Racism in Higher Education II:
Challenging Racism and
Promoting Multiculturalism in
Higher Education Organizations

by
Mark Chesler and James Crowfoot

CENTER FOR RESEARCH ON SOCIAL ORGANIZATION
WORKING PAPER SERIES

CHALLENGING RACISM AND PROMOTING MULTICULTURALISM
IN HIGHER EDUCATION ORGANIZATIONS

I. INTRODUCTION

This paper follows earlier work that provided a preliminary description and diagnosis of racism in higher education organizations (Chesler & Crowfoot, 1991).[*] We argued there that institutionalized racism (and other forms of social discrimination) are rampant in the U.S. society, and thus can be expected to be present and operative in all our public and private institutions, including higher education. Figure 1 (revised, from that chapter) summarizes that discussion by listing common organizational components, features of all formal systems, and providing examples of racism that are common in our colleges and universities.

In this paper we extend the prior argument to discuss ways of challenging and changing these racist elements in organizational structures and processes. Although our direct focus here is on organizational racism, we do refer to efforts to challenge sexism, homophobia and other forms of social discrimination and oppression. Just as these varied forms of oppression intersect to target many different groups of people, many of the efforts to combat racism (or any form of oppression) must also deal with these other forms of invidious social exclusion and stratification. We first briefly review some of the diagnostic evidence concerning racism in higher education by contextualizing it within a vision of less racist and more multicultural organizations. We then provide examples of various organizational innovations and programs that colleges and universities have generated in their own efforts to deal with these issues. We then review provide a conceptual analysis of some of these plans and programs, seeking to identify strategic assumptions and ideologies that undergird them. In so doing, we briefly consider some of the varied strategies and tactics of change-making open to advocates of multiculturalism and to challengers of racism and sexism in higher education organizations.

II. VISIONING AND PLANNING MORE MULTICULTURAL ORGANIZATIONS

Racism (and other forms of discrimination) is deeply embedded in the cultures, structures and processes of all U.S. organizations and institutions, including colleges and universities. Change will be difficult, and will require systematic strategic planning and the mobilization of key resources. Given the level of historic controversy and enmity about these issues, this is more true for the challenge to racism and advocacy of a more just system of higher education than it has been for the development of new financial plans or significant transformations of the curriculum.

One central and initial element of a strategic plan is the creation of a <u>vision</u> of the organization's future. This involves identifying just what kind of a problem (or set of problems) institutional racism is, and what alternative images of the future might be involved. For instance, different commentators and analysts - and advocates and administrators - have identified organizational goals around diversity in some of the following terms.

---

[*] It also is part of continuing work describing the process of strategic planning for multiculturalism in higher education (Chesler & Reed, 1996), of conducting a multicultural audit (Chesler, 1996a), and of analyzing the sources of resistance to multicultural change (Chesler, 1996b).

FIGURE 1: INSTITUTIONAL RACISM IN HIGHER EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS*

MISSION
- Explicit attention to goals of racial justice/equity lacking
- No recognition of plural goals/interests
- Commitment to the status quo of the institution and social order
- Competence and creativity assumed to be limited to white men
- Multicultural/antiracist rhetoric not tied to action strategies

CULTURE
- Monocultural norms for success promulgated
- Traditional "rules of the game" and norms for "appropriate" behavior/dress/expression
- Alternative cultures not recognized/promoted, and marginalized
- Diversity and excellence seen as competitive/contradictory
- Rituals/symbols reflect white Eurocentric traditions
- No explicit rewards for anti-racist innovations

POWER SYSTEM
- Senior power holders are white
- Informal access to hierarchy limited to members of the "white male club"
- Constituencies of people of color lack access to powerholders
- Protests by students of color seen as trivial or disruptive and dealt with via repression or short-term concessions

CLIMATE AND SOCIAL RELATIONS
- Faculty/staff networks generally exclude people of color
- Student clubs and social activities separate by race
- Interracial relations among students not seen as a faculty/academic concern
- No proactive policy/program regarding "incidents" or harassment
- Environment not supportive of students of color - socially or academically

STRUCTURE
- Little unit accountability for multicultural agenda
- Multicultural "office" not a central and powerful function
- Bureaucratic rigidity limits adaptive flexibility to new/alternative needs/interests
- Meetings run via traditional rules of efficiency

TECHNOLOGY (CURRICULUM AND PEDAGOGY)
- Curriculum not include/address different cultures' contributions to knowledge
- Curriculum not explicitly address racism - in disciplines, campus or community
- Traditional instructional pedagogies not altered to deal with diverse populations
- Lack of opportunities for (re)training faculty to work with students of color (and with their own feelings)
- Traditional modes of counseling, advising and mentoring

RESOURCES
- Funds not available to support/maintain anti-racist innovations
- Active recruitment of students/faculty/staff of color nonexistent or nonsuccessful
- Post-recruitment support for students/faculty of color minimal
- "Vital agendas" compete successfully for scarce resources

BOUNDARY SYSTEMS
- Lack of vigorous outreach to communities of people of color
- Racist community settings and incidents not addressed
- Alumni of color not seen/treated as vital
- Sole "important" public constituencies are white
- Priority relations with "majority" suppliers, recruiters and placements

---

* Adapted from Chesler & Crowfoot, 1991, p. 206, Fig. 12-3.

2

1. The problem is adding qualified people of color and women who can fit well into the organization as it is presently structured and cultured and operative.
2. The problem is adding qualified people of color and women who can fit well into the organization as it is and ensuring that present employees and managers understand and welcome these newcomers.
3. The problem is adding qualified people of color and women and ensuring that managers and employees are educated and that incremental changes are made in policies and practices that may have impacted negatively on minority and women employees (and their opportunities) previously.
4. The problem is adding people of color and women who bring with them new contributions (skills, expertise, visions, clients, constituencies) that can fit within the dominant coalition's current mission, core technology and power base, practices, policies, informal patterns of interaction, etc.
5. The problem is adding people of color and women at all levels and functions, and incorporating and legitimizing their contributions through changes in all organizational elements, including the membership and operations of the dominant coalition.

The first and second options are assimilationist in character; they propose to seek and include people of color and women without any effort at transforming the organization itself - except for some increased "understanding" by current members. The third and fourth options are "non-discriminatory" in the sense that they seek to utilize new members' skills and to eliminate obvious forms of organizational discrimination; they leave untouched, however, discrimination that is covert, "indirect" or built into the organization's core assumptions and operations (Feagin & Feagin, 1986). The fifth option speaks clearly to vigorous efforts to eliminate organizational discrimination and to seek the value-added changes that may flow from new members' contributions.

Clearly, what is involved here are some quite different definitions of "the problem" or "opportunities" involved in anti-racism and multiculturalism, and thus some quite different visions of a more just future. Indeed, in our view multiculturalism is a resource for the campus community, and a strategy for utilizing and benefiting from the resources of many different peoples that we sorely need to employ; it is not just a "problem" to be solved. We have found it helpful to use the components of Figure 2 as a way of considering organizations that are at quite different stages or phases of their effort to deal with institutional racism. Our goal here is not to "box" organizations or people, nor to establish a monolithic set of images and orthodoxies, but to stimulate dialogue and alternative visions of possible futures. Moreover, we realize that few or no higher education organizations (or organizations in any other sphere of U.S. life) can claim currently to be fully (or nearly) multicultural; the best we see are systems struggling with the transition to more just states of affairs. And these transitions are by no means linear or universal; development may be unbalanced across these different organizational components and the process of struggle may progress and regress over time. In all likelihood our definitions and indicators of multiculturalism will change as we approach that stage of development - as we get closer we will see this vision more clearly.

Figure 2 presents three generic models of organizations at various "stages" of developing multiculturalism; for each stage a series of identifying characteristics of various organizational components is presented. One stage or type of organization is MONOCULTURAL (called "monolithic" by Cox, 1993; "white male club" by Jackson & Holvino, 1988; and "resistant" by Katz, 1988): it has been described in part in our earlier paper and many of its elements are reflected in Figure 1. A second stage or type of organization is TRANSITIONAL (called "plural" by Cox, "affirmative action" by Jackson & Holvino, "transitional" by Katz, and "diverse" by others). A third stage or type of organization is MULTICULTURAL (called "multicultural" by Cox, "multicultural" by Jackson & Holvino, and "proactive" by Katz).

FIGURE 2: ORGANIZATIONAL STAGES OF MULTICULTURALISM*

ORGANIZATIONAL DIMENSION	STAGES		
	MONOCULTURAL	TRANSITIONAL	MULTICULTURAL
Mission	Deliberately exclude or ignore diversity.	Announce desire/need for a diverse workforce or membership. Suggest a link between diversity and "bottom line."	Positively value diverse workforce or membership and service to underrepresented groups. Link diversity to "bottom line" and social justice values. Global perspective.
Culture	White, male, and Eurocentric norms prevail. Prejudice and discrimination prevail. Encourage assimilation into dominant community. Emphasize individualism.	White and male norms are questioned but prevail. Prejudice and discrimination are lessened but continue. Seek accommodation to and comfort/tolerance for minorities. Reify particular group identities.	Prejudice and discrimination constantly confronted publicly and negatively sanctioned. Alternative norms embraced. White, male, and Eurocentric symbols changed. Synthesis of group identities and a transcendent community.
Power: The character of dominant coalition	White and male throughout. Others excluded or at bottom. Access limited to the "Club." Strong hierarchy.	A few minority members who can adapt reach middle management. White and male sponsors of minority and women members. Narrow access.	Multicultural team of leaders. Relatively flat and multi-level decision-making. Wide access. Value different decisional styles.
Climate and social relations	Exclusionary. Segregated social events. Communication within racial/gender groups. No external intergroup contact.	Distant but cordial relations. Open to assimilated minorities. Communication on deeply held issues mostly within social identity groups. Some external intergroup social contact.	Proactive inclusiveness at work and externally. Homogeneous and heterogeneous groupings co-exist. Much communication across race/gender lines. Sense of community (yet plural).
Structure	No designated responsibility for diversity agenda. Traditional management and meeting style.	Special (Staff) office for diversity programs. Unit autonomy on diversity issues. Attention to group process.	Multicultural initiative in all units/levels and seen as line function. Units accountable for progress.

4

FIGURE 2 (continued)

Technology	People required to adapt to the existing technology, which is seen as culture-neutral. Segregated work teams.	Discussion about ways technology does not fit/serve/reflect diverse groups' needs/styles/histories. Desegregated work teams.	New technologies adapt to diverse groups' needs/styles and contributions. Integrated work teams cherished.
Resources	No special funds for diversity programs. Traditional recruitment paths.	Special funds for diversity events. Recruitment focused on "promising" people of color and women. Retention efforts.	Multicultural programs built into unit budgets. Multicultural mentoring normative. Multiculturalism a priority for resource development/use.
Boundary management	Traditional separations of work and home. No external socializing with diverse peoples. "Fit" in external market and cultures a priority.	Respond to changing demographics of markets/clients/suppliers/members. Support external socializing. Respond to contradictions and conflicts.	Seek minority suppliers, markets. Advocate new external cultures and policies. Global focus. Export multicultural vision and mission to markets and peers.
Interest in change?	None unless pressed on survivability. Low overt conflict.	Seek social acceptability. Fuller utilization of resources. Seek special markets/advantage. Adapt to external or internal pressure and overt conflict.	Equity and justice. Belief in "bottom line" rhetoric and growth potential. Empowerment and organizational improvement.
Constituencies for change	None. External voices and pressures. Some internal minorities.	Some internal cadres. A few leaders from the dominant coalition Cautious and informal voices. Legal claimants.	The dominant coalition. Internal/external forces joined. Strong and fully represented internal cadres.
Major change strategies	Litigation and counter-suit. External demand/protest. Coercion. Some managerial or elite listening.	Management training and "awareness" programs. Organizational development. EEO and Affirmative Action programs. Administrative mandate. Assessments and audits.	Continuous (re)education of individuals and organization. Reward multicultural work(ers). Multicultural norms and leadership. Coalition formation. Revise policies and structures. Combat external social oppression.

* This chart builds explicitly on the prior work of Cox (1991), Jackson & Holvino (1988), and Chesler & Crowfoot (1990).

A fuller development of this work would provide expanded and concrete examples of each of these models and their characteristics, and would include language that reflects the full series of intersecting forms of discrimination and oppression; time and space limit this figure to a race and gender focus. However, we can begin here to specify some of the ways these images might be operational, especially with regard to institutions of higher education. The discussion that follows is preliminary, and we welcome suggestions, critiques and elaborations.

