

**FINAL REPORT
OF THE EXTERNAL REVIEW TEAM
FOR THE SELF-STUDY OF DIVERSITY
AT OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY**

December 17, 2012

**Daryl G Smith
Sharon Parker
Michael Tate**

**FINAL REPORT OF THE EXTERNAL REVIEW TEAM
FOR THE SELF-STUDY OF DIVERSITY AT OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
December 17, 2012**

Introduction

In the summer of 2011 President Ray established a self-study task force to engage OSU in considering equity, inclusion, and diversity efforts institution wide. This self-study was inspired in part by the reorganization of three offices related to diversity, but was more fundamentally about serving the purpose of identifying the institutional efforts needed to build capacity for diversity throughout OSU.

As part of the process, Angelo Gomez, Interim Executive Director of Equity and Inclusion established an external review team consisting of Daryl G Smith, Professor of Education and Psychology at Claremont Graduate University, Sharon Parker, Assistant Chancellor for Equity & Diversity at University of Washington Tacoma, and Michael Tate, Chief Diversity Officer and Professor of Human Development, Washington State University. The team received the self-study and then spent two full days on campus (October 24-26) meeting with a wide variety of groups (Appendix A includes the schedule of visits.) Our charge was to answer the following questions related to the capacity of OSU to move forward related to its goals for inclusion, equity and diversity:

1. Will strategies shaped around the key themes enable us to realize our goal of a robust capacity? Are there additional key themes we should be considering?
2. What additional fiscal, human, and physical resources, if any, do we need to commit or cultivate to create the capacity needed to realize our goals?
3. Are we optimally organized and structured to realize our goals? Does the organizational structure currently in place to support this work enable the coordination and synergy needed to realize our goals?
4. What are significant strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, or challenges that we have failed to consider and that would be important for us to consider?
5. Is the Office of Equity and Inclusion adequately positioned, resourced, and organized, to play a lead role to guide the university toward realization of its goals for equity, inclusion, and diversity?
6. What are the perceptions of the University's commitment to diversity?

This report will first acknowledge some of the significant strengths observed, and then describe key observations that emerged from the material provided and interviews, followed by our recommendations. Because institutional transformation with respect to diversity addresses so many issues clearly reflected in the depth and breadth of the self-study, the external review team agreed that part of our task was to outline key issues that could and must be addressed with greater urgency and focus.

Acknowledgements

We must first begin this report with an enthusiastic acknowledgement of several aspects of our visit and the self-study:

1. The work of the self-study team, the staff in the office of Equity and Inclusion, and, the hundreds of members of the community who were engaged in this process was impressive. The time and effort that goes into creating an inclusive process cannot be underestimated. And it will position OSU well as it moves forward.
2. The stated vision and mission of OSU as described by the President creates an imperative for “recruiting and retaining the most diverse and talented faculty, staff and students.” This vision has the potential to embed diversity in OSU’s strategic mission because it is linked to the institution’s mission to serve the people of Oregon. Such a linkage ensures that the work of the self-study, and the changes that follow, will be more than rhetoric. It will move the community and its leadership to action.
3. There is a lot of hope on campus that this process will lead to change. Indeed, in answer to the sixth question of the self-study, our experience suggests that there is a strong sense of the institutional commitment to diversity. We heard it expressed by a majority of those with whom we spoke and by those who affirmatively answered our query or who answered “I hope so but am not sure.”
4. We were consistently impressed by the capacity of many individuals with whom we met to do the work of diversity including the participation of those in Extension. OSU has many dedicated people who can further this effort. Indeed, as we counted the numbers of faculty alone who were members of the search advocate program and the Difference, Power, and Discrimination (DPD) program, we could envision a powerful group of knowledgeable diversity advocates who as a group or groups could be important for change.
5. Given what appears to be a significantly large number of underrepresented students in STEM fields, OSU is positioned to be a model and leader addressing the national higher education call for action to produce domestic

capacity and diversity in these fields. This will be contingent, of course, on improving and monitoring student success and retention toward graduation.

