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The problem of this study concerns the role and functions of diversity affairs centers' chief personnel officers at public universities in Texas. Because of the political and evolving nature of diversity affairs offices, it is important to understand the functions and types of services these centers provide with respect to institutional goals, missions, and student retention at public universities in Texas.

The study identified 12 diversity centers among the 35 total Texas public universities, and two of these had no personnel at the time of this study. The questionnaire used in this study was originally built on content knowledge by Ruth Moyer at Kent State University in Ohio and validated by practitioners in diversity affairs administration.

Summary of Major Findings

1. Diversity affairs centers are underfunded and understaffed. There are 10 centers with the following staffing: (a) nine have full-time directors, (b) one has a part-time director, (c) only four have two or more full-time staff members.

2. There is an insurgence of racism on campus and recent legal antiaffirmative action decisions are indicators of difficult times ahead, thus, the campus climate for ethnic students seems less friendly for multicultural initiatives.
3. Diversity affairs centers' personnel officers are a resource for students, faculty, staff, and the general public.

4. Diversity centers are often created out of campus political reaction by ethnic groups.

5. Diversity affairs centers' chief personnel functions include conflict resolution, token representation on campus committees, troubleshooting, referrals, program planning, advocating for minorities on campus, administrative chores, resolving students, faculty, and staff concerns.

6. Diversity affairs centers' chief personnel were involved in such problems as: racial and gender issues, campus violence, minority faculty retention, promoting diversity on campus, minority access to higher education, minority student retention, reduced funding, threats of eliminating the diversity affairs office, affirmative action, and high workload with reduced staff.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background

The history of democracy in the United States lends itself the belief that human beings have inalienable rights that the state or other human beings cannot justly take away. Against this background, President Abraham Lincoln (1861-1865) issued the Emancipation Proclamation in 1863 to free the slaves in rebellious Confederate states (Leckie, 1990). Leckie hailed the emancipation of slaves by Lincoln as the greatest event of the 19th century, which was followed by the historic enactment of the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments and ratified December 6, 1865; July 9, 1868; and February 3, 1870, respectively (Horne & Tonnesen, 1989). These reforms officially abolished slavery, conferred citizenship on former slaves, and established the principles that a state cannot deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law, but the political pronouncements which brought nominal freedom did little to alleviate the cruelties and gross inhumanities against people of color.

Bennett and Okinaka (1990) recalled that Blacks in the North were formally free but confined by restrictions. They were the undesirables in the South and in the North; therefore, they lived among the docks and wharves and in dark alleys—on “Nigger Hill” in Boston and “Little Africa” in Cincinnati—while some states such as Illinois and
Ohio refused freedmen admittance unless they could post large bonds. Outside New England, Negroes were generally denied the right to vote and jury duty. They could not testify against Whites.

The prevailing prejudice of Anglo southerners against the people of color was appropriately summed up by a colonel in the Union Army in 1865: “To kill a Negro they do not deem murder; to debauch a Negro woman they do not think fornication; to take property from the Negro they do not consider robbery” (Kirkpatrick, 1926, p. 40). This sentiment was epitomized by the U.S. Supreme Court’s decision of 1857 in the Dred Scott case. Scott was 30 years old when his master took him to Illinois, a free state, and to Wisconsin Territory. Scott later sued for freedom, but his argument that his residence in a state where slavery was illegal had made him free was denied by the United States Supreme Court (Weis, Farrar, & Petrie, 1989). The Dred Scott decision was widely interpreted by pro-slave groups to mean that Blacks had no rights which Whites were bound to respect (Sowell, 1981). The colored man was conceived to have no rights, and White southerners resented not only emancipation but also any behavior, words, attitudes by Blacks that implied common humanity or common rights.

In the 1960s, the United States Congress began serious legislation to address issues of civil rights and equality (Eddy, 1994). Although more than a century late, some educators and minority leaders consider the civil rights movement as a call for all citizens to live up to the American creed—“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these, are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.”
In 1963, Martin Luther King made his famous speech ("I Have a Dream"), which raised the expectation of a paradigm shift among minorities and civil rights advocates hoping for freedom and racial equality for all Americans (Schulke & McPhee, 1986). This urge for equality produced a movement in academia to press for a nonracist and hospitable learning environment (Hildago, McDowell, & Siddle, 1990). Some academic communities began calling for the inclusion of non-Western traditional modes of thought and demanded the construction of a relevant curriculum to foster social, political, economic, and educational reforms (Blum, 1994).

Rodriguez (1983) and Banks (1994) indicated that, as the demand for social equality became imperative, historical groups such as Native Americans, Asian Americans, and Hispanics insisted on a valid inclusion of all ethnic groups in the academic curriculum, although multicultural education has not improved ethnic relations in higher education in any significant way. However, mainstream historians and social scientists fostered the belief that racial harmony, through education, could be possible through the melting pot concept as a mechanism for the assimilating of all ethnic groups in the United States (Tye & Tye, 1992).

Adams (1971) wrote about Zangwill's concept of the "higher unity"—implying the emerging hope of a new American—one that would be fashioned in a cultural melting pot and processed in a crucible. Zangwill contended that the modern American would be a blend of all races, an emerging superhuman who would transcend ethnicity and break racial barriers (Morgan, 1981). According to Morgan, the fashioned invincible American would disregard racial and ethnic differences, with everyone living together in a
macrocosmic American society. Through the educational process, everyone would become one super group, Old World hatreds, memories, and group biases would become superfluous: "In the crucible of love or even co-citizenship, the most violent ... may be fused into a higher unity" (Wohlgelernter, 1964, p. 40). Weaver (1995) challenged the assumption that bringing people together from various cultures to mix socially promotes understanding and eliminates cultural differences. Harrison (1995) recalled social scientists in the 1950s, who speculated on the disappearance of interracial conflicts through prolonged contacts. This was attempted through physical activities and sports without great success. Horne and Tonnese (1989) warned that cultural polarization is a structural feature of American society. During the late 1980s, their studies on racism found that racist attitudes or ethnoviolence is on the rise.

Although one of the goals of multicultural education in higher learning was to promote acculturation and racial tolerance, hate crimes on college and university campuses are on the increase. Many of the crimes are racially motivated and directed against persons of color—Blacks, Hispanics, or Asian Americans (Levin & McDevitt, 1995). Chandras (1994), Eddy (1994), and Kerr (1994) addressed the issue of hate crimes on campus as one of the worst problems confronting postsecondary education. According to a study of 1,865 students in private and parochial institutions regarding the state of racial and ethnic tensions, it has been demonstrated that a bleak picture of race relations among Americans exists (Levin & McDevitt, 1995). The results of the study suggest that confrontations between individuals of different races and religions have become "commonplace on campuses." The creation of multicultural offices or diversity
centers in higher education became necessary, mostly as political response to the diverse needs and conflicting interests of racial and ethnic groups on campus. When first established, multiethnic centers were not only a political initiative but also an administrative response to the historical exclusion of Black students from active involvement and participation in higher education (Mover, 1992). The concept of the centers was extended to meet the needs of all underrepresented ethnic groups on campus. With the creation of diversity offices minority officers were expected to provide advocacy, increase representation for minorities who have traditionally been underrepresented in the academic system, and also serve as public relations officers between the university and the greater community.

Diversity affairs centers are often created out of conflict, and their establishment has largely been a political reaction by administrators to honestly address or manipulate the escalating controversies over maintaining minorities on campus, hiring more minority staff and faculty, and creating awareness in the adjacent communities about opportunities on campus.

Special interest groups, including students, faculty, institutional administration, and the community, significantly influence the chief minority officers' roles and functions. Each seeks to effect policy, request services, and demand redress on a variety of issues. In regard to these competing interests, Wallenfeldt (1983) declared that no amount of pressure from interest groups has produced common commitment to a standard value in governing systems in higher education, and the lack of consistency leads to tension and conflict, especially between minority and nonminority groups. This
condition is likely to exist when efforts are made to seek balance, bring about change, or otherwise influence the status quo. Wallenfeldt also noted that the system promotes behavior in which major social values held by individuals are accomplished by association with groups. The validation of this view is attested to by events of the 1960s, when special-interest groups such as university students, faculty and staff, and community activists exerted pressure on the governing bodies of colleges and universities to provide special services to minority students.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to investigate the role and functions of diversity affairs centers' chief personnel officers at public universities in Texas. Because of the political and evolving nature of diversity affairs offices, it is important to understand the function and types of services these centers provide in respect to institutional goals, missions, retention of students, attrition, and the graduation rate of minorities at the academic components of public universities in Texas.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study has been to investigate the role and functions of diversity affairs centers' chief personnel officers at public universities in Texas. Specifically, the focus was to do the following:

1. Determine the broad societal context that has contributed to the establishment of the position of chief personnel officers of diversity centers.

2. Identify current practices of such officers.
3. Determine concerns that will interfere with educational equity in the next decade, from the chief officers' perspectives.

4. Inquire about the existence of diversity affairs centers in Texas public universities.

5. Find out the graduation rates of minorities on campus.

Research Questions

1. What societal changes contributed to the establishment of the position of diversity affairs administrators?

2. What are the current practices of diversity affairs officers?

3. What administrative structures, relative to diversity centers, are now in place in Texas state universities?

4. What concerns have the chief personnel officers identified that may interfere with equity in education for the next decade?

Definitions of Terms

The following glossary of common terms used in this study is based on the definition of terms by Pincus and Ehrlich (1994), unless otherwise indicated.

**Chief diversity affairs personnel officer**: The university administrator charged with providing services to minority students and minority special interest groups.

**Discrimination**: The systematic, intended or unintended, denial of recognition, power, privilege, and opportunity to certain people based on the groups to which they belong. While prejudice is an attitude, discrimination is overt action. The result is to
restrict the opportunities or rewards available to others while maintaining those opportunities and rewards for one's own membership group.

**Diversity:** Differences among people with respect to age, class, ethnicity, gender, physical and mental ability, race, sexual orientation, spiritual practices, and other human differences.

**Ethnoviolence:** an act motivated by prejudice and intended to do physical or psychological harm to persons because of their actual or perceived membership in a group. Ethnoviolence includes acts ranging from brutal assaults, murder, and arson to everyday expressions of prejudice such as racial insults or other slights, which are common in the daily experience of many people and cause measurable harm in their cumulative effect. Groups typically victimized by ethnoviolence are those defined by race, religion, national origin, political belief, gender, age, physical condition, disability, or sexual orientation.

**Ethnic group:** In its traditional sociological sense, ethnic group refers to any group of people distinguished by race, religion, nationality, or national origin. In contemporary usage, ethnic groups are more broadly defined as groups sharing beliefs, values, and cultural characteristics; a common identity; and feelings of group solidarity.

**Minority:** An underrepresented racial group in social and institutional systems, such as Asians, Blacks, Hispanics, and American Indians.

**Multiculturalism:** Organizational culture that incorporates mutual respect, acceptance, teamwork, and productivity among people who are diverse in the dimensions of human differences.
Racism: Racism is a set of attitudes based on beliefs in the biological superiority of one group over another and the rationalization for discriminatory treatment.

Underrepresented racial group: Minorities in social and institutional systems, such as Asians, Blacks, Hispanics, and American Indians.

Limitations

The sample of universities for this study includes only public universities in Texas, and any inferences or generalizations concerning the role, status, and function of diversity centers’ chief administrators may not be applicable to any other institution of higher education in Texas.

Delimitation

The study is limited to selected Texas state universities and includes only diversity centers’ chief administrators in those institutions.

Significance of the Study

The surge of violence against minorities, the attrition of students, the curricular barriers for multiethnic studies, and the lack of racially diversified staff and faculty have given rise to the idea of the Office of Minority Affairs in higher education. The general consensus is the racism is resurfacing, while universities and colleges continue to be assailed by divisiveness, racism, bigotry, and other acts of violence on campus (Altback & Lomotey, 1994). In December 1995, two White soldiers murdered a Black couple in Fayetteville, North Carolina (Fort Bragg Report, 1995). The suspects were known to
wear clothing identified with “skinhead” hate groups while off duty. White supremacist
literature and other Nazi paraphernalia were found in the mobile home of one of the
suspects. In Texas, a Dallas Independent School District trustee, Dan Peavy, resigned
because of secretly recorded tapes on which he used profanity and racist slurs to describe
parents, school employees, and school board colleagues (Bleiberg & Lee, 1995).

In 1992, an African American, Rodney King, was beaten severely by a contingent
of the Los Angeles police force for traffic violations. Stacey Koon, Laurence Powell, and
two other White officers were acquitted of state charges in the beating of King
(Baldassare, 1994). The verdicts touched off three days of deadly rioting in 1992. Later,
the four officers were indicted on federal charges. Koon and Powell were convicted in
1993 of violating King’s constitutional rights.

A tragedy upset the Vietnamese community in California on January 29, 1996,
when Minh Ly, a 24-year-old Vietnamese man and graduate of UCLA was murdered
while skating on roller blades in his Tustin hometown school tennis court (Grisly
Account, 1996). The following morning a janitor found Ly lying in a pool of blood, with
many stab wounds to various parts of his body, as well as slash wounds to his throat.