With regard to mission, we suggest that a multicultural organization will be forthright and unambiguous in its valuation of diversity and the contributions diversity makes to the "bottom line" (whether that bottom line is profit or service or education or knowledge generation). Thus, this effort is not undertaken as acts of charity or benevolence alone, nor solely on the basis of righteous moral principle, but for instrumental gain as well. For instance, in general we have seen multiple value frames proposed for the multicultural agenda: social justice, creation of better knowledge, creation of better teaching/learning/research environments for faculty of color and students of color, greater success in placing graduates in the job or graduate school career line, maintenance of peace and order in the organization. Whether the core value frame is "doing the right thing" or "improving the bottom line" (or both) makes a difference. For the university system, with a bottom line of education and truth-seeking/generating, the availability and empowerment of groups that might have access to "multiple truths", and multiple sources and kinds of wisdom, is an essential element of educational and research processes. In a similar vein, identification of and service to previously disadvantaged and oppressed groups and communities that can benefit from the university's educational agenda and resources is a key part of a multicultural mission.

Of course few complex organizations have a single or unitary mission. Within the American system of higher education, liberal arts colleges, religious colleges and research-oriented multiversities, whether private or public, may have quite different missions. And within any single large and complex university, different units may have somewhat different missions, or somewhat different priorities among a common set of missions. For instance, schools of business, engineering, social work and public health often are more committed to a priority on diversity and multiculturalism than are liberal arts colleges and disciplines. This may be a result, in part, of their more applied missions, and their greater linkages to public constituencies that play a role in recruitment, employment of graduates, funding of research and service activities, etc.

The culture of a multicultural organization not only will accept, but will seek and celebrate, alternative norms and styles as well as key symbols. And the culture of prejudice and discrimination, however covert and implicit, will be publicly challenged. In several universities we recently have seen efforts to debate and change mascots and symbols built upon Native American myths and traditions. We have seen less effort to alter the standards and subtle messages that reflect the dominance of western and white and male definitions of appropriate behavior, interpersonal relationships and performance. These efforts go beyond assimilating people of color and women, or "tolerating" their "deviant" cultural; styles, but to creating a new and embracing cultural framework.

Just as missions may be diverse, any single complex higher educational organization may encompass several different and even competing cultures. The dominant faculty culture, with regard to forms of dress and behavioral interaction as well as life priorities, often differs from the dominant student culture. Within a diverse faculty, reflections of different unit missions may create varied cultures in different units: one noteworthy distinction often is made between the sciences and the humanities, or between basic and applied disciplines or departments. And within the broad student culture, there may be strong variations based on racial or ethnic differences, differences between the academic and athletic culture, and different norms and standards for behavior rooted in class differences as well.

The power system of multicultural organizations requires that previously excluded groups now be part of the dominant coalition, both in its official as well as informal components. Moreover, the expression of power and decision-making throughout these organizations should reflect a "flatter

hierarchy" and greater participation of people at all levels. Some of the ways in which power is exercised also may change, as different cultural expressions of power surface and are implemented. Within the university this means that people of color and women will be more often represented at all senior executive levels (not merely in those "special" Vice-presidencies or Provostships or Deanships for Minority Affairs, Student Affairs/Activities or Community Relations). The "old boy" network of informal advisors to senior executives and deans also will be broadened to include members of previously excluded groups. While greater organizational democracy and sharing of power is not a sufficient guarantor of multiculturalism, it certainly is a necessary element.

The "climate" and informal social networks of multicultural organizations will be inclusive, and will be so on a proactive rather than accidental basis. Room for various groups to "nest and nurture" in their separated traditions and identities is essential, and core groups or cadres of people of different cultures should be promoted and supported. At the same time, a transcendent sense of an inclusive community should permit the organization and its members to make the best of both their particular and common concerns and identities. In the university these guidelines apply to housing and informal social opportunities as well as to academic units. Under these circumstances, intergroup dialog is likely to increase, and more meaningful conversations will occur about race and racism across as well as within particular racial groupings.

The structure of multicultural organizations will permit various organizational units and subunits to transcend traditional bureaucratic hierarchies in the effort to create cross-cutting programs and initiatives. In addition, the procedures operative in work teams and relationships will reflect various cultures' ways of organizing, communicating and decision-making...and making structures that support these styles. Moreover, specific structural units will have responsibility for initiative and oversight with regard to multicultural issues - including climate concerns, power relations and basic goal attainment. Despite the "loosely-coupled" nature of most higher educational organizations, both vertical and horizontal integration of effort will be evident in increased formal accountability for progress on multiculturalism.

The technology of multicultural organizations will reflect the priority of peoples' skills, and different peoples' skills and styles, over the demands of particular machine-based or traditional technologies. As a result, new technologies for accomplishing organizational purposes will be developed and practiced. With special regard to higher educational organizations, the core technology involves pedagogy, curriculum and research methods. Multicultural universities will create and be recognized by new methods of classroom and out-of-classroom instruction, new curricula, and new research techniques. This may require new forms of instructional delivery, evaluation and performance review, out of class counseling and advising, and the like. And individual faculty (and graduate teaching assistant) innovations in this area are likely to be supported and advanced by special units designed to aid instructor development activities. Even traditional definitions of research, and appropriate research, may be altered as new voices and standpoints are engaged in knowledge production and the production of knowledge that may serve previously underserved and oppressed communities. In teaching, research and service arenas, it is likely that a central component of these new technologies will be an increased respect for, reliance upon and empowered participation of culturally different groups - of faculty, of teaching assistants, of students, of community members, and of research "subjects".

The resources of a multicultural organization will be conceived more broadly than in a monocultural or transitional system. People and their traditions, especially previously excluded or diminished peoples and traditions, will be seen as sources of strength and richness for the organization (in the sense that "problems" will be transformed into "opportunities"). In addition, current resources will be (re)allocated in ways that seek to realize multicultural objectives - providing for (re)training personnel, rewarding multicultural innovators and advocates, promoting new organizational structures and technology, etc.

Boundary management in the higher educational multicultural organization is a relatively permeable operation. It requires vigorous and effective outreach to minority suppliers and markets, to

K-12 educational systems, to recruiters and employers of graduates, to local oppressed communities, and a commitment to a global vision of multiculturalism. As a result, the organization is committed (and commits resources) to exporting its multicultural vision, and not simply to "fitting in" with the local community climate. Since all organizations are responsive to external constituencies' pressures and priorities, finding ways to mobilize and articulate positive market and governmental/community pressures and to reduce or buffer the impact of negative pressures is critical for multicultural change efforts. For universities that already see themselves as leadership institutions, and as institutions where new generations of leaders are being prepared, this means deliberate and proactive leadership in a multicultural form and context in local, national and (depending upon the particular college's reach) international affairs.

The interest in change in a multicultural organization is, as suggested above, both instrumental and moral: that is, it focuses on improvement in the bottom line performance of the organization as well as on the realization of greater social justice. We have previously noted some of the ways the multicultural agenda may be tied to bottom line concerns, especially in higher educational organizations. Given our specific societal and historic context, and the focus on public systems of higher education, the concern for social justice is appropriate and crucial: it is conceived as a vigorous anti-racist (and implicit in our concerns, anti-sexist, anti-classist and anti-homophobic) agenda. Moreover, it is a positive and proactive concern, not solely (or principally) generated in response to real or threatened protest or demands.

The constituencies for change in a multicultural organization include leaders of the dominant organizational coalition, internal groups of people of color who are truly empowered, internal groups of white and male executives and workers, and external markets or service recipients/providers. A key to recognizing a multicultural organization, then, is the degree of involvement, commitment and leadership to change taken by powerful whites, as well as by people of color; the burden of leadership and the risks of change cannot be borne only by people of color and other aggrieved groups. Strong linkage to extra-organizational forces and constituencies also is essential: given issues of individual and organizational vulnerability and resistance, these external parties sometimes are the only effective locus of pressure for change in the organization. In the university, relevant constituencies not only include members of the administration, faculty, student body and staff, but as well members of external alumni/ae, community groups, and (especially in the case of public universities) state and federal representatives.

The change strategies that can be employed by a multicultural organization, or by organizations moving in this direction, are numerous (Chesler, 1994). They include bottom-up as well as top-down approaches, conflict escalation or pressure-oriented as well as consensual and collaborative tactics, and the mobilization of internal as well as external forces and allies. Since the early stages of movement toward a more multicultural organization will require dislocation of traditional sources of power and privilege, it is most likely that the level of overt conflict will rise at first, hopefully to subside as progress is made.

Although these and other components of a multicultural organization can be identified, and perhaps serve as guides for change, the change process will be quite complex, time-consuming, non-linear, and replete with false starts and backward as well as forward movement. Moreover, it is not likely that progress will be made on all dimensions, nor at the same rate: principles of unbalanced development may be most appropriate and we can expect organizations to cycle and recycle through various "stages" and elements time after time. Every change effort, and every strategic plan for change, must "fit" the unique and local characteristics of the organization or organizational unit concerned (Chesler & Reed, 1996). While there are common elements usually present in one form or another, they take different shape in different organizations and organizational units. Thus, abstract principles of planning and change must take account of the local history, culture, goals, resources, key personnel and competing internal agendas.

8

violence and that anyone found guilty of code of conduct violations be subject to sanctions" and "That all administrative staff be required to attend a racial sensitivity workshop within one year of employment" (Gordon, 1991, p. 244). There has been considerable debate about "campus codes" and "sensitivity workshops", in terms of both freedom of speech concerns and their relative efficacy in dealing with campus cultures, but they stand here, and elsewhere, as examples of innovations designed to deal with monoculturalism and oppression, and with cultures that send a message of exclusivity and the accompanying high price of assimilationist inclusion.

Cultural change, like other changes discussed here, will not occur without conflict and struggle. This is normal, and an educational opportunity to engage people and ideas (and the institutions they embody and reflect) at deep levels of passion and value. But intercultural and multicultural issues, interactions and events often are fragile and delicate, operating as they do in the midst of a historically dominant white and Eurocentric national environment. They require skill and tenacity for productive engagement (rather than destructive engagement or avoidance). In this context, George Mason University stressed the necessity to "Develop new incident response/conflict resolution procedures for cross-cultural incidents;...and (to) recognize that such incidents are the responsibility of the whole campus community" (1991, p. 12). A similar suggestion was contained in the report from Indiana University (1992). Conflict resolution procedures will not prevent "incidents", but if they become part of the official culture they promise more respectful and mutually empowered ways of dealing with difference and conflict.

Power systems and decision-making. First and foremost, as Green indicates (1989, p. 9), "It is important that governing boards and chief executive officers be fully committed" to the multicultural change process. Their commitment may be reflected in public statements, the presentation of plans for change, the existence of diversity on their own staffs, and their willingness to allocate resources that support the change process (Green, 1989). But senior leadership cannot accomplish this process on their own; the advocacy and stewardship of middle-level officials and informal leaders throughout the organization also must be present and public.

In addition to the stance taken by traditional official leadership, a number of institutions have considered or recommended the introduction of advocacy voices of and for constituencies of color at senior levels of university administration. For instance, the Arizona State University report suggests "The University should create an office at the presidential level with responsibility for creating a matrix management model that will focus on student recruitment, retention and achievement. The supervisor of this office should report to the president" (1990, p. 21). Michigan State University also suggests such a role and reporting line, indicating the need for the Provost to "appoint a Senior advisor for Minority Affairs who will report directly to the Provost" (1991, p. 14). In a similar vein, the University of California system recommended repositioning the campus affirmative action officer to "include a direct reporting line (with) the chief executive officer" (1987, p. 74). The University of Massachusetts report suggests a somewhat different line of authority, albeit one with a very specific focus, "...someone with sufficient authority - other than the Chancellor - be assigned specific responsibility for resolving problems described in this report" (1986, pp. 51-52). The Princeton report urges a similarly high-level appointment, "a senior-level coordinator, reporting to the President or Provost, who is charged with overseeing the entire range of programs on campus that affect the quality of race and ethnic relations as well as minority life" (1993, p. 17). The justification for a centralized and powerful institutional office is argued clearly in the report from the University of Wisconsin; in discussing how to deal with problems of recruitment and retention of "ethnic minority students", they note that the University must "appoint a Vice-Chancellor of Ethnic Minority Affairs/Affirmative Action (and) Delineate clear lines of authority that control ethnic minority support programs. Only then will the University be able to develop sound management plan and allocate adequate resources to make these programs a success" (1987, p. 3).