6. The self-study reflects how to design a framework for diversity that is focused on the institution's capacity and is inclusive and differentiated with respect to the multiple and intersecting identities central to diversity efforts.
7. OSU has already begun to include some performance indicators related to diversity in its planning process. One strength of the existing indicators is the differentiation of international and domestic faculty and students.

As indicated, the work of diversity is not the work of a single office. Indeed, without serious sustained efforts at change from every quarter of the university, progress will not be made. The next section addresses the key issues that appeared to emerge both in the self-study and in the external review. In these observations, because we cannot assume to "know" OSU, we relied heavily on the self-study report and the interviews we conducted. We noted where consistent themes emerged and where perceptions appeared to be validated across groups. In addition, we placed the information gathered in the context of OSU's strategic plan and the issues identified in key documents.

Observations

1. **Comments on the self-study document**

The self-study itself has taken a very participatory and qualitative approach to developing a framework, identifying key issues and themes, and describing best practices. In rereading the self-study following our visit, the team has the following suggestions for tightening and focusing the self-study even further so that it might provide strategic guidance going forward (while this item could be placed in the recommendations section to follow, we felt that it belonged earlier in our report):

- a. The most critical parts of the self-study are contained on pages 11-12, the vision statement, and pages 23-26.
- b. The methods described throughout the report might be moved into an appendix
- c. The development of metrics is addressed in three different sections. At several points these are lists (Table 1, pp 20-22) of the kind of metrics that could be used in each of the four dimensions but because they are long lists, they do not yet provide the targeted and selected metrics that will be useful at present. It might be helpful in the last sections (and especially Section F) that describe key themes to identify necessary and targeted metrics that are manageable,

available, and that can begin to help monitor progress. Lagging metrics like graduation rates can be amplified by tracking first year (and even first term) persistence. Tracking student success in STEM could be similarly important given the priorities emerging. The hiring of new faculty can be tracked both during the hiring processes and at the end of each hiring season.

- d. One of the key themes identified early in the document was building faculty and staff capacity. It needs to be added on page 25 in Education, Scholarship, and Outreach as a key theme.
- 2. The status of diversity at OSU using key metrics.
The self-study report identifies lists of metrics that should be modified as mentioned above to guide the process going forward. Even given the data provided now, however, we found ourselves having to do our own analyses to really answer the question of progress. Part of the issue was that data for underrepresented racial/ethnic minority groups (URM), for example, was aggregated across all domestic racial groups making the progress across specific groups difficult to discern. For enrollment data it was hard to track changes in the demographic profile of the campus over time. The key themes of access for URM populations, faculty hiring, and student success, did emerge as critical areas where progress needs to be made.
- 3. Disconnects and missed opportunities.
While the message from the President and presumably the Provost are clear about the changing racial demographics in the state and the need to build a more successful and pluralistic community at every level, we observed numbers of apparent missed opportunities, disconnects and what appeared sometimes to be leadership decisions that ran counter to this effort. The consequences of erratic support (or communication lapses) are that people become exhausted by the lack of support for diversity work; there is an erosion of trust and many are reluctant to undertake new ventures that may only be short-lived.

- a. We heard many descriptions of erratic support for a variety of efforts that presumably are directed toward building capacity in enrollment, in the curriculum, and in student success. This has led to a deep concern among members of the community that the budgeting process, itself, is not consistently aligned with strategic diversity commitments and directions and that many significant efforts are vulnerable.
 - i. Some of our interviewees described that in enrollment, for example, while diversity was one of three priorities it was the last funded if at all. It appears that funding for recruiting URM students on a sustained basis and developing necessary

relationships with diverse communities are inconsistent at best.

- ii. Others described important and meaningful programs that would lose funding if a committed person left reflecting that the effort was not institutionalized. For example, there was deep concern expressed that “the Managing Difficult and Courageous Conversations” program in Housing and Dining may be lost because the person who took the lead left the University. Others are now wondering how to sustain it in addition to their current workloads.
- iii. Curriculum transformation, including Difficult Dialogues, is very important, yet it is not clear that programs like Difference Power and Discrimination (DPD) are being supported in ways to ensure excellence and sustainability.
- iv. We heard of a senior faculty member donating a substantial part of her salary to a student success program that will likely end when this person retires.

