based on the use of a narrow set of pedagogical techniques, lowered faculty expectations of African American students, or lack of African American representation on the faculty or in the curriculum, to name just a few factors.

Attaining Inclusive Excellence is a very ambitious undertaking. It demands that those in higher education shift their thinking about diversity. Rather than simply referring to the increased presence of racial and ethnic minority students on campus, diversity must have equity in

educational outcomes for all students at its conceptual core. The experiences of Loyola Marymount University and the several other initial partner campuses in the project illustrate the positive shifts that can occur when academic communities are motivated to become more equity-minded and to help all students move toward high academic achievement and success.

References

- Adelman, C. 1999. *Answers in the tool box: Academic intensity, attendance patterns, and a bachelor's degree attainment*. Jessup, MD: U.S. Department of Education Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- American Council on Education. 2003, October 8. Minority college enrollment surges over the past two decades; Students of color still lag behind whites in college participation. Press release. Available at:
http://www.acenet.edu/AM/Template.cfm?Section=20032&CONTENTID=3719&TEMP_LATE=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm.
- Argyris, C. 1977. Double loop learning in organizations. *Harvard Business Review* 55 (5): 115-25.
- Association of American Colleges and Universities. 2002. *Greater expectations: A new vision for learning as a nation goes to college*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Astin, A. 1999. Involvement in learning revisited: Lessons we have learned. *Journal of College Student Development* 40 (5): 587-98
- Barton, P. E. 2003. Parsing the achievement gap: Baselines for tracking progress. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Bauman, G. L. 2002. *Developing a culture of evidence: Using institutional data to identify inequitable educational outcomes*. Unpublished dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California.
- Bensimon, E. M. 2004. The diversity scorecard: A learning approach to institutional change. *Change* 36 (1): 45-52.
- Bensimon, E. M., L. Hao, and L. T. Bustillos. in press. Measuring the state of equity in higher education. Harvard Civil Rights Project.
- Bensimon, E. M., D. E. Polkinghorne, G. L. Bauman, and E. Vallejo. 2004. Research that makes a difference. *The Journal of Higher Education* 75 (1): 104-26.
- Bok, D. 2003. Closing the nagging gap in minority achievement. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 50 (9): 20.
- Bourdieu, P. 1985. The forms of capital. In *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education*, ed. J. G. Richardson, 241-58. New York: Greenwood Press.

- Bowen, W. G., and D. Bok. 1998. *The shape of the river*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Braxton, J. M., and L. A. Lein 2000. The viability of academic integration as the central construction in Tinto's interactionist theory of college student departure. In *Reworking the student departure puzzle*, ed. J. M. Braxton, 11-28. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Burke, J.C., and H. P. Minassians, ed. 2003. *Reporting higher education results: Missing links in the performance chain. New directions for institutional research*, no. 116. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Carnevale, A. P., and R. A. Fry. 2000. *Crossing the great divide: Can we achieve equity when generation Y goes to college?* Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Coburn, C. E. 2003. Rethinking scale: Moving beyond numbers to deep and lasting change. *Educational Researcher* 32 (6): 3-12.
- Cohen, C. J., and C. E. Nee. 2000. Educational attainment and sex differentials in African American communities. *American Behavioral Scientist* 43 (7): 1159-1206.
- College Board, The. 1999. *Reaching the top: A report of the national task force on minority high achievement*. New York: author.
- Fry, R. 2002. *Latino/as in higher education: Many enroll, too few graduate*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center.
- Gándara, P. (with J. Maxwell-Jolly). 1999. *Priming the pump: Strategies for increasing the achievement of underrepresented minority undergraduates*. Princeton, NJ: The College Board.
- Harvey, W. B. 2003. *Minorities in higher education 2002-2003: 20th Annual status report*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Hurst, T. 2002. *United Negro College Fund 2001 statistical report*. Fairfax, VA: Frederick D. Patterson Research Institute.
- Johnson, L. B. 1965. To fulfill these rights. Commencement address at Howard University, June 14. Available at:
<http://www.lbjlib.utexas.edu/johnson/archives.hom/speeches.hom/650604.asp>.
- Jencks, C., and M. Phillips. 1998. *The black-white test score gap*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