On March 2, 1996, the police arrested Gunner Lindberg, age 21, and Dominic
Christopher, age 17, after discovering a letter that Lindberg had written to a former
prison inmate in New Mexico. The letter contained graphic details about the murder, as
well as the writer’s apparent insouciance about the whole incident. After their arrest,
both parties confessed to the police their part in the murder (Grisly account, 1996).
According to Abraham and Jacobs (1990), the two major racial groups in the United States, African and Anglo Americans, have different views about social-political issues. Anderson (1988), Buckram (1988), Collision (1989), and Manger (1989) have argued that Whites are generally in denial by underrating racial incidents of violence or discrimination. Luzon (1993) reported that minority groups believed that barriers based on ethnic identity affected their past and are certain to influence their future, but Anglo Americans denied that ethnicity has any significant impact on the socioeconomic status of any racial groups. However, 40% of African Americans, 25% of Asian Americans, 22% of Hispanics, and 13% of Filipinos cited such barriers. In contrast, in some institutions, fewer than 5% of Caucasian Americans perceived racial barriers as major obstacles in past and future lives of ethnic groups.

A Newsweek survey (Ehrlich, 1990) reported that 52% of Whites and 30% of Blacks think White people want to see Blacks receive equal treatment. The survey also revealed that 49% of Whites and 28% of Blacks think that it is uncommon for Whites to physically attack Blacks in the cities. The poll concluded that 50% of Whites and 23% of Blacks stated that Blacks charged with crimes are treated the same in the U.S. justice system. Three years earlier, Time (Racism, 1987) reported the following findings on the issue of Black Americans having the same opportunities as Whites: same housing opportunities—48% Whites and 22% Blacks said yes; same education opportunities—73% Whites and 38% Blacks said yes; same employment opportunities—59% Whites and 26% Blacks said yes. This survey also indicated that Whites (32%) and Blacks (62%) would like for businesses to set a goal of hiring a minimum number of Black employees.
Like the American public, higher education is encountering racially motivated violence on college campuses. Ehrlich (1995) reported that 42 campuses had ethnoviolent incidents that drew substantial media attention in 1987. There were 103 incidents in 1988 and 113 in 1989. Moreover, U.S. News and World Report revealed in 1993 that 71% of U.S. colleges experience at least one violent racial incident during the school year (Race on Campus, 1993).

In 1986, the first of what was to become a series of studies of ethnoviolence on college campuses began (Ehrlich, Pincus, & Morton, 1987). Initially, the University of Maryland, Baltimore County (UMBC), conducted a study to determine the extent of violence among students of UMBC. Then, only 10% of the students, including minorities and Whites, indicated that they had been victims of ethnoviolent incidents. According to the UMBC study, the students reported that they have been called names, insulted, harassed, threatened, physically attacked, or had their property damaged. One out of four of the victimized students had experienced more than one incident during the school year.

The UMBC study was replicated at Rutgers University (Peterson, 1990) and SUNY College (Taylor, 1990). The findings of these studies and other related studies indicated a substantial flux in the proportion of students who reported being a victim of ethnoviolence. From these results, it became obvious that different groups (Black, Latino, Asian, and Jews, among others) are targeted with different frequencies on different campuses, according to Ehrlich (1990). He also observed that the structural dimensions of the campus appear to influence the rate of ethnoviolence. For example,
residential campuses appear to have more incidents than commuter campuses, although the studies did not determine reliably the sources of variation. There are, however, some substantial findings. First, the median percentage of minority students who are victims of ethnoviolence during a single school year ranges between 20 and 25. Second, the increased level of campus ethnoviolence has had little publicity because most students fail to report their victimization to campus officials. The Peterson (1990) and Taylor (1990) studies show that 80 to 94% of victims of race-based violence did not report the incidents to the campus authorities. This finding points to the major form of ethnoviolent behavior among students--verbal aggression such as name calling, insults, harassment, and threats. Students generally feel that campus police are either incompetent or lack sensitivity concerning issues of violence on university campuses, according to a report of the National Institute Against Prejudice and Violence, which revealed that three fourths of campus security departments had no formal procedures or guidelines for handling complaints or ethnoviolent activities (Ehrlich, 1995).

Building systems and a culture that unite different people in a common pursuit without undermining their differences and creating an academic environment in which all ethnic groups and races feel safe, respected, and free to develop their fullest potential is a challenge for diversity affairs centers’ chief personnel officers. This study therefore seeks to determine the role and functions of such officers in making the university experience worthwhile for all persons, especially minority groups.
Numerous articles, reports, and studies have a varying degree of relationship to the present study; therefore, the literature review has been organized into the following sections: (a) historical review of minorities on campus, (b) historically black colleges and universities: 1976-1994, (c) factors affecting the campus environment, and (d) student enrollment, retention, and alienation of minorities.

**Historical Review of Minorities on Campus**

Modern public education in the United States has been developed on the basis of common educational opportunities for all students. Academic institutions were established to respond to the need of a diverse citizenry that wished to utilize the available resources to enhance its chances of social mobility (Deaux, 1984; Handlin & Handlin, 1970). The idea of common academic experience, however, has obvious basic assumptions about the characteristics of those who benefit. Historically, the benefactors of traditional education were White males with similar social classes and ethnicity.

Between 1830 and 1860, when Anglo children were the main focus of educational policies, African Americans were denied education. Teaching Blacks to read and write was a crime in some states (Moyer, 1992). Katzenelson and Weir (1985) reported that the policy of providing public education only for White children attracted much attention.
from professional groups, and the results suggest that the combination of federalism and voting rights for White males created special structural conditions that engendered overwhelming support for public education in the early years. Their debate about common schooling and its implications, as well as the intricate relations with other social class structures, provides a basis from which to review the historical biases of policy makers and educational systems.

Between 1820 and 1920, thousands of immigrants sought new homes in American cities and towns, transforming schools as never before and causing great alarm in the ranks of educators. By 1911, three out of five public school children in 37 of the nation's largest cities were the children of immigrants (Ellwood, 1913). Their presence was felt in schools across America, mainly due to differences in values, culture, and language. The students were seen as a threat to the classic educational curriculum. Traditionally, the immigrants were generally referred to as people of color (Mann, 1968).

Immigrant children suffered from poverty, poor housing, and prejudice. There was great concern among educators about their poor performance in school, and it gave rise to much talk about whether or not to assimilate them or to exclude all colored people from the school, since many immigrant children were incapable of adapting to the conventional curriculum of American schools (Brown, 1900).

Ayres (1909) reported on a study of students who could not keep pace with their classmates. They repeated classes and generally progressed slowly through the learning process. He made the point that this difficulty resulted from a curriculum that was designed for academically prepared students, and it presented obstacles for slow learners,
especially immigrant children. Using an industrial model, he criticized the waste of school resources for the lack of accountability and then developed an "index of efficiency," to measure schools and their products. Academic researchers investigated the factors that contributed to the high dropout rates of the immigrant student populations, and a new curriculum was suggested as a panacea for this problem (DeGarmo, 1909; Kingsbury, 1907; Warner, 1901).

The central feature of the institution of slavery in America—preventing escape—was accomplished by keeping the slaves ignorant, dependent, and in fear. The overwhelming majority of the slaves, about 90% could not read or write in 1860 (Sowell, 1981). Christian missionaries founded Black schools in the North before the Civil War. Cheyney (1837) and Lincoln (1854) were established to provide educational opportunities for colored people (Branson, 1978), even though it was illegal to provide education for slaves in many states. In the belligerent South, laws made it illegal for freedmen of color to send their children to schools—even to private schools at their own expense (Goldstein, 1970). Benjamin Okovok (1990) recorded that Frederick Douglass’ mistress wanted to teach him the alphabet, but his master would not allow it and is quoted as saying, "Give a nigger an inch, and he will take an ell. Learning would spoil the best Nigger in the world," (p. 129). Education for slaves was generally proscribed, and after the slave rebellion of the 1820s and 1830s, especially Nat Turner’s rebellion in 1831, most of the southern states passed codes explicitly prohibiting the teaching of reading and writing to slaves. Because Nat Turner was literate, the ability of the Negro to read and write became associated with rebellion and violence. Education
for Blacks was abhorred by slaveholders, but with the fall of the Confederacy, however, various interest groups established schools for colored people. White missionaries from the North moved into the South to educate the children of emancipated Negroes. In less than a decade, more than 1,000 schools were created, with 2,000 teachers sent to the South, and Northern sources provided nearly $57 million, and Blacks themselves contributed $24 million, in addition to the $3.5 million spent by the Freedman’s Bureau from 1865 to 1870 (Rischin, 1962). In contrast to private education, the first Black public high school in the United States was established in 1870 in Washington D.C., Baltimore followed in 1892, New Orleans in 1916, and Atlanta in 1924 (Sowell, 1981). However, Blacks were not involved in establishing and administering the schools, and expectations of student success were low (Jencks & Riesman, 1968). Some of the institutions established for Blacks turned out to be teacher training schools, although most of them were intended for Black clergymen (Fleming, 1984).

The first viable American Black institution for higher education was Liberia College, now the University of Liberia. It was established in 1852 on the west coast of Africa by the American Colonization Society (A.C.S.), with the support of U.S. President James Monroe, Andrew Jackson, Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, and Bushrod Washington (Livingston, 1975). Key government officers supported the establishment of Liberia as a homeland for emancipated Negroes, who were given the mandate to evangelize, educate, and civilize Africa. Notwithstanding, some abolitionists urged the incorporation of the Negro into American culture and demanded equal educational opportunity for all Blacks, whereas other auxiliary organizations opposed the acculturation of Blacks in American
society. They disputed the sentiments of Black royalty in the United States and argued that the Negro could not find dignity and manhood in America (Wiley, 1980). Others argued that a Black homeland in America was possible and that the extension of higher education to Negroes would enlighten freed slaves and subsequently they would be discontented with living in America. Wiley pointed out that the Negro Convention Movement also denounced colonization and contended that racial discrimination would improve, if more Blacks were educated. Blacks who accepted the challenge to return to the land of their ancestry in Africa did so in 1821 and began a new life in what was then the Grain Coast but later was renamed Liberia to signify the new-found freedom of the American Negro in Africa.

Liberia College, although chartered in 1852 in Monrovia as a Liberian institution, was conceived and financially nurtured in Boston, Massachusetts. Two American boards, the Trustees of Donations and Education in Liberia and the New York Colonization Society (a state branch of the A.C.S.), selected staff and provided most of its support throughout the 19th century. Joseph Jenkins Roberts from Virginia was the first president of both Liberia and Liberia College. He was elected president of Liberia in 1847 and then appointed president of Liberia College by the American Boards of Trustees. Two of the well-known professors of the college were Edward Wilmot Blyden, from St. Thomas, and Alexander Crummell, from New York, a graduate of Queen’s College in London (Livingston, 1975). Thus, while located on the west coast of Africa and under the aegis of Liberian law, the institution was essentially an American college for Black repatriates, the first of such American degree-granting college to be established
abroad and was the first American collegiate institution proposed specifically for the higher education of Blacks (Hlope, 1979). Like most American colleges in the 1800s, higher education in Liberia was founded with a patriotic emphasis upon the national purpose. The college was established to serve social rather than individual interests, which was an ancient character of a collegiate purpose. Moreover, the college was greatly influenced and inspired by Western philosophy and values. Its programs of study and curriculum was based on liberal arts college models in the United States. Classical subjects such as Greek, Latin, mathematics, philosophy, and religion were taught (Liebenow, 1987).

Most Negroes in America did not trek back to Africa as many abolitionists had envisaged. To accommodate the demand for more learning facilities or opportunities for the education of Blacks, the Morrill Second Act of 1890 called for the creation of separate learning institutions for Negroes or colored people to be admitted to existing colleges in the United States. Consequently, some states, including those of the defeated South, chose to establish schools exclusively for Blacks. The U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the establishment of separate-but-equal systems for Blacks and Whites was legal, as demonstrated in Plessy v. Ferguson (1896).

During World War I and after, a wave of Black immigrants from southern states to northern cities began. The presence of Negro students in the integrated schools of the North caused the same kind of resentment and concern created by the European immigrants of earlier times.

Segregated schooling had some success. The establishment of the Freedmen's
Bureau, the movement for vocational training schools, and the establishment of Black colleges did address some concerns and issues affecting education for Blacks (Brubacher & Ruby, 1976). Debates over vocational versus liberal arts education for Blacks characterized the first half of this century. Booker T. Washington and W.E.B. Du Bois kept the argument in perspective. Washington held the view that agrarian education would provide Blacks with marketable skills and win the respect of the White community. DuBois believed that liberal education could provide a better way of life to empower the Negro as a responsible citizen (Browning & Williams, 1978). At that time few academic professionals agreed with Du Bois that Blacks in America were as intelligent as Whites, based on tests scores to determine intelligence, morality, and virtue (Thorndike, 1928). Crummell, who went to Liberia as a professor of literature added his sentiments to the search for dignity for the Negro (Bennett & Okinaka, 1990):

> Let our posterity know that we, their ancestors, uncultured and unlearned, and amid all trials and temptations, were men of integrity; recognized with gratefulness their truest friends [dishonored] and in peril; were enabled to resist the seductions of ease and the intimidation of power; were true to themselves, the age in which they lived, their abject race, and the cause of man: shrunk not from trial, nor from sufferings--but conscious of [r]esponsibility and impelled by [d]uty, gave themselves up to the vindication of the high hopes, and the lofty aims of true humanity! (p. 127)

Goldstein (1970) published a report indicating that the first Negro to receive a
college degree graduated from Bowdoin College in 1828; the first Black woman to receive a college degree was a graduate of Oberlin in 1862; the first Black man to receive a degree from Harvard graduated in 1870, and the first Harvard Ph.D. awarded to a Black man went to W.E.B. DuBois in 1896.

