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From Spring through Summer 2014, Halualani & Associates, a diversity strategy and analytics firm for higher educational institutions, engaged in a “diversity mapping process” for California State University, Monterey Bay through which a baseline of diversity efforts, progress, and curricular components could be established so as to ascertain future needs and
Diversity Mapping

Halualani & Associates created “diversity mapping,” or a reflexive practice of identifying where a university is with regard to establishing a deeply embedded campus structure grounded in diversity in terms of values, principles, objectives and goals, outcomes and resource allocations (Halualani, Haiker, & Lancaster, 2010). This process involves “taking stock of current diversity efforts and then analyzing such mappings to identify the current status of inclusive excellence at that institution” (p. 127). We highlight our “diversity mapping”’s valuable utility for locating a higher education institution’s actual (and not projected) engagement with and implementation of diversity efforts. It is important to demonstrate how this process is more than just a listing or diagrammatic exercise; instead, it stands as a meaningful practice of inquiry through which singular information pieces about diversity, which typically exist in isolation and in campus silos, are placed into a larger, holistic portrait that organizes and frames the information in relation to one another, thereby providing a comprehensive view of diversity from a structural and thematic level. Diversity mapping can provide a sense of where the institution has been, where it currently is, and how it has operationalized diversity and inclusive excellence, in both intentional and unintentional ways.

Diversity Mapping in Extant Higher Education Research: Creating a Culture of Inquiry About Diversity

Diversity scholars and chief diversity officers argue that higher education institutions should view diversity in terms of a larger and multidimensional construct. For example, Hurtado, Carter and Kardia (1998) and Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pederson and Allen (1999a) identify several important internal and external factors to a university that should be considered when examining campus climate and diversity environments. These factors include the following: compositional or structural diversity, the psychological dimension of the climate, the behavioral dimension of the climate, and an institution’s history and legacy of inclusion or exclusion (Hurtado, Carter, & Kardia, 1998; Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pederson, & Allen, 1999a, 1999b). As an extension of this framework, Milem, Chang and Antonio (2005) highlight the significance of institutional structures, such as curriculum, policies and resources, in shaping a campus environment that embraces
differently situated student populations and engages diversity as an educational outcome. Hurtado, Griffin, Arellano and Cuellar (2008) discuss the extent to which these internal and external factors are assessed by institutions to gauge the level of university commitment and the range of actions taken (along with the measured impacts) with regard to infusing inclusive excellence, fostering a positive campus climate and responding to the needs of differently positioned student groups. This kind of climate assessment typically occurs through statistical data, survey instruments and qualitative interviews to access student “presence”, outcomes, student perceptions and experiences. However, little has been done to document an institution’s full range of in-operation norms, practices, policies, efforts and curricula around diversity as a measure of the university’s conceptualization, operation and actualization of diversity and inclusive excellence. What a higher education institution is actually doing by way of diversity (in all of its forms) needs to be examined in relation to the perceptions and experiences of diversity to balance the objective and subjective dimensions of a diversity climate.

Hurtado, Griffin, Arellano, & Cuellar (2008) make the case that campuses committed to “inclusive excellence” have now determined that a good understanding of the climate should be the first step in campus-wide planning, as well as intentional educational activity inside and outside of the classroom (p. 29). Thus, “diversity mapping” represents a much needed first step for a campus taking meaningful and intentional action to carry out a diversity educational mission.

---
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Purpose and Goals for California State University, Monterey Bay:

Given the context established above, the objectives for this diversity mapping project were to:

- Trace all diversity efforts, programs, courses, curricular components, and resource allocations (from January 1, 2010 through June 1, 2014);
- Examine all diversity efforts, programs, courses, and curricular components through analytical layers;
- Delineate the ACTUAL (not projected or remembered) activities engaged in by California State University, Monterey Bay;
- Establish the baseline for where California State University, Monterey Bay is with regard to implementing major diversity efforts across all levels (top-down, bottom-up, and across) and divisions (academic to student to community affairs) at the institution and for all campus constituencies (undergraduate/graduate students, staff, faculty, managers and administrators, community members). This baseline will be used to identify and measure progress via California State University, Monterey Bay and future diversity strategies;
- Identify strengths, “leverage points” or current resources, empty zones, and “opportunities” or needed areas of improvement;
- Identify potential coordination efforts;
- Recommend possible pathways and strategies for action and implementation and next steps.