Whether these perceptions are accurate or based on lack of communication, they generate a great deal of concern, in some cases real time and energy to try to resolve the problem, and genuine concern about OSU’s commitment.

- b. The climate and culture were regularly described as bureaucratic, sometimes hostile, and not oriented to student (or staff) success. We suspect that some of the grievances and complaints being handled by several offices, including the ombuds office, and the Equity and Inclusion office, may be related to the climate and culture. There appears, now, to be recognition by faculty, staff, and students, that this has been a “byzantine bureaucracy” making it difficult to navigate even for senior people on campus. How confusing it must be for students to successfully navigate through the culture. How especially difficult this must be for first-generation students!
- c. Student enrollment and success is core to making progress on diversity and yet it is not clear that there is a continuous commitment to this both with respect to access and to success. We know from research that creating a climate in which students thrive requires a culture of success not just a few excellent programs. What emerged in our visit were too many examples of a culture of barriers not a culture of success. This was true for faculty, staff and administrators, as well as students.

4. Culture and Climate.

As mentioned above, the team began to hear about elements in the culture that will impede progress going forward on diversity. To the degree that a

“byzantine bureaucracy” exists (and this was validated by many), then aspirations for the success of people – faculty, staff, or students – will be constrained. Identifying the issues and then moving to change will be an important condition for institutional success. This appears now to be a priority in Human Resources identified by some as part of the problem in the past. We applaud the recognition of the issue in that area and the efforts that will be underway. However, we do suspect that this is an issue in other units though we did not see it emerge as a priority. We also heard that there has been a culture where “zero mistakes” is the expectation. Such a policy whether written or cultural certainly inhibits speaking out, trying new things, and engaging the kind of change that is necessary to overcome cumbersome bureaucracy and move toward institutional success.

5. Hiring.

The capacity of OSU to sustain and build pluralistic communities that work will depend heavily on the diversity within the faculty and staff. Yet, it appears that very little progress is being made.

- a. We heard many myths and assumptions about why staff and faculty were not more racially and ethnically diverse. At the same time, we saw select individual faculty and administrators, who took a leadership role, knew what to do, and who succeeded in hiring a more diverse group. Yet it was not clear that those who took leadership were supported or recognized.
- b. From the data provided, 83 tenure/tenure-track faculty were hired in the single year 2011-12 alone. Of these hires, 20% were non-citizens, and 5% were URM (African American -0; Latino-3; American Indian-1) faculty. In addition two were Asian American; and 4 identified as multiracial. Faculty of color in new hires then could reach 12%. When hires are viewed by college, it appears that URM faculty were only hired in the Colleges of Engineering, Education, Liberal Arts, and Science. This single year represents over 10% of the entire tenure/tenure-track faculty at OSU. If this rate of hiring has occurred in the recent past, it could be that in the last 5-10 years a significant part of the next generation of faculty has been hired.

6. Student success.

Student success and developing a culture of success in which all aspects of the community –staff, faculty, and students – are mobilized has not been achieved. This will not be accomplished just through programs that attend to a handful of students. Moreover, while OSU is rightly proud about the apparent diversity in STEM fields, the data were not readily available to document that these students are persisting to graduation in these fields. Such data are imperative to make the case for OSU success here.

7. "Definitions of diversity."

We heard a number of calls for clarity about the definition of diversity often reflected in a way of calling for attention to one domain (gender or internationalization) rather than engaging the multiple and intersecting issues that emerge (hiring of URM faculty, disability access, LGBTA, class etc.)

Recommendations

These recommendations, as with this report, are based on our review of the documents we were provided to understand OSU's mission and strategic priorities, on the self-study, and on our interactions with many people on campus. In addition, our recommendations are made in the context of emerging best practices nationally. Ultimately the decisions made concerning future directions must be made in the context of OSU.