In the last four decades, court orders have brought about significant changes in the educational institutions. The landmark case, Brown v. The Board of Education, Topeka (1954), made history when the high court ruled that all segregated educational facilities were illegal. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 struck down the separate-but-equal law—another milestone for minorities in education. However, historically Black colleges award more than 90% of the degrees received by Black students in colleges and universities (Gurin & Epps, 1975). The Civil Rights Act of 1964 encouraged a massive migration of minorities into predominantly Anglo institutions. Gurin and Epps recorded 278,000 Black students who attended such institutions in 1968. In 1970 the Census Bureau report showed 378,000 Black students in predominantly White postsecondary schools. The increased enrollment brought attendance problems. Mathews (1977) reported:

As the move toward equal access in the form of open admissions for the economically and educationally disadvantaged gained in momentum, educators in the academy began to question the effects of such a policy and to make certain distinctions in terms of what they meant and mean by equality. (p. 45)

The level of Black enrollment in White institutions depends on how those
educational systems create a collegiate environment in which minority students receive and return to those around them a sense of caring, personal concern, interest, respect, and support for ideas. According to Thomas (1981), the school is one place where Black students must be able to receive remediation for the skill deficits which minority students often bring to higher education.

Historically Black Colleges and Universities: 1976-1994

Historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) are institutions established prior to 1964, whose principal mission is the education of Black Americans. The following analysis is based on the National Center For Education Statistics' overview of the development of HBCUs over the past 19 years (Lippman, Burns, & McArthur, 1996).

Number of Students Attending HBCUs. In 1994, about 280,000 students attended the 103 HBCUs. Overall, enrollment at HBCUs rose by 26% between 1976 and 1994, but virtually all of the increase occurred between 1986 and 1994. The 1976 to 1994 increase at HBCUs is slightly smaller than the 30% increase that occurred at all higher education institutions. Compared to other higher education students, a larger proportion of the students at HBCUs enroll in 4-year and in private institutions.

The increase in Black enrollment (21%) at HBCUs between 1976 and 1994 lagged behind the 40% rise in Black enrollment at other colleges. As a result of the long-term growth in Black enrollment at non-HBCU institutions, the proportion of Black students enrolling at HBCUs dipped from 18.4% in 1976 to 15.9% in 1994. At the same time, more students from other racial/ethnic groups attended HBCUs.
Blacks Earning Degrees From HBCUs. Although relatively few associate degrees are conferred by HBCUs, about 28% of Black bachelor’s degree recipients received their degrees from HBCUs in 1993-94. This compares with 15% of Black master’s degree recipients, 9% of Black doctoral degree recipients, and 16% of Black first-professional degree recipients.

The number of bachelor’s degrees conferred by HBCUs increased by 16% between 1976-77 and 1993-94 as compared to 27% at other colleges. The proportion of all bachelor’s degrees conferred by HBCUs dropped from 2.6% to 2.3% between 1976-77 and 1993-94. The number of master’s degrees conferred by HBCUs declined by 23% from 1976-77 to 1993-94. The number of degrees fell more rapidly (31%) for men than for women (11%). The number of doctoral degrees increased by 223% between 1976-77 and 1993-94. About 46% of all doctoral degrees awarded by HBCUs were in the field of education compared to an average of 16% at all institutions of higher education.

Faculty Salaries at HBCUs. Increases in faculty salaries of HBCUs generally kept pace with those at other colleges, although salaries at HBCUs remained somewhat lower. In 1994-95, female faculty at HBCUs earned 86% of the average for all female faculty compared to male HBCU faculty, who earned 79% of the average for all male faculty. Within HBCUs, men’s salaries averaged 12% higher than women’s salaries, compared to a 24% difference for all institutions.

Financial Resources for HBCUs. Expenditures at public HBCUs are lower than those at other public institutions. In 1993-94, educational and general expenditure per student at HBCUs was $9,782, or about 88% of the average for all public colleges and
universities. In 1976-77, private HBCUs spent 5% more per student than all private colleges and universities. By 1993-94 the gap had reversed because of the relatively slow rate of growth in private HBCU expenditures, and private HBCUs spent about 14% less per student than all private colleges and universities.

**Overall Condition of HBCUs.** After a decade of stable enrollments prior to 1986, enrollment at HBCUs rose rapidly between 1988 and 1992. There was little change in enrollments at HBCUs between 1992 and 1994. The proportion of Black students choosing to attend HBCUs in 1994 was slightly lower than in 1988. Degrees conferred by HBCUs have been rising at all levels, mainly because of rising enrollment levels during the late 1980s.

The financial and faculty salary picture at the HBCUs generally looks less robust than at other institutions, especially at private HBCUs. Some private HBCUs show difficulty in maintaining enrollments, funding, and staff resources comparable to other private institutions.

**Factors Affecting the Campus Environment**

The National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) report on “The Condition of Education” has been of much interest to policy makers in higher education (Lippman, Burns, & McArthur, 1996). The NCES reported, among other things, that the student’s inability to speak English is associated with dropping out of school. In 1995, those 16- to 24-year-olds who spoke a language other than English (44%) at home had a dropout rate that was substantially higher than those who were fluent in English (12%). Postsecondary institutions continue to experience the fact that high school graduates
from high-income families are more likely than high school graduates from low-income families to go directly to college or university, although high school graduates from low-income families were more likely to go directly to college in 1995 than in 1972. In 1995, of high school graduates from low-income families, 34% went directly to college, compared to 83% of those from high-income families.

The learning environment of schools can be enriched by what students with a variety of backgrounds and interests bring to the classroom. The student ability levels and readiness for school are factors that create challenges for academic institutions in preparing to meet the needs of students from diverse social backgrounds. However, what is even more challenging in the school environment is the ethnic makeup of students, because a greater ethnic diversity of students provides more heterogeneity of language and culture in the schools. A large number of minority students come from poverty or non-English language backgrounds, and they may be at greater risk of not succeeding in school than other children. Education in the next decades will be transformed by a large increase in the enrollment of minority students. In 1995, according to Lippman et al., (1996), 67% of U.S. children ages 5 to 17 were White, 15% were Black, 13% were Hispanic, and 5% were Asian/Pacific Islander, American Indian, and Alaskan Native. Between 2000 and 2020, the number of minority children ages 5 to 17 is projected to grow faster than the number of White children. There will be 61% more Hispanic children aged 14 to 17 and 47% more Hispanic children ages 5 to 13. The number of Asian/Pacific Islander, American Indian, and Alaskan Native children ages 14 to 17 is projected to increase by 73%, whereas the number of those children ages 5 to 13 is
projected to grow by 67%. In contrast, between 2000 and 2020, the number of White children ages 5 to 13 is projected to decrease by 11%, and the number of White children ages 14 to 17 is projected to decrease by 10%.

The NCES report (Lippman, Burns, & McArthur, 1996) demonstrated that the United States has already begun to experience a major demographic transformation, and Anglo Americans will be a minority group by the year 2020. They will be surpassed by an increase in the populations of Indian, Asian, African, and Spanish descent. Barriers created by color, language, culture, and attitude will be greater than the United States has ever envisaged when White and minority students are joined by those from Thailand, Vietnam, and other countries. According to Power and Papsley (1992), by the year 2000, one out of every three elementary and secondary school children in the United States will be from an ethnic minority family.

While enrollments in colleges and universities are increasing, the gap between Whites and other minorities is increasing. Carter and Wilson (1993) contended that significant enrollment growth for underrepresented populations has occurred only in two-year colleges. Thus, the growth in higher education has not been translated to educational equity and diversity. Designing an academic environment that provides a relevant experience for all ethnic groups is a challenge for leadership in colleges and universities.

The current report of enrollment in higher education is as follows: American Indian, 0.8%; Asian, 2.9%; Black, 12.1%; White, 80.3%; Hispanic, 9.0%; and other, 3.9% (College Enrollment, 1996). The United States has 22% non-White racial groups
and 12% Black (Harrison, 1995). With the inclusion of multicultural education in curriculum, the students are expected to gain understanding and respect for other ethnic groups (Tiedt & Tiedt, 1990).

California, along with other states, is experiencing increases in minority enrollment. San Jose, California, has become a city of minorities, with 49.6% Anglo, 26.6% Latino, and 19.5% African Americans (Ch'maj, 1993). This diversity, according to Ch'maj, is having a great impact on the nature of postsecondary education.

Enrollment, Retention, and Alienation of Minorities

Increasing the enrollment of minorities in higher education is one of the goals of postsecondary educational administrators in Texas. According to the enrollment parity forecasts in public institutions (THECB, 1997), by the year 2010, as indicated by Table 1,

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Anglo/Other</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parity</td>
<td>261,422</td>
<td>127,726</td>
<td>50,044</td>
<td>439,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trend</td>
<td>263,419</td>
<td>79,373</td>
<td>35,156</td>
<td>377,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>1,997</td>
<td>48,353</td>
<td>14,888</td>
<td>61,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference (%)</td>
<td>-76.00%</td>
<td>60.92%</td>
<td>42.35%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>4,222</td>
<td>99,314</td>
<td>30,047</td>
<td>125,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference (%)</td>
<td>-1.55</td>
<td>155.81%</td>
<td>82.30%</td>
<td>31.75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enrollment Comparative Parity And Trend Forecasts: From 2000 to 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Anglo/Other</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parity</td>
<td>273,778</td>
<td>242,411</td>
<td>83,071</td>
<td>599,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trend</td>
<td>273,778</td>
<td>95,025</td>
<td>38,482</td>
<td>407,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>147,386</td>
<td>44,589</td>
<td>191,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference (%)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>155.10%</td>
<td>115.87%</td>
<td>47.14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hispanic and Black enrollment rates will be at parity with Anglo rates for 1995.

The ethnic mix of students enrolled in Texas higher education will proximate the ethnic mix for the 15-34-year-old population by 2010. At both the universities and community colleges, minorities would account for the necessary increases to fulfill the parity forecast in 2010; the public universities would need to recruit and retain 147,386 more Hispanic students and 44,589 more Blacks than indicated by current enrollment trends. It would be necessary for the community and technical colleges to recruit and retain 62,761 more Hispanic students and 30,180 more Black students.

Ethnic Diversity in Texas. A recent Texas A & M University report to the Texas Legislative Council indicated that Texas’ population will become less Anglo by 2008. The Anglo population will increase by 20.4% from 1990 to 2030, Blacks will increase by 62%, and Hispanics by 257.6%, but all other ethnic groups will grow by 648.4% during the same time period (Murdock, Hoque, Michael, White, & Pecotte, 1996). By 2030, the Anglo population would be only 36.7%, whereas Hispanics would account for 45.9%, Blacks 9.5%, and all other ethnic populations 7.9% (see Table 2).
Blacks and Hispanics comprised 30% of the total first-time/full-time entering freshmen for Fall 1989 at public colleges and universities in Texas. Black enrollment is approximately 6% at community colleges and 4% at universities, as indicated in a 1996 report of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB, 1996). The six-year baccalaureate graduation rates for Black and Hispanic students are 28.1% and 35.3% respectively.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texas' Ethnic Diversity Projection in Public Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor (Base year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population (1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base 2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary &amp; Secondary Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1990)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor (Base year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1990)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education According to the Texas Challenged report (THECB, 1996), there will be two million more students in primary and secondary education by 2030, an increase of 61.1% from 1990 to 2030 at a cost of $22.6 billion. At the same time, there will be an increase of 370,000 additional college students, with 1,110,757 minorities, excluding international students and out-of-state residents. The cost for college education is expected to rise to $7.6 billion in 2030.
A recent report on Blacks in higher education provides key information about the academic attainment of African Americans in the United States. The study was commissioned by the College Fund to challenge the preconceptions and stereotypes about Blacks' advancement in postsecondary education (December, 1997). The 500-page document pointed out the following:

1. Blacks make up 10.1 percent of the student population at American colleges and universities; up from 8.8% a decade ago but still below the 14.3% they represent of the US college-age population.

2. Despite enrollment gains, Blacks still earn a disproportionately small share of degrees at all levels from associate to doctorate, but Blacks made significant gains over the last two decades in the area of professional degrees, with Black women earning more than twice as many law and medical degrees in 1994 as in 1976.

3. A year after graduating from college, Blacks were nearly twice as likely as Whites to be unemployed.

4. Blacks present less than 5% of college faculty in 1992, and much smaller percentages at some research universities.

5. While Black female faculty have salaries and rank comparable to White women, only 20% of Black males were fully professors compared with 41% of White men.

6. Two thirds of Black students attended their first choice college, compared with three quarters of White students.
7. Nearly a third of Blacks at four year universities had family incomes below $20,000, compared with only 9% of Whites.

8. A higher percentage of Blacks than Whites receive financial aid at these schools, but the average grants were comparable, as was the percentage getting aid based on merit, not need.

9. White enrollment at historically Black colleges rose 71% from 1976 to 1994, while Black enrollment at those schools rose 26%.

10. Historically Black colleges now grant only 28% of the bachelor’s degrees awarded to Black students, down from 35% in 1976, but they are awarding an increasing percentage of doctoral degrees.