Our goal was to create the following diversity mappings for California State University, Monterey Bay:

- Diversity Efforts by Unit Mapping
- Diversity Efforts by Theme Mapping
- Diversity Efforts by Change Order Mapping
- Diversity Efforts by DELTA Mapping
- Diversity Undergraduate Courses Mapping
- Diversity Undergraduate Courses by DELTA Mapping
- Diversity Graduate Courses Mapping
- Diversity Graduate Courses by DELTA Mapping
Our Halualani & Associates team set out to first collect data from all campus divisions about current diversity efforts and then graphically map the data in a visual representation/mapping software program. The process later culminated in an in-depth analysis of the diversity data in terms of the institution’s level of commitment and action around diversity, leading to targeted diversity planning.

**Data collection method:**
Halualani and Associates collected information about current diversity efforts and programs at California State University, Monterey Bay. For definitive purposes, our team broadly referred to diversity effort as “any activity or program that promotes the active appreciation of all campus members in terms of their backgrounds, identities and experiences, as constituted by gender, socioeconomic class, political perspective, age, race, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, disability, regional origin, nationality, occupation and language, among others, as well as any activity or program that brings together any of these aspects.” We specifically cast our “net” wide so as to identify as many possible diversity-related activities and efforts as possible. Because California State University, Monterey Bay is a university that highlights integrative learning, service, and social justice, we were attuned to reading “diversity” through the lenses of these concepts. We understand that the inflection of “diversity” can be quite different given this focus at California State University, Monterey Bay.

**Info/data collected from campus divisions:**
Information about diversity efforts was collected in the following ways. Information about diversity efforts was collected in the following ways. First, we conducted an electronic search (web scraping, search engine optimization) of over 200 campus website links related to “diversity,” “inclusion,” “culture,” “cross-cultural,” “inclusive excellence,” “race/ethnicity,” “identity,” “gender,” “difference,” “sexual orientation/disabilities/language/religion/nationality/region/age/generation/socioeconomic class,” “veteran status,” “intersectionalities,” “intercultural,” and “international/global.” Halualani & Associates team members then extracted this Web information and inserted it into a spreadsheet program (Numbers).

Second, all campus divisions at California State University, Monterey Bay were invited to submit specific information about their current diversity efforts and documentation. We specified that such diversity efforts should have been in effect within the last four years. Just from our data collection process, we could tell that California State University, Monterey Bay was committed to engaging in this type of diversity and inclusion work.

The data collection method took place over a period of 4 months. Every division and campus program submitted key information. In the first screen of such submitted data, our team then identified any gaps or missing additional information from specific corners of the campus and sent out a specific email request for this information in collaboration
with Patti Hiramoto, Associate Vice President for Inclusive Excellence and Chief Diversity Officer and the Office of Inclusive Excellence. We also had a three-month revision period through which campus members and units could submit additional information and correct any areas of our maps. We received 40-50 new pieces of evidence in the revision phase.

Spreadsheet inventories:

Program/effort inventory

For our program/effort inventory, we employed specific strategies in which we collected, consolidated and recorded data about diversity efforts and programs at California State University, Monterey Bay. The collected data were synthesized through a process by which team members worked together to enter data into a spreadsheet that utilized specific columns to track key aspects of the programs and efforts. These data columns also simultaneously filtered such information through twenty-three (23) major analytical layers.

These analytical layers are as follows:

- Year of Effort
- Level of Focus: Primary or Partial Diversity Effort
- Division/Departmental Location
- Level of Integration: Connections & Linkages Among Divisions
- Type/Theme of Diversity Effort
- Change Order: 1st to 2nd to 3rd to 4th Order Items
- Number of Times a Diversity Effort is Highlighted in Campus News/Media
- Innovation Score
- Target Population (All Campus, Leadership, Faculty, Staff, Students, Community Members)
- Initiation Point: University-Wide or Program-Driven
- Topical Focus: Mainstream or Specific Group-Focused
- Diversity Engagement/Learning Taxonomy Assessment (DELTA): Based on 7 levels of diversity engagement and learning
  - Student Stage: Class Level of Targeted Student Population
  - Definitions of Diversity in Efforts
  - Type of Discourse Around Diversity
  - Specific Questions About Diversity That The Campus Is Exploring
  - Prospective Reach Level: How Many People Were Likely Impacted?
  - Enduring Factor Level: Time Frame/Sustainability of Effort
  - Number of Direct Measures of Impact (Actual Data Outcomes)
  - Number of Indirect Measures of Impact (Actual Data Outcomes)
  - Number of Processes
  - Number of Products
  - Collaborators