1. Setting priorities.

The self-study report engages many themes and issues across the four domains of diversity (access and success, climate, education and scholarship, institutional viability). The challenge, of course, is that diversity can be about so much that it becomes superficial. As a result of our visit, the team began to see several domains that emerged as high priority at the institutional level. This does not negate the opportunity for specific areas and offices responsible for specific issues such as ADA, to address them. These three areas are student demographics and success, faculty (both academic and professional) hiring and retention, and creating a culture of success. The latter should be a culture in which individuals and groups feel they matter, find clear pathways and support for success, and where the aspiration of creating an inclusive community that works becomes a reality.

2. Definitions of diversity.

As suggested in the self-study report, diversity today needs to be inclusive but it also must be differentiated. That is, OSU can and should pay attention to race/ethnicity, historically underrepresented groups, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, religion, class, and disability etc. At the same time, the issues that emerge when considering each of these identities and their intersections may be different. As well, the manner in which the issues may be addressed will be unique to their situation. We know from the data provided that there are race and gender gaps in student success; that progress in faculty hiring of URM (African American, Latino, and American Indian) has not improved even as international hiring has increased.

Perhaps a review of the search advocates' training is needed. We know that physical access for wheel chairs has been an issue of deep concern. Moreover, the goal of increasing the internationalization of the campus while important is not interchangeable with addressing the needs of historically underserved communities whether in education, health care, the environment or other domains very relevant to a land-grant institution.

3. Human capacity building.

Building institutional capacity for diversity, as with technology, requires building human capacity. There is a theory of change that suggests to move complex institutions in a desired direction requires identifying the people and the work already occurring. Those individuals and programs should experience support and validation. Diversity efforts need to be openly recognized to reinforce the value of the achievements of those actively engaged. The consequence will be to encourage more people to participate in the diversity efforts on campus.

While OSU has many talented people who could and do assist with various aspects of diversity, the connective tissue required to make these efforts systemic has not been developed. Leadership at all levels is required and progress on hiring will be essential. This capacity building needs to focus on hiring, curriculum development, the ability to have and sustain difficult dialogues, investment in people, and acknowledgement and support of the good work going forward.

4. Communication and strategic conversations.

One wonders where issues that are emerging are discussed and engaged. It seemed obvious, for example, that while many people could see the concerns about the culture or the disconnects about supporting efforts toward diversity, there was a gap between people expressing concerns about issues and serious conversations at the appropriate decision making bodies to deal with them. A critical area for the consideration of communication and strategic conversations is the budget process. Our review suggests that the budgeting process may be an insular one leaving key leadership out of the loop in making strategic connections between vision and implementation. While competition for resources today is a difficult one, the resource allocation process must be transparent and strategically aligned with goals in ways that facilitate strategic decisions.

In some cases, decision makers may be dealing with issues but that they are not widely known. Thus the disconnects we identified may be a function of lack of alignment or may be a function of communication. Regardless, the campus needs to make sure there is broad and frequent communication about its commitments and the areas being addressed. This will be essential for building trust and a sense of shared commitment. Without that, the institution is very vulnerable to the perception that it is disingenuous with respect to its diversity imperative. Simply stated, the university leadership's commitment to equity, inclusion, and diversity must be reinforced by authentic, *sustained* actions and communication.

5. Accountability and monitoring progress.

Every leadership position should understand where diversity is in their portfolio and expect to be held accountable on progress. While metrics are

never perfect, they provide, as do the metrics for budget and finance, a way to see a trajectory for progress at the senior leadership level.

Some traditional metrics such as 6-year graduation rates are lagging indicators. A strong Institutional Research office could, with the assistance of others, develop more responsive and proactive indicators such as first year retention or credits completed in the first semester, disaggregated by race/ethnicity and gender (field and college will be useful to deans as well).

Data on new faculty searches and hires, as well as overall academic and professional faculty demographics, are also critical. Metrics for hiring should track overall faculty over time by race/gender/citizenship, and new hires in similar categories. The racial categories should be separate so as to see progress for each group. The numbers should also be disaggregated by College so one can see where hiring is occurring. A Turnover Quotient can be developed for each group using the method described in Smith's Diversity's Promise.