Education at universities where Whites are in the majority is a product of White cultural values. Colleges and universities that are seeking to increase cultural diversity must establish new ways of attracting, recruiting, and maintaining minorities. There must be a commitment to changes in advisory relationships, curriculum requirements that reflect ethnic diversity, and research training to address the broader issues of minority retention in higher education. Some strategies appear to be working, because the number of minorities in some institutions has increased, but the overall minority enrollment in higher education is decreasing, since many students drop out before completing the programs of study (Boyer, 1987; Weis, Farrar, & Petrie, 1989).

Lower enrollment is a major concern because it fosters the personal and cultural isolation of minorities (Lunneborg, 1987; Thomas & McPartland, 1984). After a series of interviews, Loo and Rolison (1986) reported that having sufficiently diverse ethnic
enrollments give potential recruits the impression that the campus is hospitable.

According to the authors, "No matter how outstanding the academic institution, ethnic minority students can feel alienated if their ethnic representation on campus is small" (p. 72). On the other hand, increasing the enrollments of minorities on campus is not without a price. Restructuring student enrollment can bring about conflict and resistance among groups, as well as create a need for substantial institutional transformation, as in the past when some campuses experienced protests for increasing the absolute number of minorities on college and university campuses (Astin, Korn, & Berz, 1991; Farrell & Jones, 1988; Santovec, 1992).

Demands from students of color have resulted in curricular and structural changes, which include ethnic studies, ethnic student organizations, specific academic support programs, multicultural programs, and facilities (Munoz, 1989; Peterson et al., 1978; Treviño, 1992). Whites' resistance or indifference to increased minority enrollments is not expected to disappear in the near future. Theorists in race relations contend that the larger the relative size of the minority group, the more likely that minority individuals will be in conflict with members of the majority resources (Blalock, 1967). Hurtado, Dey, and Treviño (1994) reported that White students tend to believe that there is high racial tension on predominantly White campuses that have relatively high African American enrollments.

Minority students' dropout rates are higher than other groups in higher education especially in predominantly Anglo American colleges and universities (Ehrlich, 1990). However, a high degree of interaction with the peer group is an important factor in
reversing early dropout incidents (Astin, 1986; Banks, 1981). Professors, then, are
critical in sustaining or weakening the intellectual and social climate in higher education
for underrepresented groups (Boyer, 1987).

LeCompte and Dworkin (1992) identified the following factors that lead to dropout:

(1) Pupil-related factors: These pertain to the experiences and characteristics that
students bring to school with them. They include economic, familial, and sociocultural
factors that push students out of school. These factors give students out of school and
away from schoolwork rewards perceived to be greater than those offered by further
education. They also are factors over which schools feel they have little control.

(2) School-related factors: These are related to the microsystem schools or to
characteristics of the particular school, educational staff, and district that serves the
student. They include inadequate teaching; unresponsive staff and school structure
systematic stratification of knowledge and information, including information relating to
careers and employment; and other school factors that make continued attendance
difficult for students.

(3) Constructed factors: These are products of the interactions among other
factors listed above. They result from the attitudes and perceptions that teachers and
students have about schools and each other, which negatively or positively affect their
interaction with the curricular and other school-related tasks, consequently affecting the
willingness or ability of children to perform adequately.

(4) Microsystems factors: These are related to the social, political, and economic
contexts in which school systems are embedded. They include how forces external to schools—including the labor market, demography, and changes in the structure of society and the family—affect life in the classroom for teachers and students. These factors may be the genesis of what are perceived to be student characteristics, such as family income level or ability of parents to participate in school-related activities.

Although many universities focus on how to retain students, Tinto (1989) revealed that the secret of retention has nothing to do with keeping students, but rather with educating them. Once a university admits a student, it is professionally and morally obligated to help that student to learn. The same commitment must be applied for effective minority retention, which should follow sound education. Tinto concluded that sound education is most likely to be found at universities with strong support from the top administration. This can be the chancellor or provost or board of trustees. The administration must clearly state the university’s commitment to high-quality teaching and back up that statement with incentives and resources. The second feature is collaborative education techniques, such as the student learning communities through which small groups of students register together for a series of courses and work as a team on assignments, both in and outside the classroom. Students in the groups tend to socialize as well as study together, and they encourage one another to learn. Contrary to popular prejudice, recent studies indicate that learning is not necessarily linked to classroom size. Thirdly, Tinto identified frequent and immediate assessments of student learning, especially during the critical first semester of the freshman year, when students need a steady flow of feedback from their instructors—preferably, in the classroom.
Hard evidence as to what works in dropout prevention is limited. However, Tinto (1988) suggested that student-institutional fit influences a student's decision to drop out or transfer. The probability of dropping out is directly related to student-institution compatibility. Students must be socially integrated and feel a sense of connectedness to peers, staff, and faculty.

Astin (1986) has indicated that students' commitment to school can be enhanced by their involvement in learning. Other educators (Gottfredson, 1981; Altback & Cohen, 1990; Helms, 1993; Lucas, 1993) have also expressed the view of the report of the 1984 Study Group in the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education. The report indicated that student's satisfaction with college is affected by the level of interaction with peer, faculty, and staff. Pascarella and Terenzini (1979) postulated that less integration on campus increases the likelihood of withdrawal.

The attrition of Black students is greatly affected by structural diversity, the numerical representation of various racial and gender groups. An academic environment that provides for socially and culturally diverse groups enhances social interactions and promotes the sense of belonging (Kanter, 1977). Hurtado, Dey, and Treviño (1994) have indicated that a school environment with a higher number of Anglo students provides fewer opportunities for interpersonal interactions across racial lines. The campuses that lack a diverse population regard underrepresented groups as symbols rather than as individuals. Kanter (1977) found that tokenism heightened visibility of the underrepresented population, which is likely to exaggerate group differences and the distortion of the individual person to fit a stereotypical model. The environment then
appears to be hostile to individuals and usually leads to attrition or low graduate rates among minorities. In some researchers' views, minority students have a social stigma in schools with a higher proportion of Whites (Steele, 1992), and the underrepresented groups generally experience stressful conditions (Prillerman, Myers, & Smedley, 1989; Smedley, Myers, & Harrell, 1993). Thus, Hurtado, Dey, and Trevino (1994) suggested that the representation of various races across ethnic lines conveys the message that the campus fosters a multicultural environment as a higher institutional priority, which is more likely to attract minorities.

Another major concern to advocates of diversity is the presence of minority faculty members on campus. They appear to be affected by the same barriers that minority students faced when they migrated to White-dominated schools in the 1960s. Faculty of color have serious difficulties as Whites adjust to their presence on campus. Martin (1994) discussed some incidences against Black professors on campus and warned that if the attack on Black faculty is not resisted, it will have an ill effect on the future well-being of the Black race. Smith (1989) views the presence of a diverse faculty and staff on campus as beneficiary to students, because minority professors can provide support for students from their own backgrounds. Ethnic students generally seek out members of the staff or faculty who look and talk as they do, who they believe will understand their social and academic experience as students. Smith added that, if this happens, it usually helps reduce the feelings of loneliness, alienation, and isolation, which increases the chances of minorities' retention in the university. Moreover, minority faculty members are important representatives to other minority groups and the
campus community. Their presence gives the impression that the institution has a commitment to diversity and multiculturalism. Smith concluded that a multiethnic faculty and staff attest to the success of the institution in a pluralistic society.

Given the need to recruit and maintain minority students and faculty on campus, some higher educational institutions have established centers for diversity affairs. Moyer (1992) investigated the functions of these centers and reported that there are no consensus on what to name offices which provide services to underrepresented student populations. While minority affairs office is still in common use, some centers are being renamed as ethnic studies, cultural diversity, and multicultural affairs, to reflect the changing demographics of minorities in the United States. Moyer observed that this new endeavor may mean an intention of administrators to reallocate financial and personnel resources in structures that would benefit minority populations on campus but pointed out that the move itself may be self-serving or politically motivated in an attempt to comply with affirmative action provisions. Moyer concluded that:

1. Diversity affairs offices are underfunded and understaffed, with one or two full-time professional staff.
2. Minority affairs administrators identified the resurgence of racism on campus as an indicator that the campus climate for minorities was becoming even less welcoming [because] all administrators [in the study] related incidences of overt racism on their campus.[es].
3. Minority affairs administrators who were female generally had fewer staff and less financial resources than did those who were male.
4. Information on graduation rates for African American students was not released by most universities. Universities that had the data on graduation rates for minority students would not release it because of its political sensitivity. (pp. 79-87)

Summary

There has been a history of exclusion and segregation of African Americans from education in America, but meaningful reforms are being addressed. On predominantly White campuses, minorities feel alienated and dissociated, which leads to dropout and attrition of students. Early interventions and carefully designed strategies to increase commitment to student retention can improve the admission and retention of minorities in higher education. For this purpose, diversity affairs centers were created to focus on recruitment, retention, and address issues of disparity, which affects minority studies on campus. The centers are often created out of conflict, and their establishment has largely been a political reaction by administrators to address or manipulate escalating controversies over maintaining minorities on campus. Minority students still experience hostility on campuses where they are underrepresented, and the ability of diversity personnel to correct the inherent historical stereotypes against minorities is hampered by the lack of will on the part of some institutions to develop relevant and adequate multiethnic programs with sufficient funding and adequate staffing.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The methodology in this study is a replication of Moyer's design at Kent State University (Moyer, 1992), which was constructed primarily to obtain information regarding the status and functions of the diversity affairs office in higher education. An attempt was made to investigate the functions of the diversity affairs centers' chief personnel in Texas public universities. Because studies such as this are not common in the literature, a descriptive design that solicited information was selected. The questionnaire was constructed by Moyer to obtain data on the office of diversity affairs, in consultation with a team of experts from state-assisted universities in Ohio. The instrument was then validated by a group of minority affairs personnel from public universities in Ohio. Consensus was established on all questions to be included on the questionnaire. Therefore, the survey instrument was used to identify variables that could contribute to an understanding of the current functioning of diversity affairs center's chief personnel at public universities in Texas.

Participants

The participating institutions in this study included all public universities with formally established diversity affairs centers that were currently operating in Texas. Out
of 35 public institutions, only 12 or 34% had established such centers, but two offices were vacant at the start of this study. Besides, all the institutions are governed by local boards of trustees appointed by the governor of Texas. However, only 10 or 29% were retained for the study, since they had formally established diversity centers with chief personnel officers. It is important to note that universities without designated offices or structures primarily for underrepresented ethnic minorities serve their minority populations through the office of student affairs or international education. Meanwhile, an 80% return rate of the instrument was expected, based on information received during the initial contact with public university administrators. After the questionnaires were sent out with a cover letter to explain the rights of the participating diversity centers' chiefs to volunteer or withhold information as they saw fit, the importance of their involvement in this study was emphasized, and a deadline given for returning the completed questionnaires.

Profiles of Public Universities in Texas

The investigator called the president's office in all the 35 public universities with academic components in Texas to determine whether each had a chief personnel officer of diversity affairs. Although 34% of such institutions have established diversity affairs offices, two offices were vacant at the time of this study and could not participate in the study due to the lack of chief personnel officers in those positions (see Table 3). The information regarding the vacant positions were received from the human resources offices of the universities with the vacancies. The institutions that were included in the study were chosen because they have diversity affairs centers with chief personnel.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Institution</th>
<th>Diversity Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angelo State University</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamar University - Beaumont</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamar University - Orange</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamar University - Port Arthur</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie View A &amp; M University</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Houston State University</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Texas State University</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen F. Austin State University</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sul Ross State University</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarleton State University</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A &amp; M International University</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A &amp; M University - College Station</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A &amp; M University - Commerce</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A &amp; M University - Galveston</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A &amp; M University - Corpus Christi</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A &amp; M University - Kingsville</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Southern University</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech University</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Woman's University</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (continued)

**Texas Public Universities (Academic Components)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Institution</th>
<th>Diversity Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Houston - Houston</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Houston - Clear Lake</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Houston - Downtown</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Texas - Denton</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas - Austin</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Houston - Victoria</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas - Arlington</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas - Brownsville</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas - Dallas</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas - El Paso</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas - Pan American</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas - Permian Basin</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas - San Antonio</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas - Tyler</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Texas A &amp; M University</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *+ = position of center is vacant

Profiles of Participating Public Universities

**Tarleton State University** Tarleton State is a public coeducational institution. It opened in 1899 as a private preparatory school and college for the rural region. In 1908
the college officials reorganized the institution on a two-year degree program, emphasizing a liberal arts education while retaining the two-year preparatory division. In 1917 the Texas Legislature placed the college in the state system of the Agricultural and Mechanical College, which later became The Texas A&M University System.

The Texas A&M University The parent institution is a state-assisted land-, sea-, and space-grant university, located in College Station. A marine-oriented branch campus is located in Galveston. Founded in 1871 as the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, the university was opened in 1876 and adopted its present name in 1963.

The University of Texas at Arlington The University of Texas at Arlington is a 100-year-old, comprehensive research, teaching, and public-service institution located in the Dallas-Fort Worth metropolitan area. It is the second largest component of the University of Texas System and the sixth largest university in Texas.

The University of Texas at Dallas (UT-Dallas) The University of Texas-Dallas is located in Richardson and was established in 1969 as a graduate research center. In 1989 the school included freshman and sophomore students. Its current enrollment is about 9,000 students and the institution is a part of the University of Texas System.