Another major thrust is to increase the number of scholars and persons of color who now occupy senior administrative positions. At ASU the recommendation was made to mentor Chicano scholars who

may eventually "also fill administrative positions" (1990, p. 8). George Mason University's report likewise stresses the need to "increase diversity within the GMU Administration" (1991, p. 11), and Hirsch reports that the Columbia University response also recommended that "more full-time minority faculty and high level administrators be hired" (1991, p. 209). In more specific terms, the Smith College report argued that "The College should itself to reaching the minimum goal of 20% minority administrators by 1995-96" (1989, p. 2), and at MSU, "The administration will support four faculty members as administrative interns in the new CIC Leadership Fellows Program...to identify women and minority faculty with exceptional ability and promise who may wish to consider senior administrative leadership positions" (1991, p. 15).

Climate and social relations. Efforts to deal directly with the quality of faculty intergroup social and working relationships are often omitted from these reports and recommendations. Generally, such issues are seen as less important than other policy and program priorities. However, faculty isolation and exclusion from informal social and working relations is addressed by the report from Indiana University, which suggests that it "Establish a networking system that facilitates communication and support among members of the campus community who are concerned with multicultural understanding and enhancing diversity, and who oppose racial and ethnic intolerance" (1992, p. 40). And further, that the University "develop plans to include campus climate issues in evaluating faculty and staff performance" (p. 41). Moreover, it is explicitly suggested in the Indiana report that as part of this inquiry interviews be conducted with "minority faculty members who elect to stay at Indiana University in order to appraise the comfort level each minority faculty member perceives" (p. 44).

In contrast to the only occasional mention of faculty intergroup relations, there often is recognition of the troubled and inflammatory states of intergroup relations among students. Although considerable discussion has focused on the relationship between student comfort or sense of social support and academic achievement, these matters generally do not appear to be of primary concern to faculty, but are relegated to low level administrative leaders or to personnel in student services and staff support roles. Campus climate is the preeminent language for discussing informal relationships and attitudes of comfort or welcome on many campuses, and it often is a suggested focus of assessment or intervention efforts. In the Berkeley report, considerable attention is paid to students' views of their informal relationships - in and out of class - with students of other races and ethnicities (1991). Indeed, the omnipresence of separatism, both as a "preferred" group life style and as a response to perceptions of exclusionary treatment and harassment, is identified and decried in this report. Data from many other studies of intergroup and interracial relations on college campuses support the generalizability of this finding. A recommendation from the Berkeley report in this context suggests that: "over the course of the first semester, the university create and sustain small groups of students (10-15) who meet at intervals of no more than two weeks, the purpose of the meetings being to address problems of orientation, adjustment and integration into campus life...(and) Give institutional support which appears on the surface to have contradictory aims, i.e. support both (a) ethnic "support groups" and (b) groups which explicitly wish to form across ethnic and racial boundaries in behalf of some common purpose" (1991, pp. 59-60). Columbia University also explicitly addresses this issue in its recommendations: "We...urge that steps be taken to reform the way fraternities recruit new members in order that all students have the opportunity to join fraternities regardless of race and so that all students feel welcome in the fraternity system" (1988, p. 15). Further, Hunt, Bell, Wei & Ingle review several colleges' experiences in this arena and suggest that residence hall advisors and staff be trained in multiculturalism so they have the outlooks and skills that can support racially integrated living arrangements.

Indiana University takes a different and rather extensive approach to the problem of isolation, suggesting that a student mentoring program be instituted (1992). In a similar context, LeMoyne College suggests that during student orientation, and periodically throughout the campus and the academic year, the College institute "professionally conducted awareness and sensitivity workshops on race relations open to all members of the community and especially for students" (1991, p. 3). And at MIT it is recommended

that "Minority and non-minority students are encouraged to make special efforts to know members of different racial and ethnic backgrounds; to support each other as individuals and groups; to attend functions sponsored by different racial or cultural groups; and to jointly plan activities of interest to groups in the community" (1986, p. 21). A number of these concerns and plans repeat the focus on campus codes and sensitivity or awareness sessions and workshops that were discussed earlier in the section on culture and cultural change.

Green (1989) provides a useful list of interventions into the campus student climate; although many of her suggestions are directed to faculty and a wide range of other campus actors, we reproduce as Figure 3 a portion of this material focusing on student affairs administrators (1989, pp. 119-120).

Structure. Organizational structure provides the formal context within which activities and programs occur and operate. To be responsive and facilitative of different cultures and different groups' experiences will require a multiplicity of structural forms and some new ones: alternative ways of running meetings and different kinds of meetings (e.g., open town meetings as well as closed executive committees), ways of cutting through multiple levels of bureaucracy in order to act flexibly, alternative notions of (bureaucratic) efficiency, greater interdisciplinary and inter-unit interdependence and collaboration, varied venues for problem identification and problem-solving, new offices and programs designed for newly emerging needs (e.g., units designed and competent to respond to intergroup conflicts and mediation opportunities), the development of teamwork principles and support systems, and efforts to creatively overcome the firm division between academic and student affairs offices - especially in the context of living-learning issues surrounding diversity and multiculturalism.

Several of the innovations suggested earlier with regard to the power system of colleges and universities also represent or require structural innovations: this is especially true for those focusing on the creation of special offices dealing with matters of diversity and multiculturalism. Of course, the degree of structural innovation or adaptation required in this instance is dependent upon the actual power vested in this new office, and whether it is created with staff or line authority. In another structural innovation, the University of Michigan report suggests that the University "Provide full funding for minority hiring (of faculty) from central rather than unit funds" (1992, p. 12). This approach often is called establishing "targets of opportunity", wherein departments that hire faculty of color (or in some cases women faculty) do not have to do so out of departmental funds, and thus gain a "position" in their TO&E as well as a colleague. As we note later, this innovation, too, can cut both ways - it can either enhance or reduce unit initiative and responsibility for multicultural advance.

Technology - curriculum and pedagogy. Organizational technology is the means utilized to produce "outcomes", or to transform "raw materials" into "finished products". It is difficult to translate these terms in ways that capture the operations of service organizations, especially those in the field of education, but we can (at the risk of some dehumanization and diminution of their agency as more than passive material) consider students as raw material and the curriculum and pedagogy of instruction as the core technologies that seek to produce educated graduates of this system.

In the midst of great national debate and posturing about the existence and maintenance of "the canon", many universities have advocated new course requirements that attempt to increase students' experiential and/or academic understanding of issues of difference and domination in race and ethnic relationships. For instance, Arizona State University recommends "Establishment of a Cross-Cultural Awareness Course Requirement as a part of (its) Graduate Studies' Requirement" (1990, pp. 3-4) and "coursework about 'ethnicity in the Americas' as part of the general (undergraduate) studies program" (Gordon, 1991, p. 244). Recommendations at the University of Wisconsin are more elaborate, suggesting that "The University must implement a mandatory six-credit ethnic studies course requirement and create and develop various Ethnic Studies Programs" (1987, p. 4). And George Mason University recommends

13

FIGURE 3: CAMPUS CLIMATE INTERVENTIONS[*]

Strategies for Student Affairs Administrators

Student affairs personnel have a special role to play in improving campus climate. While the task should never be theirs alone, it is also true that the nature of their work and their personal contact with students made them particularly valuable contributors to the effort. In particular, student affairs personnel can:

■ *Review extracurricular programs and organizations to ensure that they meet the needs of minority students.* Sororities and fraternities, student clubs and programs can foster minority participation on campus. Their effect may also be negative if they are discriminatory, offensive, or unfriendly to minority persons. Student affairs personnel can work with fraternity and sorority advisors to establish and implement guidelines to ensure that their standards of behavior and membership practices are neither discriminatory nor offensive.

■ *Survey the residential climate for minority persons in all institution-owned housing.* Identify specific problems and design programs or policies to correct them.

■ *Make sure that resident hall advisors are sensitive to climate issues and receive training.*

■ *Hold workshops on climate for all students in residence halls.*

■ *Encourage the development and activities of minority organizations on campus.* These might include social organizations, academic and cultural groups, or other organizations that provide peer support for minority individuals or foster an appreciation of minority culture. Majority students, faculty, and staff should be encouraged to attend events featuring minority speakers or issues.

■ *Encourage minority students to participate and seek leadership positions in extracurricular activities.*

■ *Provide minority students with opportunities to acquire the skills necessary to seek leadership positions.* Appointing students to task forces and committees creates an important growth opportunity for all students; these experiences are especially important for minority students.

■ *Monitor student government spending to ensure that minority organizations and programs are funded at appropriate levels.*

■ *Encourage cooperative programming between minority and majority student organizations (such as Greek-letter organizations).*

---

[*] Green, 1989, pp. 119-120.

14

"Work assertively and collaboratively toward passing a CORE curriculum, including one or more required class(es) on cultural diversity" (1991, p. 12). Pennsylvania State University recommends that "...one or more courses on United States ethnic minorities be developed and offered on all campuses" (1992, p. 5). Wellesley College, too, suggests that "Every student should be required to take at least one course of a specified group of courses on a non-western culture" (1989, p. 12). Musil's (1995) review of curriculum development efforts at a variety of campuses highlights a lecture series on "ethnic Los Angeles" and a series of student seminars on "ethnic art" at UCLA, and courses to satisfy a "multicultural requirement" at Denison and other colleges. A number of other quite concrete examples of such innovations are provided in American Pluralism and the College Curriculum, a report from the Association of American Colleges and Universities (1995, pp. 28-40): the focus there is on innovative liberal arts courses examining "Experience, Identity and Aspiration", "U.S. Pluralism and the Pursuit of Justice", "Experience in Justice Seeking" and "Multiplicity and Regional Pluralism".

Another approach to the issue of curriculum reform or expansion speaks not to new and separate courses, but to the need to infuse present courses with inclusive subject matter, orientations and approaches. For instance, the Columbia University report recommends "that the staffs in the core courses, and the members of the DeBary Committee, consider how to include additional materials from minority cultures in the core courses (1988, p. 5)," and George Mason's report emphasizes the need to "Incorporate cultural diversity issues into the existing curriculum" (1991, p. 7). And at LeMoyne College it is argued that "faculty should be encouraged to include in their teaching, wherever feasible, discussions which involve the importance of the need to be able to function in a society and a world of differing values and cultures" (1991, p. 7); note here that the concern is with "discussion" as a classroom procedure as well as with the content of classwork. A rather comprehensive perspective is contained in the MIT report, which suggests that "There are initiatives that could be taken by the departments to help increase mutual respect and appreciation for their abilities and contributions of various groups represented within our community. These include: (1) enlisting Black faculty in the teaching of "core" courses; (2) adding subjects that deal with race and the history, literature, culture, and scientific and engineering contributions of Blacks and other minority groups; (3) integrating such concepts into existing subjects; and (4) offering Undergraduate Seminars, residentially-based Theme Seminars, Institute-wide colloquia, or IAP activities in these areas" (1986, p. 21).

At the University of Michigan, faculty and staff working with the Program in Intergroup Relations and Conflict have developed a series of "intergroup dialogues" that are offered for course credit (Zuniga & Nagda, 1993). Each dialogue course (Blacks and Jews, Gays and Straights, White Women and Women of Color, Men and Women, Latino/as and African-Americans, etc.) brings together students from different groups to talk with, understand, read about, learn from and share with others. The focus is on micro-level personal/interpersonal beliefs, attitudes and feelings as well as on macro-level analyses of the institutional and societal settings within which people live and learn.

In the reports reviewed, a focus on pedagogy generally is less present than a focus on content. One exception is in the Pennsylvania State University report, which suggests "a team taught course which would have to be technologically packaged by a joint venture partnership between University Park and the commonwealth campuses" (1992, p. 5). Further, the SUNY report suggests the development of "Programs to bring members of the teaching faculty into mentoring relationships with students..." and that "Funds should be available to encourage faculty in developing multicultural and pluralistic approaches in their disciplines, and to support time for retooling purposes" (1989, p. 52). Moreover, the Berkeley report suggests that "American Culture courses could lend themselves particularly well to a new pedagogical format. Given that these lectures are being newly formed and developed around the idea of comparative ethnic-racial perspectives, instructors need to be open to the idea that both they and their students are simultaneously engaged in a learning process that aims at being comparative" (1991, p. 61). What a simultaneous learning process is, or what multicultural and pluralistic approaches are, are not well articulated in these reports.