At other institutional levels, the metrics may become more qualitative (e.g. identifying students in trouble early in a term). The self-study identifies what some of these key metrics might be. In addition, the self-study outlines key climate indicators that would provide insight on the experience of faculty, staff and students (at the present time, little is known about these key stakeholder groups.) Climate can be monitored through the addition of three or four key questions for each major constituency group (faculty, staff, undergrads, graduate students, extension etc.) and then disaggregated by race, gender etc. [The four questions that can be added to every survey might be *How satisfied are you, would you recommend OSU to a friend, would you choose OSU again, what is your perception of the University's commitment to diversity.*]

The fundamental question for the leadership is -- how can we know if we are making progress? While the metrics will be critical, they need to be informed by sustained conversations with key groups on campus to give them meaning.

6. The architecture of an Office of Equity, and Inclusion.

While the team could not begin to make recommendations on some of the issues related to leadership on diversity at OSU, such as budget and staffing, we do make the following recommendations:

- a. OSU needs a Chief Diversity officer (CDO) who functions at the Vice Presidential level. Based on the recommendations of the self-study report, the need to introduce strategic movement on diversity that is needed, and emerging lessons nationally, we believe that it is very important for a CDO to participate and hold rank at a very senior level

in order to facilitate the work of diversity and the communication necessary. The CDO can help make sure that OSU is monitoring progress on diversity in each of its domains, prompting policy and other changes necessary, and helping to hold people and units accountable.

- b. The CDO should have an office with the necessary support and backing to work with members of the leadership team and stakeholders to build institutional capacity. Without an office empowered to raise issues and to encourage solutions, many of the missed opportunities and disconnects will continue.
- c. This office should not *do* the work of diversity but rather encourage and assist those responsible for hiring, working with students, etc. to help *build capacity* throughout OSU. The responsibility and authority to implement advancements must be embedded in every unit of OSU. Expectations for action have to be aligned with core metrics to be sustainable.
- d. The office should be less concerned about compliance than about capacity building.
- e. We spent a great deal of time discussing the current practice of having the office deal with grievances and conflict resolution. It is our judgment that while these are important institutional vehicles, they should not reside in this office primarily because these matters are very time consuming and take away from the systemic work of change. The challenge for OSU is that it is not clear that other offices have the established trust and capacity to take this on. With the new Director of HR and the addition of the ombuds office, transitions of roles should be considered.
- f. The office should work with others to bring forward meaningful information about progress using key metrics.
- g. An advisory group, much like the composition of the self-study task force would create opportunities to facilitate communication and provide ongoing support for institutional progress. This group should not be involved in developing programs.
- h. In order to answer the questions about structure and budget that the review team was not able to address, the CDO should be asked to develop the job description and structure that aligns with the work as described.

Conclusion

OSU, especially with the opportunity created by the new strategic planning effort, is poised to make real progress on diversity. Time cannot be wasted, however, especially with respect to hiring where we believe that a high percentage of the next generation of faculty has already been hired. What we know from the field and research is that real progress on diversity will require work that is:

1. Central to mission and the new strategic plan;
2. Seen as an imperative deeply and broadly throughout the campuses;
3. Well aligned throughout OSU;
4. Sustained;
5. Monitored regularly and widely reported throughout the campus;
6. And a core function of leaders at all levels of OSU.

It was our pleasure to be able to work with the leadership and community of OSU.

Daryl G Smith
Sharon Parker
Michael Tate

APPENDIX A

OSU Equity and Inclusion Self-Study
External Review
Itinerary

Wednesday, October 24th

3:30 – 5:30pm	External Review Team Arrives in Corvallis	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Daryl Smith arrives at 2:22pm in Eugene • Michael Tate arrives at 3:19pm in Eugene • Sharon Parker arrives at ? in Portland
5:55-6:00pm	Angelo accompanies external review team to dinner	
	Meet in Hilton Lobby	
6:00-8:00pm	Dinner meeting with Angelo Gomez, Susan Capalbo, La Sells Stewart Ctr (Weyerhaesuser Room)	and Jennifer Almquist
8:00-9:00pm	External Review Team Meeting (Weyerhaesuser Room)	La Sells Stewart Ctr