The University of Texas of the Permian Basin (UTPB) The institution is a component of the University of Texas System. The university started in 1973 as an upper-level institution, offering junior-and senior-level courses, as well as varied master's degrees. In 1991, UTPB entered a new era when it became a traditional 4-year university, adding freshman and sophomore classes to its schedule, with a total of 2,200 students.
The University of Texas at San Antonio. The University of Texas at San Antonio is a comprehensive public university, with 17,547 students enrolled in bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degree programs. It was established in 1969 as an academic component of the University of Texas System. Its 6,752 Hispanic students account for 38.5% of the total enrollment, and nearly 48.7% of all UTSA students come from underrepresented groups.

Texas Woman's University (TWU). Texas Woman's University was founded in 1901. It is located in Denton, north of Dallas and Fort Worth. Although TWU is primarily for women, qualified applicants may enroll in all programs of the General Divisions, Institute of Health Sciences, and the Graduate School. TWU offers graduate degrees in 30 master's and 22 doctoral program areas.

The University of North Texas (UNT). The University of North Texas was founded in 1890 and is located in Denton. The 1996 student enrollment was 25,000, and 26% of the students are in graduate school. As the fourth largest university in the state, UNT offers graduate degrees in approximately 100 master's and 40 doctoral program areas.

Sam Houston State University. Sam Houston State University was created in April 1879, and opened for classes with 110 students and four faculty members. The institution is located at Huntsville, Texas, with an enrollment of more than 12,000 students. Sam Houston State University offers an extensive range of bachelor's and master's degrees, a doctor of philosophy degree in criminal justice, and a doctorate in educational leadership.
Southwest Texas State University. Authorized by the Texas Legislature in 1899, Southwest Texas State Normal School opened its doors in 1903. Over the years the legislature broadened the institution's scope and changed its name, in succession, to Normal College, Teachers College, College, and in 1969, University. Each name reflects the university's growth from a small teacher-preparation institution to a major, multipurpose university.

The diversity centers' chief officers in Texas public universities have various titles ranging from assistant vice president to student affairs coordinators, which did not relate to the function, size, kind of institution, culture of the university, the credentials and skills of the diversity affairs chief personnel. Because of the political and evolving nature of such services, it is important to examine the status, role, and functions of such officers in the system of public universities in Texas, which is the focus of this study.

Research Design

A descriptive methodology was used in this study. It involved the collection of data in order to answer questions raised in the study. According to Gay (1987), a descriptive research design determines the current status of the subject or the way things are. In this particular instance, the opinions of diversity affairs chief personnel were solicited to determine the role and functions of the diversity affairs centers' chief personnel at public universities in Texas by telephone survey, questionnaire, observational visits and interviews of chief personnel in the centers of diversity affairs. Where possible, documents were reviewed on the various campuses visited for additional data and information.
The questionnaire was built on content knowledge and discussion with practitioners in the field of ethnic relations, including William Parker, former Vice Chancellor for Minority Affairs at the University of Pennsylvania and a nationally acknowledged expert in the learning styles of African American students, and Vincent Tinto of Syracuse University, an expert in the area of student persistence, recruitment, and retention. Furthermore, the questionnaire was reviewed and validated by practitioners in diversity affairs administration. Additional administrators familiar with minority concerns reviewed the questionnaire and made valuable suggestions as to content.

Procedure

A telephone survey was made to identify the chief personnel officers at all public universities in Texas who have the responsibility of providing services to underrepresented student populations in higher education. The researcher called the office of the president at each public institution, more than twice, in some instances, to inquire about the existence of such offices and to determine the identity of the chief personnel who hold them. All such personnel were called.

The purpose of the study was explained and their cooperation as informants requested. A written questionnaire was mailed with an enclosed self-addressed envelope to each diversity affairs chief personnel at each of the qualified universities. The individuals also received a cover letter that explained the nature of the instrument and the procedure for filling it out for those who chose to volunteer their participation. The
questionnaire was designed to obtain information about the role and functions of the diversity affairs centers' chief personnel.

The researcher set an appointment for a structured on-campus interview with cooperating chief personnel. After the interview in each case, there was an observational visit to the campus libraries, student union, and dining areas. These observations were intended to obtain information about the visibility of minorities on campus. Cultural artifacts such as campus newspapers and campus bulletin boards were valuable sources of information and data, which provided insight into the cultural environment of the campus. Moreover, documents published by each university (e.g., bulletins, organizational charts, and institutional reports) were reviewed (a) to identify mission statements relating to ethnic minorities, (b) to derive information relating to the administrative structures and history of each institution, and (c) to compile information on minority enrollment and graduation rates where possible.

Analysis

Results of the survey were analyzed to determine common practices in the area of diversity affairs in terms of chief personnel profiles, diversity affairs centers' profiles, co-optation, personnel functions, and the role of diversity affairs chiefs in student recruitment, retention, and graduation. As results of this analysis show, several frequency tables were constructed to display the responses to clarify the findings.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The procedure used in gathering, analyzing, and presenting the data to determine the role and functions of diversity affairs centers' chief personnel officers of public universities in Texas has been described in the previous chapter. The questionnaires were mailed to all public universities with functional diversity affairs centers in Texas (12 offices out of 35 institutions have been established but 10 are presently operating). The human resources department reported vacant offices in two institutions but did indicate that applicants were being interviewed to fill the vacancies.

Analysis of Data and Results

Findings presented here originate from three sources: the questionnaires sent out to chief personnel officers of diversity affairs centers in Texas public universities, structured interviews of such personnel, and observational visits to these schools by the investigator. Where possible, facts were probed by a review of organizational charts and document review.

Since the civil rights movement of the 1960s, Texas public institutions in higher education have slowly moved toward diversity by planning and implementing services
targeted to minority groups. Recently, however, the court's ruling against race-based assistance in Texas has been viewed with mixed emotions among scholars and civic rights groups, as later reported in this chapter. The general sentiment against the antiaffirmative action is that such reversal is bound to limit access to higher education by minorities, as indicated by a general decline in minority enrollments in some state colleges. On the other hand, some institutions are still committing resources in a way that does not violate antiaffirmative action laws for educational access and equity.

Mission statements express the ways in which various institutions deal with diversities on campus by including specific language that reflects institutional concern and commitment to the philosophy of diversification in the college environment as shown in Table 4, but some participating institutions did not have such a statement. Interestingly, the three institutions that did not have an explicit mission statement of intent to promote diversity on campus are among the oldest public institutions and have been in existence more than a century. The researcher did not investigate the reasons for the omission to determine whether it reflects a lack of commitment, political naivete, or a lack of sensitivity. One administrator said:

For the time I have been in this position, I must admit that the administration has
done what it takes to comply with affirmative action provisions. Most of the time actions are taken when there is an environmental pressure, and most of it comes from the students themselves. Therefore, my office is here to make sure that there is a revision in our mission statement to reflect our commitment to diversity.

The establishment of a formal diversity center represents a new concept for most public universities in Texas (see Table 5). Although some public institutions do not have formally established centers, the office of the president or human resources department in all public universities without a diversity affairs center informed the investigator via telephone that those institutions were serving diversity affairs' interests through the general student affairs office on campus.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas - Dallas</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Texas State University</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University - College Station</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarleton State University</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Woman’s University</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas - San Antonio</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas - Permian Basin</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas - Arlington</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 (Continued)

**Diversity Affairs Centers' Date of Establishment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sam Houston State University</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Texas (Had different title for 10 years)</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The role and functions of diversity chief personnel, as displayed in Table 6, illustrate the uniqueness of the offices as revealed by the official titles of officers, which are remarkably different from one diversity affairs center to another. However, the researcher observed that there seems to be a trend toward choosing titles that express a focus on multiculturalism and polyethnic environment. The following is what one

Table 6

**Official Title of Diversity Centers’ Chief Personnel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director/Center for Cultural Diversity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director/Minority Affairs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director/Multicultural Services</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs/Director of Multicultural Student Affairs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator of Multicultural International Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Assistant to the Vice President of Student Life/Multicultural Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 (Continued)

Official Title of Diversity Centers’ Chief Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Dean of Students</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Dean of Students and Director of Multicultural Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

diversity administrator said:

The "Minority Affairs" title reminds me of the Bureau of Negro Affairs in the 1800s that primarily focused on providing services to Colored people in a very limited way. There was another one about "Indian Affairs." All of these focus on one group or another, but it should not be that way. The university serves all ethnic groups, including Anglo, and so everything about our office [of diversity affairs] should make all ethnic groups feel welcome; not just African American or Hispanic students.

All informants addressed the issue of institutional commitment to diversity affairs largely, and most seemed overwhelmed by the amount of work the position requires. The stories were similar -- including understaffing, having limited room to accommodate various ethnic activities, and the lack of adequate funding. The consensus was that it takes a superhuman to fulfill all the expectations of the office of diversity affairs. Many administrators discussed the need for the university to recognize that one or two staff members cannot adequately serve all ethnic groups on campus. An informant stated:

Don't get me wrong, but for an individual to say he or she fully understands and
feels what other people feel about their cultures is being less truthful about the whole multicultural issue. It is a human instinct to want to be around people that look and sound like you, and when students walk into our multicultural centers and see only a person of another race or ethnic group, they will not feel at home there unless the leadership makes it happen, but with all the other things we are required to do, that is almost impossible with our limited staff. So, to give full expression to the culture of each ethnic group, there should be a representative of each racial group on the diversity affairs staff because this is not just an issue of minority, but we are talking about diversity and multicultural affairs. I, too, share the view that we are facing an impossible task of providing services to an expanded target population without adequate resources and floor space where we are boxed in.

It also became obvious while interviewing some centers' chiefs that there are various conceptions of the role and functions of the office of diversity. Some administrators focus on the larger traditional ethnic groups—the African American and Hispanic groups, although they try to serve all underrepresented groups on campus. The emerging pejorative meaning of minority or diversity is beginning to attract attention and widely discussed as an issue of concern in diversity affairs. A director in one of the centers of minority affairs commented thus:

The meaning of "minority" needs to be reworked and redefined or streamlined to refocus attention to ethnic groups instead of having to worry about people of
alternative lifestyles or social orientation, which have nothing to do with ethnicity. As underrepresented non-ethnic groups make demands for compensatory services and considerations, they increase the likelihood of reducing services to ethnic minorities, especially African Americans and Hispanics, and this will not help but confound the role and functions of the minority affairs office.

As the investigator visited the campuses, he observed a movement of separation, where multicultural centers are being segregated from diversity or minority affairs centers. The multicultural offices are beginning to focus on developing an academic curriculum with a multicultural outlook or agenda for a diversified academic environment and then encourage ethnic studies on campus. On the other hand, most diversity affairs centers are not concerned with curriculum design as much as they are with planning for the display of multicultural programs and activities on campus. It was also observed that 90% of chief personnel officers of diversity centers have no pedagogical or academic assignments for instruction on campus. They said that most of their counterparts in multicultural centers do. Although all diversity centers' chief personnel officers felt it would be good to teach, some of them said it would not make their job easier since they were understaffed. One diversity affairs center's chief personnel volunteered two hours a week to teach a course in multicultural leadership. Another personnel officer said:

I would like to teach even an introductory course in diversity affairs, but it will be
disastrous to do so. I am the only full-time staff member and my office is
generally shut down when I am not here. My assistants are students and work 20
hours a week or less, and this slows the office down because many times we have
uncompleted tasks that need immediate attention, but one person can only do so
much . . . What really gets to me is that the administration is aware of this but do
not show any sign of doing something about it. I know we are not as effective as
we could be, but if we had an extra hand with extra time, a lot more could be
accomplished.

The dilemma of how to name minority affairs centers is compounded by the
admixture of races. One director expressed the confusion over titles in this manner:

People in the United States are becoming more multiracial, and choosing one
name to fit all is not going to fit. Some ethnic American students are opposed to
special services to international students, irrespective of their ethnicity, so what
are we going to do with them [international students] since we are taking their
money and making big promises? How are we going to fit gays, lesbians, women's
affairs, and the handicapped under one title? I know in my mind multicultural or
diversity affairs may be closer to what [titles] I am thinking, but none is satisfying
because it gives me the feeling that I must live with something I don't want to deal
with, or pretend to be something else just to fit in or be politically correct. In my
position, I must serve gays and lesbians under the new concept of diversity
although I do not ascribe to their moral values. While I believe no one should
hurt them, I am not always comfortable to be in their company, but in my role in this office, political correctness is everything.

Official titles of diversity affairs centers, as shown in Table 7, reflect the variation and uniqueness of the public institutions surveyed. Forty percent of the offices have a similar name (Multicultural Services), whereas the remaining 60% have an individualized name that is unique to each of the other institutions surveyed. One of the diversity affairs centers' personnel commented on the name of his office:

I feel that one of the things that need to be changed around here is the name of this office. The name has to convey the philosophy of the institution toward diversification or multicultural education. We are more focused and committed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Center</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative Affairs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Cultural Diversity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Student Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Affairs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural International Student Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Life for Intercultural Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in this office than that name suggests. Our focus is on making this university a better place for the people of color and all other underrepresented groups on campus. But each time I look at that name and then realize that I am the only full-time employee in this office, I am left with the impression that something is not right. However, I guess that's why I accepted the challenge in the first place—to be an agent of change here.

Another personnel officer observed that whenever the issue of adapting an appropriate name for the diversity center is raised, some administrators argue that changing the name is not a panacea. In addition, they are concerned about the budget because everything has the old name (such as publications and logo materials) that has to be reprinted to reflect the new title. The informant concluded:

> It is wrong for people to think that every time you mention minority you are talking about black people. Some universities believe in this so much that they name their diversity centers **African American Centers**. However, times have changed, and while we must still deal with the classic group, especially African Americans and Hispanics, other groups have emerged with issues that need to be addressed. So I do not believe that diversity affairs is only a minority issue as such. It is broader than that.