In a somewhat different vein, the George Mason report suggests that faculty may need assistance in developing new curricula and pedagogies: it is suggested that the University "Offer a number of specific professional development workshops for faculty (e.g., how to handle sexual harassment and rape charges, ways of dealing with difficult issues in the classroom, the unspoken rules of academia, etc.)" (1991, p. 13). Similar suggestions were actually put into place at Boston College, where "summer grants (were) awarded to six clusters of faculty developing courses with a strong multicultural emphasis, designed to fulfill core requirements (Musil, 1995, p. 19)," and Notre Dame developed a "two week intensive conference on curricular revision for approximately fifty members of the faculty" (Musil, 1995, pp. 22-23).

A particularly interesting (at least to us) and innovative faculty development effort has occurred at the University of Michigan, where a volunteer faculty group (FAIRteach, 1994) developed a program to (re)train other faculty to teach more effectively in the diverse or multicultural classroom. The workshops they conducted for faculty focused on the assessment and development of faculty skills such as the following:

-Making courses more multicultural in content
-Handling race and gender-related incidents in class with confidence
-Avoiding racist behavior as an instructor
-Adopting a teaching style that is compatible for students of color as well as for white students
-Utilizing class activities and assignments that are as compatible for students of color as for white students
-Incorporating critical thinking about race, ethnicity, gender and class issues in class
-Avoiding centering all authority on the instructor
-Helping students deal with differences in class
-Helping students deal with issues of dominance and disrespect in class
-Finding and using audiovisual materials about racial issues and histories
-Surfacing and dealing with covert racial and gender conflict effectively

Workshop designs included the creation and implementation of conceptual and strategic maps for mutual learning, as well as practical and experiential encounters with oneself and the above issues. These faculty development efforts essentially are exercises in "adult education" and "participatory education". A great deal of university cultures and structures have evolved in ways that privilege and support the wisdom that faculty members themselves have developed over their teaching careers. Thus, it is marginally effective, and often counterproductive, to "lecture at" faculty members; rather efforts were made to involve them in mutual learning activities, stimulated by materials and exercises developed together over the course of this work. Among the activities that usually were part of workshop designs were:

-Social identity group exercises
-Lecturettes
-Role-plays
-Vignettes or case studies to analyze and problem-solve
-Group discussion
-Presentations of "data" or evidence of problems and issues
-Personal reflections
-Fishbowl discussions
-Discussion and reaction as a total workshop group

Moreover, rather than impose pre-packaged designs on diverse audiences, the process of workshop planning and design usually was undertaken in collaboration with the department or college requesting the activity. Consideration initially focused on the nature of the audience (status level, prior peer relations,

discipline, interest) and their goals and concerns. Unfortunately, developing and providing one-time workshops usually resulted in the construction of short-lived "temporary social systems", sets of social relationships and perhaps changes that were not likely to be long-lasting (although some faculty obviously did make changes that were sustained over long time periods).

Another example of a coherent attempt to enhance faculty skills in teaching in diverse classroom environments comes from the experience at the University of Maryland at College Park. Figure 4 presents the content of a program that has been utilized, in one form or another, at several campuses and conferences (Schmitz, Paul & Greenberg, 1992). Numerous examples exist of specific campus Centers created to help "faculty and teaching assistants meet the instructional needs brought about by changing campus populations" (vom Saal, Jefferson & Morrison, 1992). Some of these faculty development efforts are long-standing operations only recently turning their attention to issues of diversity and multiculturalism, and others were formed specifically to focus on these issues. As vom Saal et al. (1992) note, frequently such development programs "trickle up from below", from the faculty and graduate instructors, but administrative commitment and leadership is essential in order to bring such efforts in from the margins and to integrate multicultural concerns fully into the teaching enterprise.

None of these faculty development efforts, nor the classroom implementations of lessons gained therefrom, are easy to sustain. If the collegiate climate and culture remains non-supportive or minimally supportive of such ventures, it will be difficult to recruit faculty to these programs and even more difficult for faculty to commit the time and energy and skill and courage to try out new designs in the classroom. For instance, Weinstein & Obear (1992) report the result of their inquiries with 25 faculty members regarding their anxieties and experiences dealing with issues of race and racism in the classroom. The most commonly reported fears include: "Confronting my own social and cultural identity conflicts...Having to confront or being confronted with my own bias...Responding to biased comments...Doubts and ambivalence about my own competency...Need for learner approval...Handling intense emotions, losing control" (1992, pp. 41-42). Unless these kinds of fears and concerns are dealt with, both at the individual level and via a more supportive unit and campus climate, little progress is likely.

In some cases the advising and counseling (or mentoring) aspect of classroom instruction was a focus for change. The Princeton University report suggested that the "Dean of the College be asked to study the effect of the advising system on minority performance, and that faculty and academic advisors be alerted to the particular challenges that some minority students face in the current climate" (1993, p. 18). Other initiatives involved student-centered and initiated projects - some of which occurred outside the typical classroom setting: at the University of the Redlands students developed cultural celebrations and intervention programs in campus living units and at Pitzer College students were linked in a service-learning experience to "the local Los Angeles community through internships and volunteer community service" (Musil, 1995, p. 35).

A final element of university technology, one not related to classroom instructional efforts, is the style, capacity and operation of research. This is an especially important focus of concern for major research universities, often the most elite and prestigious elements in our national system of higher education. Observers have raised many important questions and concerns about patterns of discrimination in the conduct of scientific research. These concerns include the potential ethnocentric and male bias of positivist (and other) epistemologies, the impact of varied data-collection methods, the role of insider-outsider issues in the generation of knowledge about (especially) traditionally oppressed groups, the privileged access of some groups to research funds and even to bias in access to and acceptance by research publication outlets (this is a vast and growing literature, but see, for instance: Billingsley, 1970; Collins, 1991; Cox 1990; Harding, 1993; Harding & O'Barr, 1987; Merton, 1972). Perhaps most interestingly, none of the reports reviewed herein addressed any of these concerns in the operation of scientific research.

**Appendix C: Content of Faculty Development
Programs (One-Hour and Three-Hour Formats)**

Topic 1: Demographic Data
Subtopics: changing student body, changing faculty, changing society
Purpose: to establish need for faculty to consider changing their classroom
behaviors

Topic 2: Principles of Effective Teaching
Subtopics: student-faculty contact, cooperation among students, active learn-
ing, prompt feedback, time on task, high expectations of all students,
respect for diverse talents and learning styles
Purpose: to establish joint assumptions about what constitutes effective
teaching

Topic 3: Differences in the Classroom
Subtopics: impact of age, culture, class, disability, ethnicity, gender, national
origin, race, religion, and sexual orientation of faculty and students on
classroom dynamics
Purpose: to encourage faculty members to acknowledge the difference that
difference makes in the classroom setting

Topic 4: Classroom Behaviors That Can Discourage Learning
Subtopics: ignoring students, cultural differences in eye contact, expectations,
singling out differences, joking, put-downs, interruptions, overprotective-
ness, condescension, stereotyping, communication styles, learning styles
Purpose: to create a relationship between faculty behavior and student learn-
ing; in each category, to discuss and give examples of both effective and non-
effective behaviors in order to replace negative behaviors with positive ones

Topic 5: Effects of Negative Classroom Behaviors on Learning
Subtopics: discourages participation, discourages help seeking, encourages
dropouts, lowers confidence, lowers expectations, inhibits faculty-student
communication, inhibits creativity
Purpose: to develop positive relationships between faculty behaviors and
effects on students

Topic 6: Evaluation of the Need for Change
Subtopics: peer evaluation of classroom behaviors, student evaluations of
classroom behaviors, videotaping classrooms, self-evaluation checklists
Purpose: to help faculty identify specific areas of behavior on which they
might focus

Topic 7: Specific Strategies for Change
Subtopics: clearly stated expectations, open communication with students,
developing awareness and checklists for noticing, experiment with different
assignments, seating arrangements, ways of recognizing students, ways of
asking questions, different questions, noticing humor, evaluation of curric-
ulum materials for omission and bias, monitor student-student interactions,
observing nonverbal messages
Purpose: to provide tools for modifying behaviors once areas in need of
change have been identified

Topic 8: Resource Packages
Subtopics: follow-up readings (two to five articles), list of people to contact
for further assistance, selected bibliography, list of follow-up workshops,
checklists
Purpose: to provide follow-up resources for those who wish to learn more
about specific groups

* From Schmitz, Paul & Greenberg, 1992.

A different form of research, institutional research was reflected in the very existence of some of these reports. Moreover, several reports suggested that institutional audits be developed in order to examine the local, culture, power structure, climate, etc., to determine the current state of multicultural affairs on campus and to create recommendations and remedies that might lead to a healthier and more just campus environment for all concerned (Chesler, 1996a).

Resources. Very few of the above programs and recommendations will be implemented, and even fewer will be sustained and successful, without the infusion or reallocation of resources. The examples provided in Musil (1995) and American Pluralism and the College Curriculum (1995) were partially funded by a special program generated by the Ford Foundation's Campus Diversity Initiatives Program. In addition to special funds targeted for specific programs, incentives can be provided to individuals or units that take leadership and innovate successful multicultural ventures (and by the same token, negative sanctions may be levied on recalcitrant or unsuccessful units).

Many colleges and universities have recognized the necessity to recommend, spur or support programs with local funding. For instance, the Arizona State recommendations suggest the allocation of $50,000 a year to the Hayden Library Chicano Research Collection, and an expansion of "efforts in order to devise summer academic bridge programs on campus targeted specifically at minority students from middle or junior high school and community colleges... recommends the allocation of $250,000 for these programs over and beyond the funds currently being allocated..." (1990, p. 17). Moreover, "The University should establish a Hispanic scholarship endowment of $2,000,000 to assure the appropriate scholarship funds will be available to deserving students as they matriculate" (p. 22). Thus, several different programs are to be supported by these resources: research facilities, recruitment and bridging programs for Hispanic students, and special scholarship aid for economically disadvantaged students. Other colleges have dedicated additional resources to academic support programs, such as special reading and writing enhancement projects and peer-counseling activities. In commenting favorably on a variety of administrative initiatives regarding projects and coursework focused on diversity, the Columbia report indicated that "These programs are in their very early stages, and that while we realize that the Dean of the College does not have a free hand in the allocation of academic resources, we recommend that all measures be taken to see that adequate funding is provided for the development of this work" (1988, p. 5). Hirsch reports that shortly after this report, and the major racial incidents that spurred them, "a gift of twenty-five million dollars for minority scholarships was announced" (1991, p. 208-209). The State University of New York report recommends that "A pool of funds should be set aside to support academic and student groups requests to observe special racial, ethnic or religious holidays or celebrations" (1989, p. 48), and that "Specific attention will also focus on the establishment of an early awareness financial aid program..." (p. 57). And Wellesley College suggests that "The College should establish an endowed fund, producing at least $150,000-$200,000 annually to support faculty research dealing with matters of race and ethnicity" (1989, p. 8). Multiple targets of new resource allocation are evident in several of these reports.

Resources also can be applied to enhance the infrastructure of support for diversity and multicultural efforts. For instance, Michigan State University suggests that "Beginning in 1990 Michigan State will establish the 'Diversity and Excellence Awards' for units and or faculty, students and support staff who have made exceptional contributions to affirmative action efforts at this University" (1991, p. 14). In addition, MSU suggests it will provide special funding for "research projects, travel, curriculum or program development...which are likely to contribute to affirmative action efforts at M.S.U." (p. 14). Thus, awards can be provided for academic as well as social innovations in support of the multicultural agenda.

Resources do not always have to be financial, they may be human as well. Indeed, a number of the above-noted financial packages are oriented to garnering additional human resources - students and faculty of color. In addition, post-recruitment efforts were noted as vital to supporting these human resources; as the Indiana University report indicates, it may be important to "Provide adequate financial support and

allocate the necessary human resources to improve the campus climate" (1992, p. 41). The George Mason University report further suggests the need to develop and utilize human resources in new ways: "Tap the resources of existing culturally diverse organizations (e.g., student clubs) in developing responses to cross-cultural friction on campus" (1991, p. 12). And the Smith College report suggests that "The Office of the Dean of Faculty should endeavor to develop formal relationships with historically Black colleges and universities in order to create regular faculty exchange programs" (1989, CCP, p. 1). Faculty members clearly are important resources, and faculty members of color are resources that must be actively sought and supported. Green provides, in Figure 5, a set of guidelines for improving the likelihood that faculty members of color will be retained, be promoted and achieve success (1989, p. 89).