Curricular Inventory

For our curricular inventory, we identified diversity-focused university curricular components as constituting a key component of the campus efforts toward promoting the appreciation of diverse backgrounds and viewpoints. Thus, it
was important to begin tracking the various diversity-related courses and curricular components across specific disciplines in both the undergraduate and graduate course offerings at California State University, Monterey Bay. Given the service and social justice focus of California State University, Monterey Bay, we were particularly interested in how different academic programs approached and incorporated diversity within their curricula. For our inventory, we defined a diversity-related course as one that “focuses on issues and topics related to various cultural groups, backgrounds, identities and experiences, and/or promotes the larger importance of diversity, difference or cultural sharing for the public.”

In order to make an accurate accounting of these diversity-related courses, we performed a detailed qualitative content analysis of all university competencies, program learning outcomes, course learning objectives and outcomes, course descriptions, syllabi content, and submitted assignments and outcomes.

We combed through these aforementioned curricular elements looking for course titles and course descriptions containing the terms “culture,” “diverse,” “diversity,” “multicultural/ism,” “global,” “difference,” “identity,” “cultural competency,” “underserved,” “historically underrepresented,” “race/ethnicity,” “gender,” “sexual orientation,” “socioeconomic class,” “religion,” “nation/nationality,” “language,” “political perspective/ideology,” “disabilities,” “veterans,” “age/generation,” “intersectionalities,” and variations of those words. The labels – “primary,” “partial,” and “integrated” – were used to classify the level of emphasis on diversity in courses and curricular components at the university. A “primary” course on diversity referred to a curricular offering that had a primary focus on diversity issues, topics, perspectives and/or principles, whereas a “partial” course on diversity referred to a curricular offering that had a minor focus on diversity issues, topics, perspectives and/or principles. An “integrated” course on diversity closely ties ALL subject matter on a continual basis in that course to various aspects of culture and diversity. An institution needs to evaluate the focus and range of content in diversity-related courses. This is in order to indicate if diversity is merely window dressing, a temporary bus stop for one week out of the semester, a passing reference or an integrated theme that cuts across all topics and subject matter in a course (as a competency focus and objective with a designated learning outcome for students).

Once we identified a curricular component as having some focus on diversity, an entry was made on a spreadsheet. In the spreadsheet, the entries were examined via data columns through thirteen (13) major analytical layers:

These analytical layers are as follows:

- **Course Student Level**
- **Course Description**
- **Level of Focus: Primary, Partial, Integrated Diversity-Related Course**
- **College/Division/Departmental Location**
- **Course Type: The Kind of Course (Core Competency/ Skills Course, Disciplinary Content Applied to a Cultural Context Course, First Year Seminar, Language Instruction Course, Area Studies Content Course, Ethnic Studies Content Course, Cultural Appreciation Course, Global/ International Focused Course, Study Abroad, Service Learning Course)**
- **Cultural Focus: 2 or More Cultures; Singular Culture/ Identity, Comparison of Cultures, Intersectionalities**
- **Spread of Culture: International/Global, Domestic**
- **Temporality of Culture: Contemporary, Historical**
- **Cultural Specificity: Culture-General or Culture-Specific**
- **Definition(s) of Diversity in Courses**
• Diversity Engagement/Learning Taxonomy Assessment (DELTA): Based on 7 levels of diversity engagement and learning
• Critical or Power-Based Approach
• Student Stage: Class Level of Targeted Student Population

Lastly, we conducted a schedule analysis of the last two (2) years of course offerings in relation to our coded diversity-related courses in order to identify the exposure potential of students to courses in terms of how often such courses were offered and in how many sections.

Moving from inventories to visual mappings
The next stage required the smooth transition from data entry and compilation in a spreadsheet to the actual visual mapping of the data using MindManager™ software by Mindjet®, a brainstorming software for organizations.

Graphical/visual mapping via Mindjet MindManager

Mapping diversity-related courses
Four (4) maps showcased the current range of California State University, Monterey Bay’s course offerings on diversity (two for undergraduate courses and two for graduate courses). The courses were color coded and numerically labeled based upon the aforementioned analytical layers.