The diversity affairs centers' chief personnel are not equally divided by gender, as shown in Table 8; there are four females and six males. The ages range from 26 years to above 46 years, with 80% between the ages of 31 and 45, as shown in Table 9. The male
personnel cluster more on the lower range of the age scale than their female counterparts. Most of the males are less than 36 years old and only two are above 40 years, whereas

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

80% of the females are over 40 years of age (see Table 10). Tables 8, 9, and 10 describe the gender and age range, respectively. Most of the male personnel officers have titles that reflect higher level of responsibility, such as assistant dean, assistant to the vice president, but only one female holds such a title.

Table 11 shows the degrees earned by diversity affairs centers' chief personnel officers. Of the diversity centers' personnel surveyed, one male and a female had
Table 10

Diversity Centers' Chief Personnel Age by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11

Degrees Earned by Diversity Affairs Centers' Chief Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

doctoral degrees; four held Master's--three males and one female; four bachelors--two males and two females. One of those with a master's had earned 24 credit hours toward a doctorate but was not enrolled for advanced degree. Two males were studying toward graduate studies.

At the time of this study, public university administrators in Texas did not have a standard requirement for the office of diversity affairs. One of the administrators said:
I currently hold a bachelor degree and am the head of this department. Some people may wonder why I hold this position with my current level of qualification, but I must tell you that most universities work like business corporations. They are looking for people who are willing to work hard and get the job done. This does not mean that higher degrees are not important, because I am pursuing mine now. All I am saying is that honesty and hard work, especially if you know somebody up there [in the administration] who believes in you, it can get you anywhere. I can almost guarantee that. So I got this job because I worked my way up, and I deliver what they [administrators] want.

No female chief personnel were currently studying toward an advanced degree, and none expressed a desire to do so in the near future. On the other hand, two males were currently pursuing a graduate degree, and another one was seeking to enroll for the doctoral program in higher education. During the on-campus interview, diversity affairs chiefs acknowledged the dominance of African Americans in the position of chief personnel officers, as shown in Table 12. When asked why this appears to be the case in public universities in Texas, everyone generally expressed the sentiment that it was by

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo (White)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12 (Continued)

Ethnicity of Diversity Centers’ Chief Personnel by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Design. Others said it was the same in most states they have visited, and many of the conferences show that Blacks hold many of the positions. One officer stated:

When the concept of diversity affairs offices was first conceived, the focus was African Americans. They were demanding that cultural centers be built for Blacks. So the construction of minority offices was due to that movement of activists, and even now, there are minority affairs offices that carry Afro-or African American in their title because the establishment of the centers was rather a political response, and to a large extent, policy makers are still responding politically to the needs of Blacks, and that is sad. Of course, later, Blacks were joined by Hispanics to demand services and relevant curriculum. The two groups have joined forces from time to time to pressure the administration for services. However, there is also one important factor; it is generally believed that Black administrators can better "control" (quote and unquote) the minority groups. Sometimes it is like being in a boat to make sure no one rocks it, knowing full well that even if no one did, waves and storms always do; nothing can be done about that by the caretakers. So I don’t see that as my role at all. However, I think it makes the African Americans, Hispanics, and other minorities to feel
good when they know that another minority is in the office. It’s always good for them to have someone they can identify with.

Table 13 describes the extent to which diversity affairs officers were promoted from within the institution. Of the six males, four were promoted from within the

Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diversity Affairs Centers’ Chief Personnel Co-optation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hired From</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside the University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

university, and two served in other institutions of higher education, where they performed similar functions before their current positions. Those who came from outside agencies have served in their present positions for less than three years.

Table 14 displays the reporting relationships within the administrative structure of the institutions surveyed. One diversity officer reported directly to the president and had satisfactory relationships with other departments and administrators. Two officers would rather have a different line of reporting privileges (direct contact with the president) instead of what they have now. Overall, chief personnel officers were generally pleased with the persons to whom they report. However, one dissatisfied director said:

It is not that I have any personal problem with my boss, but the level at which my line of reporting starts is a little too low because, by the time it [request] gets to
the president or those responsible to make the final decision on what my office can get in funding for programs, or by the time an endorsement for one of our programs is approved, we generally get less than we have anticipated. I like to be closer to the top leadership or decision maker so I can plead our case, because I think I can do a better job justifying why we need funds for certain programs that are turned down from time to time. Also, everyone else listens to you better and takes you more seriously when they know that you have access to the president or his close associates. That's the American way. We judge people by association.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Administrator</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate Vice President of Student Affairs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Student Affairs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Student Affairs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 indicates the various locations of the diversity affairs centers in the

Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
administrative structure of the public institutions surveyed. One of the diversity affairs centers was located in the administration building, and the director of the center reported directly to the president. On the other hand, 90% of the other centers were located in the student affairs center. One chief personnel officer said the problem with their location is that they do not have enough room to do the kinds of things the job description prescribes in order to reflect the center's philosophy of diversity. Among other problems, most chief officers said that space was an issue because it limits their ability to give the centers a multicultural outlook.

Commenting on the issue of space, one of the directors said:

The bad thing about this location is that you feel boxed in because there is no room for adequate programming or useful cultural activities. This place should have a piece of artwork and historical artifacts of all the students we serve, including a cultural center library. However, there is no room to display them. What I think would really serve the interest of cultural diversity is having a center that is an entity somewhere on campus. Why not? Diversity is not just about students, and I do not believe that students will come to the center more because it is located in the student center. However, like everything else, budgetary constraints will not allow us to do that, and there is no plan to move from where we are now.

The chief personnel officers for diversity affairs are also assigned to a variety of committees (see Table 16).
Table 16

Committees on Which Diversity Centers’ Chief Personnel Serve

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Committee</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative Action</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship Committee</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Committee</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Student Advisory</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Council</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Search Committee</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Affairs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultures Committee</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diversity affairs personnel have a daily responsibility to be responsive to underrepresented groups on campus. These groups include students, faculty, and staff.

Moreover, the chief personnel officers have personal stake in representing minority groups to the administration, and they have a role in interpreting the policy of the institution and relevant events to the groups whom they serve. In performing these
roles, loyalties often conflict with personal agendas. An informant perceived his role thus:

I think it makes the administration look good when it knows that it is being represented in meetings or committees which discuss minority activities on campus. They expect me to be there, and many times the most important thing is visibility on each committee or meeting. This seems to be the most important function, but when I stand firm on an issue that is of interest to my office and diversity affairs, I'm accused of being Afro-centric. So many times, it is like what I read about the African child—he or she is expected to be seen but not heard.

However, when I took this job, I made a commitment to myself and all minority students (and faculty for that matter) that I will advocate on their behalf whenever appropriate. When asked to describe their most time-consuming duties, as shown in Table 17,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time-consuming Responsibilities Reported by Diversity Centers’ Chief Personnel</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working With Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Committee, Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
50% of the chief personnel officers identified working with students. In some instances, referral services became a part of the responsibility to students. The officers were then asked to quantify the amount of time spent in the three major areas that relate to the office of diversity affairs (see Table 18). It was interesting to note that the amount of time spent on student services did not have a direct relationship with the title of the diversity affairs officer. The affirmative action diversity affairs officer who reported time on student affairs reports to the associate vice president of student affairs. He indicated that there has been a restructuring of his office which has left him with reduced responsibility in diversity affairs, while taking on an increased role in

Table 18

Time Spent With Students, Administration, and Off-campus Community by Diversity Affairs Centers' Chief Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Off-campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
administration. A director who reports to an associate vice president reported the 98% figure. Two respondents to the questionnaire expressed their goal to help reeducate the students to respect the rights of others and develop tolerance for the cultures and preferences of other people, as long as their actions and activities pose no danger to the well-being of other students.

The questionnaire asked the diversity center chief personnel officers to list the five most serious problems their offices will face in the next ten years. Affirmative action, inadequate funding for minority affairs programs, minority access to higher education, lack of support for underrepresented groups on campus, minority student retention, minority faculty retention, threats of eliminating the diversity affairs office were listed as issues of major concern (see Table 19). One chief diversity center

Table 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Concern to Diversity Affairs Centers' Chief Personnel</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative Action</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Workload With Reduced Staff</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Funding</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats of Eliminating the Diversity Affairs Office</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Access to Higher Education</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Students Retention</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting Diversity on Campus</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Faculty Retention</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
personnel indicated that the backlash against affirmative action seems to be gathering momentum, because there is an attitude on the part of some influential social thinkers to foster the notion that the civil rights laws mean the opposite of what they say, as seen in the ruling against the University of Texas School of Law in considering ethnicity as a factor in admitting students. Concerns about curtailing affirmative action programs and disallowing access to higher education have heightened since Cheryl Hopwood's case against the University of Texas School of Law race-based admission policy.

Offers to minority students have been curtailed by a court decision issued in 1996 by the 5th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. It abolished the race-based admissions policy at the UT School of Law. The decision is called Hopwood after the plaintiff, Cheryl Hopwood, an Anglo student who sued the law school for reverse discrimination after being denied admission in 1992. The court ruled that race could not be a factor in admissions or other university decisions. Texas Attorney General Dan Morales subsequently interpreted the ruling to apply to financial aid, scholarships, fellowships, and recruitment and retention programs targeted at specific minority groups at all state-run institutions.

Table 19 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Concern to Diversity Affairs Centers' Chief Personnel</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus Violence</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Group Infighting</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial and Gender Issues</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The *Hopwood* case is viewed by all the diversity affairs centers' personnel surveyed as a major setback to the gains higher education has already attained for making education accessible to minorities and other underrepresented groups. One of the diversity centers' directors said:

> I do not think the University of Texas law school should be forced by the federal courts to disregard race when offering admission, because to disregard the racial factor is to vote in favor of admitting few students in that school, and for that matter, all schools in Texas, Louisiana, and Mississippi—the three states that the 5th Circuit Court's ruling will affect. This is already beginning to happen because in May this year the UT-law school invited 11 Blacks and 33 Hispanics to join a class of 500 students on a racially neutral basis. In our own university the number of enrollment has dropped significantly, and what is even more tragic is that we lost most of the Black and Hispanic student population who have been here on special financial assistance programs. The administration has to discontinue the programs for fear of being sued. This is a tragedy.

Another passionate comment came from an informant who is turning to private sources for funds to continue financial aid programs for minorities. He stated:

> All educators in this state should be concerned about what is happening to the education of the underrepresented groups in higher education. June's report was a clear indication that there are those minority students who will attend school if
they had the financial backing. Since Hopwood, enrollment, especially in professional schools has declined significantly, and according to reports from the various newspapers, some of the state's most prestigious medical, dental, and law schools will have few, if any, minorities in their classes, and this is a direct result of the court order that prohibits committees from considering race as a factor for admissions. This decision is destined to have a long-term effect on the states affected due to the great need for doctors, dentists, lawyers and other professionals in minority communities. However, maybe we should not be panicking now because we should have expected this when the politicians phased out welfare dependency that would help to build poor families. They seem to be right on track when they also attack affirmative action in the schools.

One other area of concern that the survey and interview reviewed was the presence of minorities on campus. Almost all the interviewees were quite candid in their comments about the academic climate for minority students and other underrepresented groups. Some of them explained that the classic concept of discrimination no longer exists and that no one is physically being lynched or called names publicly but that injustice against ethnic groups has not changed much. One diversity affairs director, an Anglo, told the investigator in an interview that:

Discrimination is not blatantly obvious around here, but when one listens and reads the bulletins, you can't help but come to grips with the fact that ethnic minorities are still against a lot of odds, and discrimination still exists, except that
it is subtle, and not bloody and vocal as it used to be. However, that is the
challenge of our office--to see to it that everyone on this campus is treated with
respect and given equal opportunity, irrespective of their race or place of origin.
Painstakingly, however, every time you think you're gaining ground, something
happens to undo what you have achieved, but I guess that is life. I'm specifically
referring to Dr. Lino Graglia's comments ["Blacks and Mexican-Americans are
not academically competitive with whites in selective institutions. They have a
culture that seems not to encourage achievement and failure is not looked upon
with disgrace"). It is difficult to tell how such a comment from a veteran professor
in a prestigious institution like University of Texas law school will help improve
the academic climate for minority students in that school or all other institutions of
higher education that take his view serious.

Whether the diversity affairs office will still exist after the next ten years have
been an issue of debate, and there is a general feeling among diversity affairs centers'
personnel that, if the present trend of legal assaults against affirmation action continue,
the office of diversity affairs may not survive at all. An interviewee said:

I have sat in a meeting and heard administrators question the importance of the
minority affairs office. To them, the concerns of students should be the concern
of every office and not just one office with a special title. The money saved could
go for scholarships or international education or something that will benefit
everyone instead of just a target group. From time to time, I have to stop these
kinds of arguments in their tracks and have taken the liberty to let the
administration and other decision makers know that the office of diversity affairs
or minority affairs, whatever you want to call it, is the conscience of this
university and closing it down will be an attempt to hush the voice of conscience
in this school. Some of them know that, because this office was not established
out of the goodwill of the university. Minority students demanded it because you
could hardly find a minority professor here of African or Hispanic descent.
They're minority professors still too few, but at least it is not all Anglo as it used
to be. The curriculum did not offer subjects that related to Black or Hispanic
cultures. So I know that there are threats against the existence of multicultural or
diversity centers here in the state of Texas, and maybe this is why many public
universities have not bothered establishing centers for diversity in Texas public
school system. The Hopwood decision even makes the threat against the
establishment of diversity centers more plausible because, if they say it is wrong
to use federal or public funds to establish programs for minority groups, then they
can successfully argue that the minority office should not exist, especially one
like mine, because the funds that service my budget come from students' activity
funds. So one can't help but wander where this is going to lead.