. Inasmuch as the incentive and reward system embodies the normative frame for the allocation of many resources, alteration of these norms also may be an appropriate change goal. As the George Mason University report suggests, one can "Evaluate departmental reward systems for their effects on the likelihood of cultural diversity-related projects being carried out" (1991, p. 12). Perhaps another way of supporting departmental level innovation is, as suggested in the Indiana University report, to identify adequate financial resources "for every academic unit and student organization which invites minority performers and speakers to participate in cultural events" (1992, p. 51). It is important to emphasize again that while incentives are important to support the process of change, not all incentives need be financial in nature - encouragement and public recognition (as well as negative sanctions) are also relevant.

Boundary systems. Every organization must interact with its external environment, and must find a way of surviving and prospering in the context of societal and community events and relationships. This is certainly true for universities and colleges, especially publicly funded ones, and it is especially important to manage these boundaries and relationships effectively when dealing with issues of racism and racial justice. These relationships can affect student and faculty recruitment, housing opportunities for university personnel, action on a service mission, etc.

Several reports address these issues. For instance Arizona State University suggests that "the University should focus on developing strategic and working partnerships with public and private schools, community-based organizations, and other community groups involving parents" (1990, p. 16). In addition, this relationship is urged to be reciprocal, with the suggestion that "a body of three community leaders unaffiliated with the university investigate the racial incidents and issue a report on its findings" (Gordon, 1991, p. 244). And Wellesley College is urged to "establish an enrichment program for high school students in the Boston area" (1989, p. 11). More generally, LeMoyne College suggests the College "Establish a community involvement function under an Administrative auspice to plan and implement a program which LeMoyne can initiate and continue an effective presence in the minority community of Syracuse..." (1991, p. 7). And the University of Wisconsin report notes that "The University needs to reach out to the minority community in Madison. It should establish and support an Office of Minority Affairs housed in the Multicultural Center. This office will develop and coordinate programs to encourage interaction between the university and the minority community" (1987, p. 4). Similarly, the recommendations from Columbia University include a concern "that the University establish better relations with the surrounding minority community" (Hirsch, 1991, p. 209). More specifically, the Columbia University report suggests that the student orientation program should include community-related programming, such as: "(a) minority community leaders as keynote speakers in the orientation schedule; and (b) visits to cultural institutions in the Harlem community as part of the orientation schedule (e.g., Studio Museum, Schomburg Center, Apollo Theater)" (1988, p. 12). In addition, this report recommends that "the Dean give serious consideration to establishing a College prize to encourage student volunteerism and community service" (1988, p. 12). A number of colleges and universities have established "community service" or "community service learning" opportunities, and these activities cross the typical university-community boundaries by involving students in community service programs that are tied to academic

FIGURE 5: GUIDELINES FOR IMPROVING RETENTION AND SUCCESS OF FACULTY OF COLOR[*]

Retention and Professional Success

As with student recruitment, the task does not end once a faculty member is hired. As mentioned above, *all* junior faculty need to know what the expectations are before they are hired. Minority faculty have special burdens placed on them because they are so few. These expectations come from students, the community, and the institution. Unless institutions are prepared to recognize these contributions as being equally important as scholarship, tenure, and promotion criteria, ways must be found to lighten this load and ensure that minority faculty have the same opportunities for publication and professional growth as their majority counterparts. Some successful approaches to ensuring the success of junior faculty include:

- *Reducing teaching and committee loads in the first few years.*

- *Providing half-year sabbaticals in the third year.* A sabbatical at this point permits junior faculty to be sure that their research and publication are on solid ground well before the tenure review process begins.

- *Provide funds for research and opportunities to work with senior professors.* Junior faculty can benefit greatly from the sponsorship and mentorship of senior professors. Senior professors, usually white males, need to take an active role in working with their junior minority colleagues both in research and in advising them on how to navigate the tenure process.

- *Be sure that the tenure process does not disadvantage minority faculty members.* Faculty members who conduct research on minority issues and who publish in minority-focused journals may be disadvantaged in the tenure review process by their colleagues' lack of familiarity with these areas and publications, or by their devaluation of different scholarly endeavors.

- *Attend to the continuing professional development of junior faculty members.* The professional vitality of *all* faculty members is crucial to the well-being of any institution. Thus, a vigorous program of faculty development, encouraging new areas of research, improved teaching, and faculty leadership will benefit all. Institutions should ensure that minority faculty are well informed of opportunities and procedures for fellowships and grant support.

---

[*] Green, 1989, p. 89.

learning and course credit (these programs were given an enormous boost by President Clinton's support and advocacy).

In a somewhat different version of a boundary issue, the Smith College report recognizes the important role that alumnae play in the recruitment of students and that these alumnae may not be in tune with recent campus developments. Thus, it suggests that "Alumnae who recruit for the College should be thoroughly informed of the College's commitment to develop a more diverse community...Admission staff and alumnae groups might work together to develop strategies for alumnae recruiters to tap into different groups in their home territories" (1989, p. 3).

There is relatively little discussion in these reports of higher education's role in other aspects of town-gown relations that may involve issues of discrimination: practices of real-estate and service establishments, police behavior, minority contracting, etc. Discrimination and harassment in these areas are legion, and they impact upon the morale and quality of life of faculty, staff and students of color (Feagin & Sikes, 1994). In Figure 2 we suggested that proactive activity in this arena is one of the features distinguishing the multicultural and transitional stages of organizational development.

Summary. A number of these suggestions and potential innovations can be summarized in Figure 6: this figure replicates the dimensions of racism first portrayed in Figure 1 (above).

IV. CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF REPORTED PROJECTS AND PLANS

The policy and program innovations and changes presented in the prior section represent a considerable range of possibilities. They stretch across many components or elements of organizational life and raise many important issues. In this section we review these possibilities in terms of their underlying assumptions about collegiate organizations, their likelihood of implementation and their probable efficacy in dealing with the underlying issues of organizational racism and social injustice. Several questions are posed:

1. What definitions of multiculturalism, or what understandings of the problem of racism, are evident in these statements?
2. Which programs make most sense in terms of addressing the problems of racism and reaching the goals of multiculturalism in higher education? Which programs are most likely to represent and result in substantial change, rather than minor reforms or simple add-ons, or changes on the periphery rather than the center of organizational life?
3. Which programs are most responsive to the pain and pressure felt by students and members of socially disadvantaged and oppressed groups?
4. What strategies and tactics of change are involved in introducing and institutionalizing these programs/plans?
5. To what extent is all/most initiative seen and located internally, within the organization and its units or leaders? What attention is paid to the influence (and to proactively taking advantage of the influence) of external forces?
6. Which programs are most likely to be implemented and sustained - perhaps in the face of resistance? Is rhetoric likely to be transformed into action and policy into program, and is there likely to be ongoing support for changes?

FIGURE 6: EXAMPLES OF MULTICULTURAL PROGRAMS/ACTIVITIES' FIT TO THE MODEL

Mission
    Forthright policy statements
    Attention to multiple groups
    Link to other missions - e.g. excellence
    Justify change
Culture (overt/covert, formal/informal, dominant/subordinate):
    Revise code of conduct
    Race awareness training for administrators
    New norms and reward criteria
    Make room for subcultures to flourish
    Define communities of difference and commonality
    Symbols of "who we are"
Power/governance (leadership, decision-making, formal/informal, challenging/legitimate):
    Administrative review and proactive response to incidents
    Representatives of diverse groups and statuses (including students)
    Respond to challenge as opportunity
    Middle management role
Climate and social relations (communication and interaction)
    Student-faculty-staff-administration diversity task force
    Anti-racism awareness training for students, faculty and administrators
    Dealing with differences in dress, timing, emotional expression, conflicts, etc.
    Support for white males to change
    Retraining middle management
    Informal social events relating to workgroups
    Support groups
    Mentoring
Structure
    Flexible and fluid alternatives to formal bureaucracy
    Interdisciplinary and inter-unit collaboration
    Use of teams and teamwork
    Performance review systems
    Alternative meeting designs and ways of running meetings
    Accountability for multicultural progress
    Alternative problem-solving venues and procedures
Technology (people processing, curriculum, pedagogy):
    New curricula
    New pedagogy
    Alternative research methods/epistemologies
Resources and internal management (persons, skills, styles):
    Enrollment and hiring efforts
    Special funds for programs and program innovators
    Fairness in salary and other resource distribution
    Mentoring and retention/advance of human actors
Boundary management (external relations, markets):
    Placement of graduates
    Service to communities
    Anti-racist efforts in town-gown relations
    Minority contractors

The variety of <u>mission</u> statements represent different rationales or bases for organizational action. Most present the diversity or multicultural agenda as a matter of substantial concern, but how they do this varies greatly. Some address the core issues of institutionalized privilege and discrimination we have suggested is at the root of racism in higher education; others reflect a more or less strong effort to continue "equal opportunity" and "affirmative action" policies in hiring and retaining members of socially oppressed groups; still others address the need to acknowledge and "celebrate" different cultures. Indeed, some statements "own" their institution's involvement in a history of societal discrimination, while others do not begin with such acknowledgment; thereby different notions of responsibility for addressing such discrimination are in place. Moreover, some focus primarily or solely on race and racism as "the issue", while others connect concern for racism with action on other dimensions of social privilege and oppression. In our view, this "intersectional" or multicultural approach does not diminish a concern for anti-racism, or anti-sexism, but strengthens it by linking it these issues to a positive vision of social justice.

The statements excerpted from some reports suggest that action on these issues serves the interest of everyone, not just those of special groups or a minority. The argument that such action is good for the entire university - on whatever basis - and is not simply done for "others" - whether as acts of charity or good will - are very different. Indeed, all of the above options are rooted in different value frames, and each represents a different orientation to the problem of institutional advantage/disadvantage in dealing with discrimination and to its multiculturalist solution.

It remains to be seen to what extent these mission statements have been or will be related systematically and successfully to the core of each college's historic mission. For instance, in a recent workshop at a Catholic college the President opened the session on multiculturalism by stating that whatever its relevance for students' learning and the college's position in student recruitment efforts, it was, for him, primarily a "spiritual calling", an aspect of his relationship with his God and the religious/spiritual mission of the College. Other Presidents, at other colleges and universities, have been more or less direct in linking the multicultural agenda to the historic mission of their institution. The transition in legitimating mission statements presented by University of Michigan presidents (see earlier presentation) reflect different attempts in this regard; similarly the range of justifications presented in the excerpt from LeMoyne College permits many different audiences to select their own preferred rationale for action.

In any event, it is clear that mission statements alone do not carry the power for change. They may represent good public relations ploys, and they may even reflect the authors' and leaders' strongly felt commitments to change. But placing that rhetoric in public view is not the same as mobilizing the organizational resources required to change policy and practice.

Efforts to address the <u>culture</u> of the organization vary between ameliorative designs that seek to make room for or even celebrate alternative cultures and a focus on altering the dominant social and academic culture of the institution. If institutional racism is, in part, a cultural phenomenon, a socially constructed process of devaluing people based upon assumptions about their life and work, and the meaning or value of their existence and contributions, then the culture that supports this racism must itself be challenged and altered. In this context, it may be quite appropriate and useful to create separate support groups for faculty and/or students of color, to create special cultural programs and events, and even to design culturally separated housing or social units. But while these efforts may support culturally distinct groups by providing them with a safe nest within an alien environment, it is that alien and often hostile environment that must eventually be changed. Moreover, we are not particularly optimistic that organizational cultures can be altered by a focus on modifying individuals' attitudes or behaviors. The focus on "racial sensitivity" and greater understanding and interaction among varied groups may be useful and important in and of itself, but it does not necessarily translate into changes in the organizational culture (see Mohanty, 1989-90). Much more macro-level efforts must be made for this to occur. Thus, a priority must be placed on culture-changing designs that focus attention on altering or diminishing the power of the while male Eurocentric tradition that has supported institutional racism and that dominates in American society and its higher education institutions.