Mapping diversity efforts and programs
Four (4) maps were created to represent California State University, Monterey Bay’s diversity efforts: “Diversity Efforts By Unit,” “Diversity Efforts By Theme,” “Diversity Efforts By Change Order,” and “Diversity Efforts By DELTA.” For each diversity effort, a distinction based upon the available descriptions we gathered was made between primary, partial, and integrated diversity efforts.
We defined a “primary” diversity effort as one that had diversity – the promotion of and appreciation for diverse backgrounds, experiences, identities and perspectives, and/or the larger principles of inclusion and intercultural dialogue – as its major purpose and goal of operation. A “partial” diversity effort was designated as one that had a corollary, secondary and/or minor focus on diversity as defined above; meaning, the effort would exist even without the diversity aspect. An “integrated” diversity effort refers to one that had a diversity focus and function deeply embedded into an operational practice or activity. We then color-coded and numerically labeled the diversity efforts in terms of the aforementioned analytical layers.

Methodology for analyzing the mappings
After all of the mappings were completed, the analysis stage of this process ensued. This involved the use of spreadsheet software (Excel, Numbers) as well as SPSS to perform statistical analyses. We also employ a qualitative coding software (NUDIST™; NVivo™), which analyzes thematic patterns, and a manual coding schemata based on thematic domain and grounded theory frameworks (see Halualani, 2008).¹

Chapter 2

California State University, Monterey Bay’s Data Narrative

Our diversity mapping analytics at Halualani & Associates has identified the following core data narrative, or story about how California State University, Monterey Bay is engaging diversity in terms of its recent actions and curricula. This data narrative features the key highlights of our diversity mapping findings.
Higher educational institutions typically approach diversity in a few key ways. Colleges and universities most often approach diversity in terms of the compositional makeup of the student body and the degree to which specific racial/ethnic/gender groups are represented on campus. Other institutions connect this focus on representation to the theme of “historical underrepresentation,” or the inclusion of specific racial/ethnic/gender groups that have been historically excluded from and marginalized by educational arenas of society in terms of access to quality education and educational success pathways. Today’s colleges and universities have recently embraced a focus on the graduation and retention of marginalized groups of students on their campuses by tracking completion rates and investing in student success interventions (for e.g., first year cohort programs, academic excellence boot camps for students of color).

While these aforementioned approaches are important to higher education in tracking institutions’ work on inclusion, access, and service to diverse groups, a primary focus on “filling numbers” and “bumping up graduation rates” is not enough (Bensimon, 2004; Williams & Clowney, 2007). It is not enough to focus on compositional features of diversity WITHOUT proactively creating a campus infrastructure and environment that cultivates diversity appreciation, learning and development, and responds to historical societal injustices related to difference that campus members encounter.

As a counterpoint, Halualani & Associates examines the degree to which higher educational institutions meaningfully, comprehensively, and strategically engage diversity across all levels of a university so that all members (students, staff, faculty, administrators, alumni) thrive, feel valued, and attain personal and professional success and fulfillment. We especially look at ways in which colleges and universities employ diversity as an educational resource and knowledge domain for students and as a central ingredient for their academic success. Our firm also highlights the extent to which universities engage, confront, and dismantle historical societal injustices that have filtered into and embedded the higher educational landscape. Taken together, these foci constitute the real work of “diversity.”

---

Section 2

Is California State University, Monterey Bay (CSUMB) Making “Diversity” Happen?

Yes, California State University, Monterey Bay (hereafter CSUMB) is making “diversity” happen but not to the fullest extent.

• For example, our analysis found that CSUSM has completed 309 diversity-related efforts in the period under review (January 1st, 2010 through June 1, 2014).

• Indeed, when CSUMB engaged in diversity-related efforts, the large majority (86%, 265) of these efforts were primary focused, or centrally designed to serve the purpose of promoting diversity at CSUMB. Thus, there appears to be a level of commitment to diversity at CSUMB.

• All divisions at CSUMB are “on deck” or participating in diversity-related efforts. However, the two “heavy lifters” are Academic Affairs (AA) and Student Affairs & Enrollment Services (SAES). Moreover, the efforts driven by these divisions are also primarily focused on diversity.

![Diversity Efforts By Division](chart)
In terms of Halualani & Associates’ diversity change order sequence, **CSUMB is clearly situated in an action stage (2nd order)** as evident by the chart below (88%, 272, in 2nd order stage). This means that CSUMB is enacting (moving on) their commitment to diversity. However, it is not clear what CSUMB is moving towards in terms of their diversity-related aspirations. Thus, a diversity-related strategic plan with a framework of goals is absolutely needed.