- Kaplan, R., and D. Norton. 1992. The balanced scorecard: Measures that drive performance. *Harvard Business Review* 70 (1): 71-9.
- King, J. E. 2000. *Gender equity in higher education: Are male students at a disadvantage?* Washington, DC: American Council on Education Center for Policy Analysis.
- Knight Higher Education Collaborative, The. 2000. The data made me do it. *Policy Perspectives* 9 (2): 1-12.
- Lee, V. E., and J. B. Loeb. 1996. Collective responsibility for learning and its effects on gains in achievement for early secondary school students. *American Journal of Education* 104: 103-47.
- Massey, D. S., C. Z. Charles, G. F. Lundy, and M. J. Fisher. 2003. *The source of the river: The social origins of freshmen at America's selective colleges and universities*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- McLaughlin, M.W., and D. Mitra. 2001. Theory-based change and change-based theory: Going deeper, going broader. *Journal of Educational Change* 2: 301-23.
- National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education. 2000. *Measuring up 2000: The state-by-state report card for higher education*. Washington, DC: The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education.
- National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education. 2002. *Measuring up 2002: The state-by-state report card for higher education*. Washington, DC: The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education.
- National Assessment of Educational Progress. 2003. *The nation's report card: 2003*. Mathematics and reading assessments results. Available at: <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/mathematics/results2003/> and <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/reading/results2003/>.
- National Center for Education Statistics. 2003. *Status and trends in the education of Blacks* (NCES 203-034). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Ogbu, J. U. 1978. *Minority education and caste: The American system in cross-cultural perspective*. New York: Academic Press.
- O'Neil, H. F., Jr., E. M. Bensimon, M. A. Diamond, and M. R. Moore. 1999. Designing and implementing an academic scorecard. *Change* 31 (6): 32-41.
- Renner, K. E. 2003. Racial equity and higher education. *Academe* 89 (1): 38-43.

- Tinto, V. 1987. *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Trent, W. T. 1991. Focus on equity: Race & gender differences in degree attainment 1975-76; 1980-81. In *College in black and white: African American students in historically black and predominantly white public universities*, ed. W. Allen and E. Epps, 41-59. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

About AAC&U

AAC&U is the leading national association concerned with the quality, vitality, and public standing of undergraduate liberal education. Its members are committed to extending the advantages of a liberal education to all students, regardless of academic specialization or intended career. Founded in 1915, AAC&U now comprises 1,000 accredited public and private colleges and universities of every type and size.

AAC&U functions as a catalyst and facilitator, forging links among presidents, administrators, and faculty members who are engaged in institutional and curricular planning. Its mission is to reinforce the collective commitment to liberal education at both the national and local levels and to help individual institutions keep the quality of student learning at the core of their work as they evolve to meet new economic and social challenges.

Information about AAC&U membership, programs, and publications can be found at www.aacu.org.

About the Authors

Georgia Bauman is the Director of Instructional Services in Academic Affairs at Santa Monica College. Her scholarly interests include organizational learning and change which promote student success and narrow the gaps in educational outcomes for students of color. Contact Georgia Bauman at bauman_georgia@smc.edu.

Leticia Tomas Bustillos is a Doctoral Student at the University of Southern California as well as a Research Assistant for the Center for Urban Education. Her scholarly interests include issues of equity in remedial education for students of color in higher education. Contact Leticia Tomas Bustillos at lbustill@usc.edu.

Estela M. Bensimon is Professor of Higher Education and Director of the Center for Urban Education in the Rossier School of Education at the University of Southern California. Her research interests include academic leadership, organizational change, urban colleges and universities and women and minority faculty in higher education. Contact Estela Bensimon at bensimon@usc.edu.

M. Christopher Brown II is the Vice President for Research and Policy at the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and a professor and senior research associate on continuous leave at the Pennsylvania State University. His scholarly interests are higher

education leadership and governance, postsecondary statutory and legal concerns, institutional history, and collegiate diversity. Contact M. Christopher Brown at mcbrown@aacte.org.

RoSusan D. Bartee is former Interim Executive Director of the Frederick D. Patterson Research Institute of the United Negro College Fund. She is currently Associate Project Director of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. Contact RoSusan Bartee at rosusan@ncate.org.