Some programs that focus on the organizational climate assert the need for "civility" in the face of differences, and for the development of conflict intervention or mediation programs to deal with heated and escalated incidents or confrontations among groups. Indeed, the call for trained intervenors, often specially prepared students, as intervenors in student intergroup disputes, is a popular endeavor in public elementary and secondary school systems as well as in colleges. George Mason University and Syracuse University (both through support from the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation's Program in Conflict Resolution Theory and Practice) have led the way in this effort. But once again, while this firefighting and conflict-reducing program may be effective and useful in diminishing heated and destructive exchanges, they do not necessarily address the basic culture of the organization that sets the stage - and perhaps even the inflammatory ground - upon which disaffected groups play out particular conflicts. Indeed, criticism of these programs often centers on their "cooling out" potential, the possibility that premature or power-asymmetrical negotiation may so diminish the power of protesting and challenging parties, and so produce peace and order without justice or change.

In like fashion, plans to alter cultures, or to promote civility, with "codes of conduct" and systems of sanctions for acts of racial and sexual harassment have been instituted at many colleges. And they often have been the focus of litigation and media ridicule, as examples of limits on freedoms of speech and the imposition of a surface form of political correctness. But it is clear that words hurt, and hurtful words ought to be dealt with forcefully (either in private exchange or via public notice). It also seems clear that rules and regulations are poor substitutes for educational and/or consciousness raising programs. Education is the business of our higher education system, and it makes good sense to introduce notions of civility - and indeed, arguments about what is proper civility (as well as the advantages of occasional incivility) in a pluralistic society - into the formal business of our colleges. Such a design places these issues of cultural transformation at the structural and curricular heart of the collegiate enterprise rather than at the individual and special program periphery. We return to this issue in a later discussion of curricular reform itself.

Power is the seat of privilege. Organizational power generally preserves and reproduces privilege for some and creates the constant struggle for leftover pieces of the social pie for others. Thus, these program suggestions must be reviewed in terms of their likelihood of altering the structures and processes of power that have held sway in the past, and that have, consciously or not, helped to preserve the system of racist privilege and oppression. A number of these reports suggest that a new central authority should be named to take responsibility for local multicultural change. Language suggesting the need for "clear lines of authority" and "someone with sufficient authority" imply a distrust in the power or ability of current leadership to move this agenda in a positive and timely manner. And the University of Massachusetts report is quite clear in its emphasis on the involvement of students, typically the main campus flashpoint for interracial tensions and incidents, in generating and implementing innovative programs.

The common call, repeated in excerpts from many of these collegiate reports, for members of traditionally underrepresented and oppressed groups to be recruited, trained and moved into higher-level faculty and administrative positions is a partial response to the existing monocultural structures of power in most higher education organizations. But as appropriate and necessary as it is to "diversely populate" the centers of organizational power, replacing one set of people with another is not necessarily a positive long-term solution. New powerholders, from previously unrepresented groups, often are placed in roles that lack line authority, are relegated to staff and advisory positions, and hold powerful roles in lightly valued arenas of organizational life. Thus, we see persons of color (and women) now present as Vice-Presidents or Deans of Student Affairs, Community Affairs and Minority (sic) Affairs, rather than as Academic Provosts and Vice-Presidents for Financial Affairs; they more often serve as Deans of Schools of Social Work, Education and Public Health, rather than as Deans of Schools of Liberal Arts, Law, Engineering or Medicine. Moreover, once placed in positions of traditional and mainstream authority, some will have a difficult time representing and reflecting in their actions the particular needs of distinctive racial and ethnic constituencies. At the same time, prevailing elites may still hold them accountable for "keeping these constituencies in check" and easing the life of more senior white and male powerholders. A central

question, then, is to what extent new members of the elite will operate, or be permitted to operate, any differently than their monocultural predecessors? Will they, and how will they, be supported by traditional (and still powerful) white male elites in these new roles? Power, after all, first protects itself!

Throughout our higher education system students and faculties may rail against apparently unbridled administrative power, but the truth about the way such organizations operate often is just as evident in unit and individual disregard for leaders' pronouncements with which they disagree. The structures of academic organizations rest on principles of faculty academic freedom and unit or department intellectual (and thus usually programmatic and operative) autonomy. Thus, new systems of governance that include representatives of the governed, especially those traditionally excluded from governance processes, in the design and implementation of multicultural policies and programs is essential. Such broader involvement and greater democratization is time consuming and requires substantial skill. But it also permits and indeed requires the resistance that exists to such changes to surface; then they can be faced and dealt with. Otherwise wonderful and enlightened decisions will be made and not followed, and resistance will continue to operate in passive rather than active form,

Plans to alter the climate of the organization permits us to examine various ways of assessing and responding to ignorance, intolerance and tension that are perceived at the interpersonal level of relationships, but that really are part of the embracing structure and culture of the organization. Many such efforts (and their accompanying analysis of organizational realities) focus primarily on student interracial attitudes and behaviors. On the one hand, it makes sense to make the concerns of this primary constituency or service clientele the highest priority and to frame the issues with a context of education for civic responsibility in a plural and democratic society. In addition, the priority exists here partly because this is where the most "noisy" and overtly destructive incidents seem to occur. However, this may not be the best place to begin – or to stay, once begun. Such a priority often overlooks the degree to which the state of the faculty and administration in fact determines much of the culture and operational structures that students enter and take part in. Moreover, the transitory nature of the student body means that changes attempted here must be organized in ways that are repeated every year - thus they must be institutionalized (in faculty and staff functions as well) to have any chance of being effective - and such institutionalization requires significant collaboration and participation from more temporally stable members of the university community. Finally, the focus on students often ignores the ways in which racism (and other forms of discrimination) are institutionalized throughout our society, and thus in the structure of the higher education organization itself.

Therefore, it would make sense for many of the options normally directed at the "campus climate", generally taken to mean students' relationships and interactions - racial awareness and education activities, sensitivity sessions, intergroup social events, intragroup social and support activities, resident hall and fraternity/sorority living unit innovations and educational programs, service learning options, conflict-intervention and mediation training, etc.- also be planned for staff and faculty members, or at least be implemented for students in ways that involve staff and faculty. Some of the most serious divisions in the collegiate environment are age-status related, and in some situations the alienation and conflicts that bedevil faculty-student and staff-student interactions may be more severe and resistant to change than those involving racial or gender relationships. Thus, there is a serious need to provide retraining events for faculty and staff, so that these actors may be able to take the lead in building new in-and-out-of class relationships with students in general, and especially with students from different social groupings and traditions.

Issues affecting informal relationships among parties often are rooted in the formal structure of higher education organizations. For instance, even the replacement of individuals in real seats of line authority, as suggested in the section on power, must be accompanied by transformation of the organizational structures and procedures that have helped to maintain racial privilege and oppression. New committees or concepts of teamness, decisional systems that reflect varied groups' cultural preferences, and new mechanisms for ensuring accountability for change are required. In this way the plans for

26

transformation of systems of racial privilege can be linked to new ways of doing organizational business, and do not have to rely on yet one more set of innovations within old systems of bureaucratic and elite (even interracial or pluralistic elite) rule.

Given the traditional patterns of decentralized authority and faculty autonomy that exist in most of our elite undergraduate colleges and large research-oriented universities, it is difficult for any single organizational leader to mandate new priorities throughout a multi-unit organization. In these complex organizations little consensus or integration may exist among various units that resemble feudal kingdoms. While innovation (or compliance) in one unit may spur adoption in another, it may just as likely spur competitive resistance, and the best efforts of central administrations may not lead to commitment in peripheral units. Indeed, some of our most noteworthy and prestigious institutions are the repositories of the extremes of privilege in this society, and thus of some of the extremes of resistance to the multicultural agenda - although to be sure such resistance is by no means limited to these institutions.

The structural innovations embodied in the suggestion that central administration funds be available for "targets of opportunity" at the departmental or unit level makes more resources available for hard-pressed units to diversify their ranks. At the same time, such largess may take the pressure off units to make hard choices. Sooner or later units must decide the extent to which their own scarce resources will be channeled to diversity and multicultural initiatives (in the same sense that it was much easier to garner public support for affirmative action in the expanding labor market of the 1960s-1970s than in the increasingly competitive and shrinking labor markets of the 1990s).

The aspect of organizational technology that has received the greatest attention in the literature on anti-racism (and other isms) and multiculturalism remains the collegiate curriculum. This is the major prerogative of the faculty, and its dominance as a focus of attention reflects, as no other discussion does, the central roles of the faculty both as maintainers of institutional power and privilege and as key stakeholders in any reform effort. With regard to curriculum reform, debates often focus on whether advancing multiculturalism in the curriculum means broadening (and enriching) the curriculum to include many groups' concerns and spokespersons (literature, scientific work, history) or whether it also requires "throwing out" many of the works of "dead white men" - diluting and deconstructing the canon. Clearly, advancing multiculturalism does not require destroying anyone's real history and valued perspectives, but on broadening the range of voices, experiences and realities available for inquiry. Indeed, many critics question just how diverse or multicultural recent curricular advances are, and whether they offer more than a celebratory and difference-oriented glance at issues of historic and contemporary dominance and oppression. However, the cry of canonical destruction continues to be raised by resisting forces as a shibboleth remindful of other visions of "destructive hordes that herald the end of western civilization." And the few cases where multiculturalism has been betrayed by wholesale trashing of Eurocentric traditions and single-minded enforcement of "political correctness" have lent the scent of reality to these shibboleths.

In like fashion, debates continues to occur regarding the proper role and (organizational) place of centers for Ethnic Studies (variously and perhaps multiply labeled and structured as Centers for African-American Studies, Latino Studies, etc.) or Women's Studies. It is clear that disciplinary exclusion of these intellectual traditions, and of students and scholars whose work focuses in these areas, has led many universities to establish separate and free-standing Centers for instruction and research. But is also is clear that, once constructed, many of these Centers are effectively marginalized and continue to be excluded from the core of academic life. The challenge, obviously, is to both separate and integrate these Centers, neither to exclude them via assimilation into inhospitable central disciplines nor to exclude them from the core via increasing marginalization.

In the context of these (often heated) issues of curricular content, less attention has been paid to matters of multicultural pedagogy or processes of instruction, although some recent faculty development efforts have begun to place this aspect of instructional technology almost on a par with the curriculum itself. Attempts to alter the traditional role and style of faculty behavior in the classroom threaten to

27

diminish faculty power and control in ways that faculty-led revision of the curriculum do not. But it is clear that one cannot "teach" or "help to learn" all students in the same way and still be effective. There is ready agreement that individual differences among students in learning styles impact on their ability to navigate the traditional educational enterprise, and that instructional designs should be responsive to these differences. Since some of these individual differences may be culturally or socially structured, they may reside to a greater or lesser extent within groups' particular cultures and patterns of learned behavior - including preferred ways of learning, relating with one another and generally dealing with academic authority. This is not to say that all white students learn best one way, or that all African-American students learn best another way, or that all Asian-American students learn best another way, etc. This sort of stereotyping and essentialism is to be avoided, but in avoiding it we still must pay attention to some trends that may be culturally related, and to considering the utility of a plural pedagogy that permits faculty to respond differentially to members of a diverse classroom. Moreover, to the extent that wisdom and skill in intergroup relations is not solely the property of adults (faculty and staff members) pedagogical innovations may be promoted that place skilled students in the lead of peer-directed learning environments and activities.

Whatever the shape of programs to diversify university curriculum and pedagogy, it is clear that faculty development or change efforts cannot be one-time events, nor can they proceed effectively if left to one-on-one situations. Change of this sort must be supported by long-term programs, and by programs that provide administrative, collegial and student support for innovative faculty efforts. Without connection to others trying similar classroom innovations, without support from departmental colleagues, and without a reasonable level of responsiveness from students, such innovations will not be tried or, if tried, will be short-lived. Multicultural classroom change is simply too lonely and risky a set of tasks for individual faculty members to take on by themselves.

One of the priorities of higher education, especially of research-oriented organizations, is the pursuit of truth and the generation of scientific knowledge. In this regard, the claim often is made that some cultures may have epistemological styles, and a fund of knowledge (scientific and popular, social and natural), artistic styles (visual and literary) and experiences that are not reflected in or represented best by western, rationalist, positivist epistemological frameworks and their accumulated bodies of scientific and artistic material. Once again eschewing essentialist arguments, it seems important to engage this claim, and to consider its relevance for the plural pursuit of knowledge in the sciences and the arts. Moreover, to the extent that collegiate representatives of oppressed social communities may have especially strong desires to conduct research that directly serves these communities, they may promote alternative research visions and methods (i.e., ones more focused on the generation of applied and directly usable rather than academic knowledge, that serve oppressed rather than elite or governing constituencies, that are tied to action plans, or that even are initiated with partisan policy and program commitments). It is striking that so few of these issues were raised in any of the campus self-reports cited herein.