Thursday, October 25th

	Breakfast	
	Hilton Garden Inn	
8:15-8:30am	Angelo accompanies external review team to MU	Meet in
	Hilton Lobby	
8:30-9:30am	Meet with Self-Study Team	
	MU 109B Angelo Gomez (co-chair), <i>Interim Executive Director, Office of Equity and Inclusion</i>	
	Brenda McComb, <i>Dean, Graduate School</i>	
	Brian Bay, <i>Associate Professor, School of Mechanical, Industrial & Manufacturing Engineering</i>	
	Elizabeth Thomas, <i>Office Administrator, Academic Success Center</i>	
	Janet Nishihara, <i>Director, Educational Opportunities Program</i>	
	John Edwards, <i>Transitional Director and Associate Professor, Department of Psychology</i>	
	Larry Roper, <i>Vice Provost, Student Affairs</i>	
	M. Tonga Hopoi, <i>ASOSU President for 2011-12 AY</i>	
	Michelle Bothwell, <i>Associate Professor, School of Chemical, Biological & Environmental Engineering and Interim Director, Difference, Power and Discrimination Program</i>	
	Susan Capalbo (co-chair), <i>Department Head, Agricultural & Resource Economics</i>	
	Tony Wilcox, <i>Co-Director, School of Biological & Population Health Sciences</i>	
9:45-10:45am	Meet with Office of Equity and Inclusion	
	MU 109B	
	(Discussion about internal capacity, how the new structure is evolving, and perspectives	
	on how the university is doing)	

Kate Peterson, Associate Provost for Enrollment Management

Noah Buckley, Director of Admissions

Victor Zamora, Assistant Director of Admissions

*Patty Brady-Glassman, Associate Director of Financial Aid & Scholarships
(Jennifer will accompany members of external review team from MU 109B at 2:50pm)*

Marianne Vydra, Senior Associate Athletic Director and Senior Women's MU 109B Administrator

4:00-5:00pm Open session for OSU community
MU Journey Room

Friday, October 26th

Breakfast
Hilton Garden Inn

7:45-8:00am Jennifer accompanies external review team to MU
Meet in Hilton Lobby

8:00-8:50am Meet with Various Stakeholders
MU 211
*Kate Halischack, Director, Student Athlete Academic Services
Moira Dempsey, Director, Academic Success Center*

*Bob Nettles, Director, Administrative Services
MU 212
Dave Blake, Assistant Vice President, Human Resources*

9:00-10:20am Meet with Members of the Cabinet and Provost's Council
MU 212
*Becky Johnson, Vice President, OSU-Cascades
Janine Trempy, Associate Dean, College of Science
Mark McCambridge, Vice President for Finance & Administration
Patricia Kenney, Senior Director of Human Resources, OSU Foundation
Meg Reeves, General Counsel
Steve Clark, Vice President for Relations & Marketing
Toni Doolen, Dean, Honors College*

10:30-11:20am Meet with Representatives from International Programs and INTO OSU
MU 212
*Erich Cutler, Coordinator, Academic English Program, INTO OSU
Rachael Weber, International Student Advisor, International Programs
Sunil Khanna, Associate Vice Provost for International Programs
Valerie Rosenberg, Director, International Admissions & Student Experience, INTO OSU*

11:30am-12:15pm Sack lunch provided
MU 212

12:15-1:05pm Meet with members of the Associated Students of Oregon State University
MU 212

1:05-4:00pm Break/External Review Team Meeting
MU 212

4:00-5:00pm Meet with President Ray, Sabah Randhawa, Angelo Gomez
Kerr 650
(Angelo will accompany members of external review team from MU 212 at 3:50pm)

5:55-6:00pm Angelo accompanies external review team to dinner
Meet in Hilton Lobby

6:00pm Dinner with Angelo Gomez, Susan Capalbo, and
(Weyerhaeuser Room) Jennifer Almquist La Sells Stewart Ctr

Saturday, October 27th

8:00am-12:00pm External review team departs Corvallis