All personnel surveyed did self-reporting on their achievements and success on
campus, and everyone felt that the office was doing a good job. The subjective report was
not evaluated to determine the effectiveness of each office. It was also difficult to acquire
the graduation rates of minorities on campus. Every office expressed regrets for not
being able to furnish the information because those who were responsible for generating such information were unable to give the data for undisclosed reasons. One observer informed the investigator that it seems as though the registrar’s office and those responsible for that data have not generated the information, as was reported to him. He added:

I would like to know myself, since you raised the issue, but I can see the political dilemma, because it is difficult to know how such data will affect decisions regarding minority programs on campus. If fewer minorities are graduating, will that hurt funding or cause the reallocation of some programs from one institution to another? It is something to think about, but I don’t really believe that they do not have that information. We’re too advanced for that. So, I’m sorry, but I just can’t help you on that.

The budget for each center was also discussed, as represented in Table 20. Some diversity affairs chief personnel said they depended on activity fees from students for

Table 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $10,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,001 - 25,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,001 - 45,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,001 - 100,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,001 - 150,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$150,001 - 200,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 - 300,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$400,000 - 500,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

operation. Other diversity affairs centers also have soft money from private sources. One director indicated grant sources for additional revenue. However, the fund allocation was not related to size, number of staff or location. Some institutions with fewer students reported nearly twice as much funding, although they may have only one or two full-time staff members.

Summary of the Results

Some of the information this study revealed was surprising. For example, the analysis of the questionnaire data showed a unique title for each diversity affairs centers' chief personnel officer in public universities in Texas. Noticeably, there is a trend toward titles with an emphasis on multicultural services, and there has not been a reduction of services to minority students as a result of the change. On the other hand, with antiaffirmative action sentiments growing, some chief personnel officers have expressed concern over the possible reallocation of the scarce resources now available for programs that serve underrepresented ethnic groups.

Serving on various committees on campus and the community gives the personnel
officers opportunity to bring visibility to the diversity affairs office, but in other instances, sitting on some of these committees is no more than a political gesture to show the public that the administration is concerned about minority issues, even if such a gesture is perfunctory or superficial. Moreover, serving these committees is time consuming, and for those offices with one full-time staff member, operation of the office is usually shut down while the chief personnel officer is attending committee meetings. One diversity affairs center’s chief personnel officer said that his office is usually shut down for a few hours periodically because he is the only full-time staff and his assistants are often gone to attend classes. He added that the periodical work stoppage and inconsistency of part-timers’ schedules slow operations in the office, because some things that need to be done immediately are often left undone due to the lack of time or available staff members.

Most of the chief personnel officers spend a great amount of office time on students, but as a group, the aggregate is 61% on students, 27% on administration, and 12% on community affairs. All the diversity centers’ chief personnel expressed their concern about the negative effect of Hopwood on minority access to higher education in Texas, dwindling enrollment of minority groups, retention of minority faculty, and the lack of funds and staff to operate the office of diversity affairs.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This study was designed to examine the role and functions of diversity affairs centers' chief personnel in all public universities in Texas. The purpose of the study was to: (a) survey broad controlling societal factors that have contributed to the concept of formal establishment of such centers, (b) examine the practice of those who are entrusted with the primary responsible for their operation, (c) describe the administrative structure providing services, (d) identify obstacles which would interfere with minority access to higher education during the next decade, and (e) investigate the persistence to graduation of minority students.

The questionnaire used in this study was designed in 1992 at Kent State University in Ohio and validated by a team of diversity affairs experts. Consensus was established on all questions to be included on the questionnaire, and the instrument was used by Moyer (1992) to identify the status and functions of minority affairs administrators at public universities in Ohio.

The current study involved ten public universities with functional diversity affairs centers in Texas. Twelve diversity centers out of 35 institutions have been established between 1977 and 1997, but only ten were functioning; attempts were being made to fill
the two vacancies. The ten questionnaires sent to the diversity affairs chief personnel officers were filled out and returned in two months, as of mailing date. The questionnaires were analyzed and the result displayed in frequency tables that reflect institutions with mission statements that specifically address diversification on campus; official titles of diversity centers' chief personnel; diversity centers' official titles; gender and age; co-optation; reporting relationship; location of administrative structure; committees served by diversity chiefs; amount of time spent on students; administration, and community; and major problem areas in the next ten years. The data for graduation rates of minority students were not available, because the institutions surveyed reported that such data have not been generated.

Major Findings

Several major findings are particularly significant to this study. Such findings were based on the questionnaire data analysis, telephone interviews, on-campus structured interviews, observational visits on campus, and literature related to the campus surveyed. This study is a replication of the Moyer study at Kent State University in Ohio. Moyer's findings compliment the current results in several ways, and the similarities and differences are pointed out in this section.

1. Graduation rates for minorities were not provided in the universities surveyed. In a similar study in Ohio by Moyer (1992), university authorities in the survey did not give official information about minority graduation rates in public universities, but 50% of the diversity affairs directors gave unofficial data that could not be verified because
the Institutional Research Division did not generate such data. The study reported
general concern by Ohio public university authorities over the impact of low or high
minority graduation rates in regards to the services being offered.

2. The wide range of titles of diversity affairs chief personnel and diversity
centers in public universities demonstrates a pluralistic interpretation of the functions of
those centers that is related to the unique institutional culture and reflects the
administrative structure of those institutions. All diversity affairs centers' chief personnel
officers expressed a will to shift from focusing primarily on minorities to titles that direct
attention to multiculturalism, as 40% of the centers now carry multicultural services as
its title. Although Moyer reported that this trend was emerging, only 17% of such offices
in public universities in Ohio carried titles reflecting multicultural affairs/students in

3. Demographic trends suggest that minority students'—Blacks and Hispanics—
enrollment rates in Texas will be at parity by the year 2010; however, limited provision
has been made to include expectations of higher minority enrollments that could
materialize because of an increase in recruiting, counseling, remediation, and retention.
The growth rate in ethnicity demonstrates that by 2008, the Texas population will
become less Anglo. By 2030, Hispanics will account for 45.9%, 36.7% Whites, Blacks
9.5%, and all other ethnic populations 7.9%.

4. Diversity affairs personnel were a resource for students, faculty and staff, and
the community, but as a whole, less time is spent on community activities. The greatest
amount of time is spent in conflict or grievance resolution and in resolving other student,
faculty, and staff concern; advocating for minority students and staff, responding to information from university decision makers; and working with minority students. Responding to the demands of the institution was identified as time consuming; and everyone indicated that sitting on committees was taking up more time than personnel would like to give. Completion of required documentation and writing proposals consume a significant amount of time. Other vital functions include troubleshooting and referrals, planning programs, and administrative duties. The percentage of time spent addressing student concerns does not relate to the chief personnel's title. For instance, vice presidents spend as much or more time in service to students as some directors or coordinators. The more senior staff did report more time spent on administrative duties. This finding is consistent with the Moyer's study.

5. Diversity affairs chief personnel are not evenly divided by gender. Sixty percent of males occupy such positions, whereas 55% of the males occupied such offices in the Ohio system of public universities, as reported by Moyer. Unlike males in the Ohio study, the male personnel of this study tended to be younger with higher degrees than their female counterparts. Moyer reported that females in the Ohio study tended to be younger, with lower degrees. In the Texas survey, however, half of the males in the study were either enrolled in graduate programs or were planning to do so by Spring 1998, but no female chief personnel officer was considering further education toward advanced degrees. Notwithstanding, all chief personnel officers stated that their present positions were a good career move and that they like the challenges the job entails.
6. Ninety percent of the diversity affairs centers were located in the building for student services, which carries a variety of titles from one campus to another. Only one diversity affairs center was located in the administration building, and its director reported directly to the president. In the Ohio study, 16% of the diversity affairs centers were located in Academic Affairs, 50% in Student Affairs, 33% in the office of the president, and 1% in other facilities.

7. The diversity affairs centers' chief personnel officers reached consensus in identifying the five most serious concerns they will face a decade from now. They agreed that changing the social and academic environment of the campus by antiaffirmative laws will interfere with the performance of their duties. The investigator observed that campus newspapers, posters, and bulletin boards substantiate the perception of chief personnel officers that racial issues are subtle, but more overt at times, majority "backlash" and the view that the attention given to political correctness (PC, as some directors call it) is causing a changing mood on campus. Graffiti on bulletin boards and racial cartoons in some college newspapers were causing a negative response from minorities. The director of the diversity affairs centers on one of the campuses surveyed disclosed that he had a scheduled meeting to address minority concerns over remarks and images in their school newspaper against minority students on that campus. Another campus newspaper carried a front-page article against the director of the diversity affairs center for what the author referred to as "Afro-centric initiatives" on campus. There was a clip of an article on one of the students' bulletins with a large inscription: "Hate Mongers Read This." The article was a recent speech by President Bill
Clinton to 300 officials of various civil rights groups, educators, and race-based violence victims. During the daylong conference, he supported an expanding definition of hate crimes. In the address, the president recognized that criminal acts motivated by prejudice strike at the heart of what it means to be an American. The two studies, five years apart, compliment each other on the nagging issues which may become problematic in the next decade. Antiaffirmative action and abolishing the diversity affairs offices stood out as major concerns.

8. Budget constraints and inadequate financial support were also stated as a cause for concern. Most of the funds come from student activity fees and private sources. The decline in student enrollments therefore has a direct impact on programming for diversity affairs centers, which depend on those sources for funding. Some centers' allocation of financial resources by the administration has little or nothing to do with the programming and activities of the centers. Funding can be expected to decrease or increase moderately, based on the student activity fees. There was a general agreement, even from centers with relatively better funding, that there will not be sufficient resources to continue to provide current level of services to diversity initiatives while expanding similar services to other special interest groups or individuals with alternative lifestyles within the student body. Other issues identified in the interviews were racial and gender issues, minority group infighting, campus violence, minority faculty retention, promotion of diversity on campus, minority access to higher education, minority student retention, reduced funding, threats of eliminating the diversity affairs office, affirmative action, and high workload with reduced staff. All of these are consistent with the Moyer study.
9. It was not possible to examine the relationships between administrative structures and the graduation rates of minority students statistically. Information on graduation rates for minorities was not released by most universities. Some universities do not keep graduation rates for some ethnic groups. In the Ohio study, diversity affairs chief personnel officers who attempted to obtain the information said that the data may be confounded by the number of years it took before baccalaureate graduation is eminent, and there was the lack of agreement about when to measure persistence. Additionally, universities that had the data on graduation rates for minority students did not release it to the public in the Moyer study because of its political sensitivity. Repeated requests for this data were ignored, because, as someone put it, the numbers were just not available, at least to the public. In the case of the Texas study, as a final gesture, the investigator called the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board to inquire about graduation rates of minorities and obtained some information on the graduation rates of freshmen entering in Fall 1989. This information revealed that Black and Hispanic students comprised 30% of the total first-time/full-time entering freshmen for Fall 1989. The graduation rate for Black is 28.1% and 35.3% for Hispanic. A further breakdown for each public university was requested; however, the Coordinating Board referred to the individual universities for such data. A spokesperson for the board offered to provide the baccalaureate graduation rates of minorities at public universities in Texas. The information was helpful as far as determining aggregate data on graduation rates for all public universities, but not individual institutions.
Research Questions

Specifically, this study has provided some answers to the following research questions:

1. **What societal changes contributed to the establishment of the position of diversity affairs centers' chief personnel officer?** Diversity affairs centers are often created out of conflict, and their establishment has largely been a political reaction by administrators to address or manipulate the escalating controversies over maintaining minorities on campus.

2. **What are the current practices of diversity affairs centers' chief personnel officers?** This study reveals that diversity affairs centers' chief personnel officers were a resource for students, faculty and staff, and the off-campus community. Most chief personnel spend their time in conflict or grievance resolution and in resolving students, faculty, and staff concerns, advocating for minority students and staff, responding to information from university decision makers, and working with minority students. Responding to the demands of the institution was identified as time consuming and everyone indicated that sitting on committees was definitely taking up more time than each personnel would like to give. Completion of required documentation and writing proposals consume a significant amount of time. Other vital functions include troubleshooting and referrals, planning program, and administrative duties.

3. **What administrative structures, relative to diversity centers, are now in place in Texas state universities?** Out of 35 public institutions in Texas, 12 or 34% have formally established diversity affairs centers but two offices were vacant at the time of this study.
It is important to note that universities without formally designated offices or structures primarily for underrepresented ethnic minorities serve their minority populations through the office of student affairs or international education.

4. What concerns have the diversity affairs centers' chief personnel officers identified that may interfere with equity in education for the next decade? There was a general agreement that there may not be sufficient resources to continue the current level of services to minority students, while expanding similar services to other special interest groups or individuals with alternative lifestyles within the student body who qualify for minority status. Other concerns identified in the interviews were racial and gender issues, minority group infighting, campus violence, minority faculty retention, promoting diversity on campus, minority access to higher education, minority student retention, reduced funding, threats of eliminating the diversity affairs office, affirmative action, and high workload with reduced staff.