If power is the seat of privilege, the control and allocation of resources is the language through which power speaks and acts. And although most of these reports suggest the (re)allocation and expenditure of considerable funds in multicultural change efforts, it remains to be seen whether those funds really become available and, if available, are applied in the manner suggested. Moreover, funds are not the only, nor sometimes even the most important, resource. People are a resource: and several reports address the need to recruit and retain (and advance) larger numbers of students, staff, faculty and administrators of color. Fewer reports, but still an impressive number, address the need to go beyond recruitment, and to build in systems of social and financial support for new organizational members. Many institutions have found it easier to fund multicultural innovations than to expend time, energy and funds in altering the culture and structure of the organization in ways that bring these new people and other innovations into the mainstream of organizational life and sustain them over time.

In addition to funds and people, resources such as skill and organizational authority also often are in short supply when it comes to making multicultural changes. Perhaps most importantly, multicultural

28

advances will require people skilled in planning organizational change, in developing realistic strategic plans, and in doing so in ways that can acknowledge and overcome the traditions of racism, sexism, etc., noted previously.

The process of organizational change can also be facilitated by the allocation of funds and related resources to those units that take the lead in successfully making progress on the multicultural agenda. Such an approach once again places the priority on organizational rather than individual action for change.

Finally, changes have been suggested in the boundary systems of higher education organizations. The historic notion that colleges and universities should wall themselves off from local communities, and adopt a policy of non-intervention in local affairs was built on the conception that such a stance would also guarantee autonomy and community non-involvement or intrusion into university affairs. Many of the reports reviewed here, and indeed much of the literature on multicultural change in organizations, proceeds with an emphasis on the role of internal factors (leadership, voluntary activity) in the change process. But it is clear that powerful factors in the external environment exert pressures for both stability and change (in various directions and sometimes both at the same time) and this is certainly true for educational organizations facing the challenge of diversity and multiculturalism (Richardson & Skinner, 1990). Organizations must somehow adapt (not necessarily comply) with these pressures if they are to maintain both their internal integrity and their access to external resources. For instance, major demographic and economic shifts have occurred, in our nation at large and in our college-bound population, and these shifts have led to an expanded need for higher education. Partly in response, governmental pressures in support of affirmative action, sometimes in the form of threats and sometimes as incentives, has led to increased enrollments of students of color (Hanna, 1988; Hyer, 1985). In turn, increased enrollments of students of color has impacted not only the complexion of student bodies, but as well the curriculum, student services and collegiate climates (Hunt, Bell, Wei & Ingle, 1992). External incentives and pressures also exist at the other end of the "throughput system", from the employers of university graduates - the "users" of educational "products". Numerous corporate and governmental organizations have created partnerships (with added resources attached) with higher educational systems in an effort to guarantee preparation and recruitment of a workforce with the skills to operate in a multicultural environment (Jennings, 1993), and some local school systems have stressed the need for university colleges of education to similarly prepare their eventual employees for such classroom opportunities.

Eventually, it will be impossible to create and sustain a multicultural university in the midst of a monocultural community. Thus, the suggestions in several of these reports that universities reach out to provide service to local communities (e.g., link to elementary and secondary school systems and create "partnerships") makes good sense, although the unspecified character of these partnerships makes it unclear whether they will actualize the multicultural agenda in form as well as function. In other ways, as well, universities may be advocates in community settings, especially, but not limited to, ways in which community activities impact on university personnel and functions (police interactions with students and staff, real estate practices impacting faculty and staff home purchases, bank lending practices, etc.). Relatively little attention is paid in these reports to the reciprocal relationship between universities and local communities regarding issues of discrimination and diversity. That is, while attention is paid to university outreach to communities, little focus is on community engagement with the university. From decisions about suppliers of goods and services (preferential purchasing from minority suppliers) to community representation in university decisional councils, a variety of options are available that permit the community and the university to work across traditional boundaries in the pursuit of multiculturalism and social justice.

While we have discussed various elements of the organization of higher education in more or less sequential fashion, it is clear that action for change on these elements does not proceed separately or sequentially, but may (and should) fit together in integrated plans. For instance, changes in classroom pedagogy will, if effective, necessitate changes in the structure of units and unit reward systems. And as we have noted, changes in university structure imply alterations in the power system of the organization.

29

Certainly support for multicultural climates and curricular change require new resources. And so on. No single innovative effort need wait for a comprehensive and integrated strategic plan, but it is important to consider ways of increasing the effectiveness of the overall challenge to racism and sexism via the use of integrated change efforts.

With this perspective on the organizational elements addressed and/or impacted upon by the programs and projects suggested in these reports, we can now focus our attention on addressing the several questions raised at the beginning of this section.

1. What is multiculturalism? It is clear that different definitions of diversity and/or multiculturalism are being used in these different reports and in their different sections. As previously noted, and as illustrated generically in Figure 2, they range from tolerance for and celebrations of difference to efforts to dismantle prevailing systems of cultural and structural dominance in order to permit differences to flourish. Few higher educational organizations have developed visions that go beyond the transitional stage of multicultural development, and even fewer have established change plans that would get them there.

It is rare for leaders of colleges and universities, even those leaders who have stepped out in front to advocate diversity, to forthrightly note the embedded racism and sexism of their institutions. Oppression is still seen as an aberration rather than part of the warp and woof of institutional life in the United States. Some of the reports we have referred to do explicitly charge institutional racism and oppression at the heart of the collegiate enterprise, but that does not mean that their interpretation has been accepted by a wide variety of local institutional leaders and decision-makers. If not, multiculturalism can easily be interpreted and practiced as a celebration of difference, as political correctness, as essentialist separation or as watering down the anti-racist and anti-sexist nature of our own diagnosis and analysis.

2. Which programs address racism and the need for fundamental change? A central aspect of systems of racial, gender and class oppression in the United States, and its various institutions, is the system of power that benefits from and maintains such oppression. Therefore, only the alteration of those systems of power - in and out of colleges and universities - will fundamentally alter oppression. But that may be a unrealizable goal, at least in the short run, so it is useful to consider carefully what other alterations can support and advance the multicultural agenda. Clearly, wholesale and long-term efforts to alter the organizational culture and structure, including its operating procedures and policies - its technology, etc. - are required. It is unlikely that any of these central organizational components can be successfully altered without significant impact on other components. Thus, an integrated design, developed via a strategic planning process, makes good sense and is an effective antidote to happenstance, reactive and piecemeal planning for change.

In addition, a focus on the importance of changing the organizational culture and structure should not bypass the necessity to plan for continuing changes on the part of those individuals who are members of the organization. As individuals we all have work to do in reducing our own "baggage" of racism, sexism, classism, homophobia, etc., and in ensuring that those legacies do not continue to be passed on unwittingly or unwillingly (or via any means) to another generation of students. Just as individual students need access to more diverse sets of educational materials, so do faculty need access to retraining opportunities, to sessions in which they can gain skill in teaching and working differently - with students and with peers. Recent research in multicultural education has delineated some of the stages of student racial identity group development, and the implications of the various developmental stages for classroom activities and interactions (Hardiman & Jackson, 1992; Tatum, 1992). By the same token, faculty and staff members have different levels and types of understanding of multiculturalism, and of their own ethnic and other identities. Efforts to help all people in the higher education environment to consider these issues may present some very different avenues for collaborative work. In addition, departments must be able to provide a supportive environment within which individuals can take risks in trying new procedures, in relating with one another more openly and honestly, and in sustaining the courage to change. Efforts to create increased opportunities for intra-unit dialogue and collaborative problem solving would assist in this

30

effort; so would administrative leadership in providing rewards and incentives for classroom change. Most importantly, these efforts cannot occur only on a one-time basis; they must be built in to the normal operating procedures of units, and be part of the ongoing incentive structure.

Resistance to the multicultural agenda often surfaces in the form of fears that cherished programs will be destroyed or supplanted by new developments. This often is direct evidence of the persistence of a sense of privilege, privilege embodied in the representation of one's own culture and beliefs in institutional format and program. At the same time that such organized privilege must be challenged, not all cherished programs reflect inappropriate privilege, and not all should be jettisoned. It is important to maintain a balance between new missions and organization structures/processes and those established traditions and procedures that continue to have great value for the organization.

3. Which programs respond to concerns of students and people of color? The most direct and observable stimulus for the harassment, discrimination, pain and anger experienced by students of color come from peer actions. Students of color, African-American and Latino/a students especially, have been the victims of quite open harassment at a number of colleges and universities. White attacks on African-American students clearly were the precipitating incidents that led to campus reports and subsequent change efforts at the University of Massachusetts and Olivet College, and these students' reactions to racist graffiti in dormitories the stimulus at the University of Michigan. Other colleges have their parallels, sometimes involving the actions of campus or municipal police forces, and the occasionally overtly discriminatory behavior of faculty and staff. On the primary basis of student-student behavior as the stimulus for public concern, efforts to deal with the campus climate, especially in terms of "changing students' attitudes" and "educating students" via a few new courses have become very popular.

But these incidents, and thus these responses, are only the tip of the iceberg of institutional racism and sexism. As we have argued throughout, and illustrate in Figure 1, these are but the most visible manifestations of systems of privilege and oppression that run through all components of the higher educational organization. Moreover, no significant change in students' intergroup attitudes and behaviors are likely to occur and be sustained unless other aspects of the institutional structure and culture also change; and no small number of special courses on intergroup relations will alter the educational diet unless there is parallel redevelopment of the remainder of the collegiate curriculum. Thus, while it is important to respond, and to develop proactive responses, to the "immediate causes" of pain experienced by the most vulnerable members of socially disadvantaged and oppressed groups, these efforts must be complemented by changes in the more distal structure and culture of organizational life.

4. What change tactics are discussed? In addition to thinking about the specific programs involved in a multicultural change effort, decisions must also be made about the strategies to follow in undertaking the change-making process. This is a complex problem, especially since colleges and universities often are notoriously decentralized, with transient constituencies and multiple centers of power, and varying norms about administrative authority and control. The very notions of academic freedom and individual faculty/unit autonomy make coordinated change efforts difficult to achieve. They also lend fuel to the defensive posture of those powerful white males who feel that their individual rights and privileges are unfairly compromised by collective moves toward multiculturalism and change. In addition, the lack of a clear bottom line of sales efficacy or customer market control, or even of ready agreement among all organization members about what constitute the concrete aims of the instructional process, let alone higher education itself, make accountability and coordinated action difficult. The institution and institutionalization of change in loosely-coordinated systems of higher education will occur quite differently than in pyramidical and obedient corporate or governmental organizations. When we add to this mix the often controversial issues involved in multicultural change, we face some very difficult issues and choices.

The clearest choices regarding change-making strategies are those that distinguish between consensus-oriented and conflict-oriented approaches (Chesler, 1994). This distinction is somewhat stereotypical, because most strategies employed in the real world are a mix of these two approaches, but it may clarify our thinking and planning to consider this dichotomy, however briefly. Figure 7 (from Chesler,

31

FIGURE 7: WAYS OF THINKING ABOUT MAKING ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE*

	The "OLIVE BRANCH" approach: Trust and communication - Consensus	The "TWO BY FOUR" approach: Power and pressure - conflict
ASSUMPTIONS	Everyone is in this together	Not everyone is in this in the same way or for the same things
	Decision-makers can and do want to improve the situation Lower-level members do not have a lot to say or do about it	Power brokers will not improve the situation on their own Lower-level members can and do have a lot to say and do about it
	Not too much is wrong	A lot is wrong
	Conflict is unnecessary and can be overcome	Conflict is natural and can be a force for change
GENERAL APPROACH	Cooperative problem-solving	Constituency organizing and surfacing conflict
	Appeal to decision-makers with information with needs or concerns with grievances/requests with shared values	Persuade and pressure power brokers with information with pressure with incentives with demands
	Educate and persuade managers with reason with information with incentives with support with new options	Threaten managers with disclosure with embarrassment with disruption with lack of support with a "way out"
WORKING "WITH"	Decision makers and staffs	Others of the constituency or interest group
	Internal informal influentials	Internal cadres External agents/agencies
	Consensus	Coalition

---

* Chesler, 1994, p. 15.