Summary and Conclusion

This chapter has presented the major findings and conclusions of the study. Limitations were identified and suggestions for further research were proposed. The conclusions were discussed in the context of the research questions identified in Chapter I. The major conclusions are generated from the questionnaire and structured interview analysis as well as observational visits on campus and a review of documents such as campus newspapers, university bulletins, and other cultural artifacts. Major conclusions are as follows:
1. There is no consensus on what to call centers that provide services to underrepresented student groups. While the title of minority affairs is still in common use, there is a recent move to use such titles as multicultural services. Given the changing demographics of minority populations in the United States, the move to focus on diversity or multicultural titles may be a political posse, or it could be an honest attempt to reallocate financial and personnel resources to serve underrepresented students on campus.

2. Diversity affairs centers are underfunded and understaffed. There are 10 centers with the following staffing: (a) nine have full-time directors, (b) one has a part-time director, (c) only four have two or more full-time staff members.

3. There is an insurgence of racism on campus and recent legal antiaffirmative action decisions are indicators of difficult times ahead, thus, the campus climate for ethnic students seems less friendly for multicultural initiatives. As one director said, "It is not always blatant, but it's there--just subtle."

The issues of confidentiality limited this study and constrained the reporting of the results of the study, especially in regard to identifying relationships for effectiveness, resource allocation, and institutional commitment to diversification or racial pluralism on campus. The primary focus of this study was the role and functions of diversity affairs chief personnel in public universities, but the inability to compare institutions by variables may limit the generalizability of the results. However, the findings suggest several areas for further study.
Limitations of the Study

1. Due to the political nature of this study at a time when antiaffirmative actions are increasing, the need for confidentiality limited the ability of the investigator to reveal the identity of the institutions or diversity affairs centers' chief personnel officers. Institutions are politically sensitive, and informants were assured that findings of the study would be in aggregate form.

2. The methodology for presenting this data did not permit the identification of relationships between specific offices and student persistence of graduation. Informants were candid regarding their perceptions of institutional racism, lack of commitment to campus diversity by policy makers, and the lack of adequate resources, all of which make effective administration of diversity affairs centers difficult. Some institutions did not have enough space to operate. At other universities, there was an obvious dichotomy between the publicly acknowledged commitment to diversity and the lack of resources committed to accomplish it. Because of the commitment to confidentiality in order to acquire such forthrightness, the existence of the dichotomy can only be acknowledged, without illumination.

3. The literature review did not yield vital information about the role and functions of diversity affairs centers' chief personnel, especially in Texas. There were no data providing evidence for an evaluation of the effectiveness of these offices. There is a lack of available data relative to student graduation rates from individual universities, and no institution provided such data to the investigator, although there was no outright
refusal to release minority graduation rates. In fact, two of the diversity affairs officers said they were also curious to find out, now that the issue was raised in the study.

4. The selection of population was constrained by the number of public universities that have formally established diversity affairs centers in Texas. Out of 35 public universities in the state, only 12 or 34% have established domains for diversity centers. Two of the centers had no directors at the time of this study, and that may limit the generalization of the findings. The data in this investigation are influenced by the political, economic, and social climates that may be unique to each institution.

5. The interviews generated additional information that was not included in the structured interview questions. The questions were open-ended, and once asked, each person was allowed to give as much time as deemed necessary to exhaust the answer. This generated variables that were not necessarily consistent across all interviews and therefore could not be included in the findings.

Implications for Institutions

This study identified certain areas for further research. There is a need to evaluate the effectiveness of diversity affairs center chief personnel and offices to determine whether the services provided by diversity affairs centers are related to minorities' successful completion of the baccalaureate degree. This investigation is dependent on the generation of appropriate data by each institution. There seems to be a general agreement by the participants in this study that such data should be generated and made easier to obtain.
Although there are disconcerting variables, such as length of attendance for a degree, open versus selective admissions policies, and the socioeconomic factors of minority students, more study in the effectiveness of diversity affairs services is important.

Research that determines the factors influencing the formal establishment and operation of diversity affairs offices can provide vital information for institutional decision makers as they grapple with the dilemma of provision to increasingly expanded diverse student populations with diminished resources. The issues concerning the renaming of diversity affairs centers to offices of multicultural affairs suggest specific areas for more study.

Comparative studies with other state systems of education would provide information that could identify the impact of regional or geographic factors. Universities in the West and Southwest are servicing special interest groups of Hispanics, Latinos, Asians and other populations from the Pacific Rim. Administrators in institutions of higher education in Texas can benefit from their experience.

Implications for Diversity Affairs Personnel

All diversity affairs chief personnel expressed concern about the increased expectations concerning expanded services to underrepresented groups on campus. It is important for leaders of diversity affairs centers to assist institutions in evaluating the services they provide to the institutions, students, faculty, and staff, and to the adjacent community. Studies to investigate the effectiveness of these centers are crucial for the
allocation of resources. Sometime in the future, it would be interesting to study the
gender factor in this administrative area. The findings in this study show that female
diversity affairs officers hold lower educational credentials and are relatively older. In
five years, it may be interesting to have data on their career mobility and achievement of
terminal degrees.

Recommendations for Further Study

1. Determining institutional variables such as size, geographic location, and
selective or open admissions policies can clarify the effects of implementation and
operation of diversity affairs centers within the institutional structure.

2. The need exists for a historical study that could identify the establishment of
diversity affairs centers.

3. A study of variables affecting the individual practice of diversity affairs
personnel could focus institutional attention on such issues as the impact of financing and
staffing on the functions of the centers.

4. Studies to identify factors that influence career choice for diversity affairs
personnel can increase understanding of the importance of appropriate education and
credentials in order to function effectively within the political system of the institution.
Certainly, the most obvious area for further investigation is the relationship between
resource allocations for diversity affairs and the graduation rates of minorities.
APPENDIX A

LETTERS
Dr. Rollie Schafer  
Chair, Institutional Review Board  
The University of North Texas

Dear Dr. Schafer,

I changed the title of my dissertation from "Ethnoviolence on Campus" to "The Role And Functions of Diversity Affairs Centers' Chief Personnel Officers at Public Universities in Texas." The design and method of collecting data—through questionnaire—and with the informed consent of all participants remain the same. Only directors or chief administrators of diversity affairs centers in public universities in Texas will be involved in the study.

The letter attached stated that I should resubmit my proposal if the design and method of collecting data change. Basically, everything remains the same. Is it then possible to go ahead with this study without resubmitting a new application? (The updated proposal is attached).

Thanks for your usual cooperation.

Sincerely,

John S. David
HE ROLE AND FUNCTIONS OF DIVERSITY AFFAIRS CENTERS' CHIEF PERSONNEL OFFICERS AT PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES IN TEXAS

QUESTIONNAIRE

General Background Information for Chief Personnel Officers

1. Name of institution ___________________________________________________________

2. Headcount Fall 1996 _______________________________________________________

3. Age of chief personnel officer: (a) Less than 25 (b) 26-30 (c) 31-35 (d) 36-40 (e) 41-45 (f) 46 and above

4. Gender: _____ Male _____ Female

5. Your official title ___________________________________________________________

6. Do you hold a tenure track position? _________

7. Position prior to assuming present position ____________________________________
   at present institution _____yes _____no

8. How many years have you been a minority affairs chief administrator? __________

9. On which committees do you serve? _________________________________________

10. Are you: ___ elected ___ appointed ___ consultant
Academic Preparation

1. Please list your academic degrees (the highest degree first)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Year Completed</th>
<th>Institution Conferring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Are you currently working on a degree? ___ yes ___ no
   If yes: what degree ______________________ Where ______________________

3. Do you hold academic rank? If yes what is your title? ___ Professor ___ Associate professor ___ Assistant professor ___ Other

4. Did you teach during 1996-97? If yes: how many hours ______________________
   What courses ______________________
   Was this teaching voluntary? ___ yes ___ no

5. List professional organizations of which you are a member.
   ______________________
   ______________________

6. If you hold an office in these organizations, please identify ______________________
   ______________________

   Administrative Structure

1. What is your official title? ______________________

2. Where are you located in the administrative structure of the university?
   ___ Academic affairs
   ___ Student affairs
   ___ Other (Please specify) ______________________

3. What is the title of the person to whom you report? ______________________
4. Please describe the most time consuming duties of your position

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

5. Please list the offices which report to you

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

6. List what you consider to be the most important function of your position

________________________________________________________________________

7. Please indicate the percent of your time devoted to each of the following constituencies:
   ______ campus administration
   ______ Students
   ______ outside community

8. Please describe your role in formal decision-making with regard to your position

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

9. Please describe the extent of your interaction with deans and department chairs

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

10. Do you have a role in policy-making? __yes__no

11. Do you have a role in institutional research? __yes__no
December 17, 1997

John David
3637 Trinity Mills, #212
Dallas, TX 75287

Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research (IRB)
Re: Modifications to IRB Application No. 96-269

Dear Mr. David:

Thank you for submitting the revision to your project titled “The Role And Functions of Diversity Affairs Centers.” As required by federal law and regulations governing the use of human subjects in research projects, I have examined the change to your proposed study. The risks inherent in this research are minimal, and the potential benefits to the subjects outweigh those risks. The submitted change of title to your protocol is hereby approved for the use of human subjects on this project.

The UNT IRB must re-review this project annually and/or to any other modifications you make in the approved project. Please contact me if you wish to make any additional changes or need additional information.

Sincerely,

Walter C. Zacharias, JR., Ed.D.
Chair, Institutional Review Board

WZ: sb

cc: IRB members
Dear <TITLE> <LAST_NAME>:

As an administrator in the field of minority affairs, you can provide important information about the status, role and functions of your position at a state university. As the United States moves toward an increasingly diverse population, it is crucial to prove educational equity for that population. Administrators such as yourself play a key role in defining and providing services and your participation in this study can contribute to the advancement of knowledge of this increasingly important function of our universities.

The enclosed survey has been especially developed to ensure efficient use of your time. Simply check the appropriate response for most questions. Some open-ended questions have been included to allow your input into the instrument. The entire process should require less than fifteen minutes to complete. Please return the completed survey in the self-addressed stamped envelope by October 1, 1997. Your early response will help me complete this study in time for graduation in December. Each participant will receive a summary report of the study.

The study will gather data to provide an empirical map of the current status, role and functions of minority affairs administrators at state universities in Texas. In addition, I will be calling soon to schedule an interview with you on your campus. Because the specific population targeted for this study includes only a selected number of universities, your participation is extremely important. We sincerely appreciate your cooperation and look forward to talking with you soon.

Sincerely

John S. David
The University of North Texas
(817) 261-2661
Fax: (817) 276-0836
E-mail: jseh@cteIcom.netn.com

Dr. John P. Eddy, Dissertation Advisor
Department of Counseling Development and Higher Education
The University of North Texas
(940) - 565-2956
eddy@coefs.coe.unt.edu
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE
Historical information

1. In what year was your position established?__________________________________________

2. Did your institution previously have a position relating to minority affairs? no
   If yes, please describe ____________________________________________________________

3. Does your institution have a mission statement which reflect a commitment to minority
   affairs? no

PLEASE CHECK ALL FUNCTIONS THAT APPLY TO YOUR DESCRIPTION. IN THE
SECOND COLUMN, PLEASE INDICATE WHETHER OR NOT YOU CONSIDER
THESE ACTIVITIES APPROPRIATE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Do you perform is this function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>this function?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COLUMN 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. STUDENT RECRUITMENT</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Send recruitment mailings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Attend high school visitations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Visit church and communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Participate in college affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Provide pre-admission advising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Seek recruitment assistance from local civil group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. ORIENTATION TO THE INSTITUTION</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Prepare for assessment testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Provide special orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Provide peer mentoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Develop a calendar of events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. RETENTION</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Schedule entrance/exit appointments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Provide student advocacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Monitoring student progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Represent student concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Ensure minorities representation on all major governance committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Enhance the coverage of minority student concerns in student newspaper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you perform this function?  COLUMN 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLUMN 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is this function appropriate?  COLUMN 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLUMN 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS

a. Needs assessment for program planning
b. Budget preparation
c. Hire staff
d. Evaluate staff
e. Fire staff
f. Compose annual report
g. Distribute to minority students
h. Distribute to community
i. Serve on institutional committees
j. Serve as community resource for education
k. Publish handbook on minority faculty recruitment
l. Help develop goals for institution

Please list the five most serious problems you will face in the next ten years as an administrator in minority affairs.
Structured Interview Questions On Campus

1. Please tell me about your preparedness for the current office you hold.

2. However would you describe the reporting relationship between you and university administrative structure?

3. What would be your preference, if any, other than your present line of reporting in the university administrative structure?

4. What is the graduation rate of minority at the university?

5. What are your major concerns about societal constraints or issues that you think will impact your practice or the operation of your office in the next decade?

6. What authority do you have in budget making?

7. What responsibility do you have to effect policy and obtain student scholarships for minority, recruitment, and retention on campus?

8. Given your experience in diversity affairs, how best do you think minority affairs could be structured or organized to serve every ethnic minority group on campus more appropriately?

9. How would you describe the support you get from other administrators on campus?

10. Some diversity affairs administrators feel that they have more work than they have time for and fewer staff to work with. How would you address this issue in regard to your office?

11. What is the budget for your department?

12. What kind of impact is your office having in regard to minority issues on campus?
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