1994) distinguishes between these strategies. While recent events suggest that little progress may be made without protest and coercion, and that reliance on voluntary commitment to change is inadequate, too great a reliance on coercion fuels the fires of resistance. It also is clear that too great a reliance on persuasion and voluntarism may fail to create a sufficient sense of urgency and fail to sustain action for change. This tactical dilemma is especially problematic in organizations of higher education, where alleged norms of collegiality and the search for truth lead to strong preferences and norms in support of consensual decision-making. Of course, these norms are much more prevalent in rhetoric than action, and often disguise a subtle system of pressure and coercion. They also often mask resistance - sometimes to the multicultural agenda and sometimes to any action for change. Sooner or later adversaries must sit down and a table and negotiate or problem solve with one another.

Leadership for the multicultural change effort may come from, and indeed must come from, many sectors of the university. Faculty initiatives provide leadership to this agenda when the focus on change efforts is the curriculum, and faculty efforts to pass race/ethnicity graduation requirements and to initiate new courses occur frequently - with or without assistance from mobilized student groups. Certainly there are examples of administrative leadership on this agenda. The Michigan Mandate, authored by James Duderstadt represents a major initiative taken by a university president. This Mandate occurred partially in response to student-initiated protests and demonstrations, but its continuing update well after protests had died down reflects the vision and leadership energy of this administrator. Other university presidents and provosts have taken similar leads, in oral or written presentations, especially in the face of recent attacks on affirmative action programs (see remarks of Presidents of Harvard University and UCLA, among others). And they have been both applauded and attacked for their efforts. Seldom have alumni and local community members been involved as powerful actors in multicultural change efforts; as a result most alumni sentiment is expressed sub-rosa. Since most alumni of most major colleges and universities are white, their memories of white-dominated educational organizations (as well as their own locations in a white-privileged society) become the prevailing - and negative - framework for their views of multicultural change. We already have indicated how common it is for this agenda to become an organizational priority as a result of mobilized student protest. In many places students formed Unions, Ethnic Associations or Multicultural Coalitions to demand university response, and their protests precipitated system-wide attention. The University of Massachusetts report, almost alone among the campus reports cited herein, calls for meaningful and sustained student representation in the multicultural change-making process. Overall, student initiative (and the deep concerns students have about these issues) has not been treated or institutionalized as a powerful force in planning or implementing sustained and system-wide change. Nor has much attention been paid to the development of student-faculty-staff-community-etc. coalitions for change.

These alternative centers of leadership or initiation for change efforts do raise the question of what mix of "top-down" and "bottom-up" strategies should be employed. Clearly, strong support from senior-level faculty and administrative leaders is essential for any systemic change effort to be successful. And this leadership must take the form of supportive material as well as cultural or symbolic resources and statements. Just as important, however, is leadership and energy from below. Without the critical role of student mobilization in placing the issue of multiculturalism on many colleges' agendas, without their efforts and generally without their strong protests, a lot less would be forthcoming from most the administrative centers. Given students especially transient status in the organization, special efforts will have to be made to sustain contact with their leadership efforts. The same is true for the activity of faculty members in the trenches - in the classrooms, advising offices, and student activity centers where these issues are discussed. Thus, an important principle is to involve varied constituencies in the change-making process. In particular, it is essential to include members of traditionally oppressed and excluded groups: people of color, women and students. And just as essential is the involvement of sympathetic elements of traditionally privileged groups: men and white people from all sectors of the university and community!

Indeed, if multicultural change is to be institutionalized systemically - in classrooms, in residence halls, in informal gatherings, in departments, in policy statements - leadership must be forthcoming from all sectors of the college.

5. Is there a focus on external as well as internal factors? While a number of these reports suggest increased need for interaction and cooperation between higher educational organizations and their external environments, few treat the external environment as a powerful force impacting the nature of the multicultural agenda on campus and the shape of local responses. Even fewer do so in ways that acknowledge the often raw politics of these relationships (including court decisions, public referenda, etc.). The result is a continued (and often unrealistic) emphasis on internally driven change efforts and the primacy of voluntarist programs and general good will.

6. Which programs will be implemented/sustained? This review of the numerous options for change contained in a series of reports raises the question of the extent to which the proposers and audiences of these reports can and will implement any of these quite attractive change designs. Under what conditions are varied members of higher educational organizations likely to undertake and sustain multicultural change efforts? While we lack the evidence to respond to this question we address it briefly in the conclusion.

V. CONCLUSION

This is, for the time being, a paper without a conclusion, as it is a story without an end. We have yet to see whether the multicultural agenda in U.S. higher education can and will be sustained. While it appears that many colleges and universities are struggling with these issues, and are locatable within the transitional stage of organizational multiculturalism (see Figure 2), strong and sustained action on the innovations noted in Figure 6 will be required to make further progress. Moreover, as noted above, these innovations must be institutionalized, linked to broader changes in the racist structure and culture of these institutions, for progress to continue. And clearly this will not be easy: as the multicultural agenda has made headway strong forces have surfaced to challenge it See, for instance, Chesler, 1996b). Whether or not institutions of higher education will generate the political will, technical skill and personpower to persevere in this effort remains to be seen. In the next few months we plan to continue this exploration by inquiring into the actual progress made by campuses in acknowledging (or not), accepting (or not) and implementing (or not) the suggestions cited in their own reports cited herein.

REFERENCES

American Pluralism and the College Curriculum. Washington, D.C., Association of American Colleges and Universities. 1995.

Arizona State University. Chicano Faculty and Staff Association Strategic Plan, 1990-1995. 1990.

Billingsley, A. Black families and white social science. Journal of Social Issues. 1970, 26, 127-142.

Chesler, M. Planning multicultural organizational audits in higher education. (mimeo) 1996a.

Chesler, M. Resistance to the multicultural agenda in higher education. (mimeo) 1996b.

Chesler, M. Strategies for multicultural organizational development. The Diversity Factor. 1994, 2 (2), 12-18.

Chesler, M., & Crowfoot, J. Racism on campus. In May (Ed.), Ethics and Higher Education. New York, MacMillan. 1991.

Chesler, M., & Crowfoot, J. Visioning change: Stages in the movement from monocultural to multicultural organizations. (mimeo) Program on Conflict Management Alternatives, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan. 1990.

Chesler, M., & Reed, B. Strategic planning for multicultural organizational change in higher education. (mimeo) 1996.

Collins, P. Black Feminist Thought. New York, Routledge. 1991.

Columbia University. Columbia College Committee on Race Relations. (Report to Dean Pollack) 1988.

Cox, T. Cultural Diversity in Organizations. San Francisco, Berrett-Koehler. 1993.

Cox, T. The multicultural organization. The Executive. 1991, 5 (2), 34-47.

Cox, T. Problems of research by organizational scholars on issues of race and ethnicity. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science. 1990, 26 (1), 5-23.

Crowfoot, J., & Chesler, M. The role of white men in multicultural coalitions. In Bowser & Hunt (Eds.), The Impact of Racism on White Americans. Newbury Park. SAGE Press. 1996.

FAIRteach. Workshops Presented by FAIRteach 1/91-11/94. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan. 1994.

Feagin, J., & Feagin, C. Discrimination American Style: Institutional Racism and Sexism. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice Hall. 1986.

Feagin, J. & Sikes, M. Living with Racism: The Black Middle-Class Experience. Boston, Beacon Press. 1994.

George Mason University. Cross-Cultural Conflict and Consensus Building Opportunities in the George Mason Community. The Conflict Clinic, 1991.

Gordon, L. Race relations and attitudes at Arizona State University. In Altbach & Lomotey (Eds.), The Racial Crisis in American Higher Education. Albany, N.Y., SUNY Press, 1991.

Green, M. (Ed.). Minorities on Campus. Washington, D.C., American Council on Education. 1989.

Hanna, C. The organizational context for affirmative action. Journal of Higher Education. 1989, 59 (4), 390-411.

Hardiman, R., & Jackson, B. Racial identity development: Understanding racial dynamics in college classrooms and on campus. New Directions in Teaching and Learning. 1992, Winter, 22-37.

Harding, S. (Ed.). The Racial Economy of Science. Bloomington, Indiana University Press. 1993.

Harding, S., & O'Barr, J. (Eds.). Sex and Scientific Inquiry. Chicago, University of Chicago Press. 1987.

Hirsch, E. Columbia University: Individual and institutional racism. In Altbach & Lomotey (Eds.), The Racial Crisis in American Higher Education. Albany, N.Y., SUNY Press, 1991.

Hunt, J., Bell, L., Wei, W., & Ingle, G. Monoculturalism to multiculturalism: Lessons from three public universities. New Directions in Teaching and Learning. 1992, 52 (Winter), 101-114.

Hyer, P. Affirmative action for women faculty. Journal of Higher Education. 1985, 56, 282-299.

Indiana University. The Hoosier Plan for Minority Enhancement. 1992. (Draft)

Jackson, B., & Holvino, E. Multicultural organizational development. Program on Conflict Management Alternatives Working Paper #11. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan. 1988.

Jennings, K. Recruiting new populations to the library profession. <u>Journal of Library Administration</u>. 1993, 19 (34), 175-191.

Katz, J. Facing the challenge of diversity and multiculturalism. Program on Conflict Management Alternatives Working Paper # 13. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan. 1988.

LeMoyne College. <u>Self-Study</u>. 1991.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology. <u>The Racial Climate on the MIT Campus</u>. Minority Student Issues Group. 1986.

Merton, R. Insiders and outsiders: A chapter in the sociology of knowledge. In <u>Varieties of Political Expression in Sociology</u>. Chicago, University of Chicago Press. 1972.

Michigan State University. <u>College Level Planning Program: Faculty and Academic Staff Diversity Survey</u>. Social Science Research Bureau. 1991.

Mohanty, C. On race and voice: Challenges for liberal education in the 1990s. <u>Cultural Critique</u>. 1989-90, 179-208.

Musil, C. <u>Diversity in Higher Education</u>. Washington, D.C., Association of American Colleges and Universities. 1995.

Pennsylvania State University. <u>Enhancing Diversity: Toward a Better Campus Climate</u>. Committee on Lesbian and Gay Concerns. 1992.

Princeton University. <u>Race Relations at Princeton</u>. R. Simmons. 1993.

Richardson, R., & Skinner, E. Adapting to diversity: Organizational influences on student achievement. <u>Journal of Higher Education</u>. 1990, 61 (5), 485-511.

Schmitz, B., Paul, P. , & Greenberg, J. Creating multicultural classrooms: An experience-derived faculty development program. <u>New Directions for Teaching & Learning</u>. 1992, 49, 75-87.

Smith College. <u>The Smith Design for Institutional Diversity</u>. (Appendix of recommendations from CCP) 1989.

State University of New York. <u>Campus Climate and Bias-Related Behavior</u>. Office of Student Affairs and Academic Programs. 1989.

Tatum, B. Teaching about race, learning about racism: An application of racial identity theory in the classroom. <u>Harvard Educational Review</u>. 1992, 62 (February), 1-24.

Tierney, W., & Rhoads, R. Enhancing academic communities for lesbian, gay and bisexual faculty. <u>New Directions for Teaching and Learning</u>. 1993, 53, 43-50.

University of California. <u>The University of California in the 21st Century: Successful Approaches to Faculty Diversity</u>. J. Justus, S. Freitag, L. Parker. 1987.

University of California at Berkeley. <u>The Diversity Project</u>. Institute for the Study of Social Change. 1991.

University of Massachusetts. <u>Report on University of Massachusetts Investigation</u>. 1986.

University of Michigan. <u>Faculty, Staff and Students of Color: A Statistical Profile for Academic Years 1981-82 Through 1991-92</u>. Office of Affirmative Action and Office of Minority Affairs. 1992.

University of Wisconsin-Madison. <u>Final Report</u>. Steering Committee on Minority Affairs. 1987.

vom Saal, D., Jefferson, D., & Morrison, M. Improving the climate: Eight universities meet the challenges of diversity. <u>New Directions for Teaching and Learning</u>. 1992, 49, 89-102.

Weinstein, G., & Obear, K. Bias issues in the classroom: Encounters with the teaching self. <u>New Directions in Teaching and Learning</u>. 1992, 522, 39-50.

Wellesley College. <u>Report of the Task Force on Racism</u>. Task Force on Racism. 1989. (Draft)

Zuniga, X., & Nagda, B. Dialogue groups: An innovative approach to multicultural learning. In Schoem, Frankel, Zuniga & Lewis (Eds.). <u>Multicultural Teaching in the University</u>. New York, Praeger. 1993.