---

**Diversity Efforts by Change Order Sequence**

![Graph showing diversity efforts by change order sequence]

- **1st Order**: 8%
- **2nd Order**: 88%
- **3rd Order**: 3%
- **4th Order**: 3%

---

**Change Order Locales**

- **Academic Affairs**: 32% 32%
- **Student Affairs & Enrollment Services**: 23% 58%
- **Administration & Finance**: 27% 1%
- **Office of the President**: 18% 5%
- **University Advancement**: 0%

---

**Figure 2.1 Change Order Sequence Description**

**ASSESSING EVOLUTION OF A DIVERSITY PRACTICE**

H & A has developed a unique numbering sequencing designation that indicates the degree of evolution of a diversity effort/practice in terms of the following:

1. **First order** - declarative efforts and policies that set the climate
2. **Second order** - action completion
3. **Third order** - sustained regular practices
4. **Fourth order** - culture changing

*These categories remake the notion of "business as usual."

*The goal is to have a balanced representation of diversity efforts, practices, and processes across designations, as each change order foregrounds its successor.

---

While all divisions are participating in 2nd order actions (with Student Affairs & Enrollment Services, SAES as the leader), there is little alignment among CSUMB’s divisions in terms of a larger strategic diversity framework that stands as its end goal.

---

Though four divisions (Academic Affairs, Student Affairs & Enrollment Services, Administration & Finance, and the Office of the President) have contributed 1st order actions or more specifically, mission statements related to diversity, these mission statements frame diversity either in general terms or...
policies/ protections and not as a strategic focus. 75% (15) of the mission statements highlight diversity in general terms (naming the importance of diversity but not in terms of any meaningful dimensions, relationships, or directions of diversity. 25% (5) of these mission statements did specifically name diversity in relation to race, gender, and sexual orientation as foci. 60% (12) of the mission statements are primarily focused on diversity while 40% (8) are partially focused on diversity. But, again, these extant mission statements do not provide enough of a strategic framework for California State University, Monterey Bay’s diversity future.

When considering CSUMB’s 1994 Vision Statement as a possible source of a diversity strategic framework, it does not suffice, although the vision statement was groundbreaking at the time of creation. For instance, in a qualitative textual analysis of the 1994 vision statement, there were emphases placed on access, learning (in terms of a society-centered curricula), and defined priorities of “multilingual, multicultural, and gender-equitable” aspects of diversity. However, there was no mention of “social justice” and no specific unpacking of what diversity means to CSUMB (via breaking down of such terms as “global,” “cross-cultural competence”). Thus, CSUMB needs a diversity strategic framework with explicit goals, aspirations, objectives, and end results.

Figure 2.2 Tag Cloud of All CSUMB Mission Statements

Figure 2.3 Tag Cloud of CSUMB Vision Statement
To further this point, the types of diversity efforts that CSUMB mostly engages in are events (49%, 152) and trainings/workshops (11%, 34), with the remaining efforts spread across 16 other types. (Keep in mind that these highest percentage diversity efforts are largely driven by Academic Affairs and Student Affairs & Enrollment Services.)

This data point reveals that there is no diversity strategic framework in place and that CSUMB may be suffering from a classic case of “activity-itis” common to higher educational institutions or the notion that when a campus is putting on diversity-related events, activities, or programs (that are most often one-shot, temporary efforts), that it is making true diversity progress. So while over 300 diversity efforts have occurred at CSUMB in the last four years, the question remains: What is CSUMB moving towards? What does CSUMB want to achieve by way of diversity and inclusive excellence? Who does it want to serve and in what ways? What kinds of efforts does CSUMB want to focus on? Universities cannot do everything with limited fiscal resources and external pressures (state divestment in public higher education, community and workforce needs). Thus, CSUMB needs to make decisions about the kinds of diversity efforts it wants to prioritize in the next few years and ideally, have those efforts align with a strategic framework.
Moreover, when considering the level of engagement on issues of diversity that occurs in the events and trainings/workshops, the two highest percentage diversity efforts, we found that the mapped diversity-related events were predominantly topping out at our DELTA (Diversity Engagement Learning Taxonomy Assessment) Taxonomy Level 1 - Knowledge Awareness (85%, 129).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events By DELTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Knowledge/Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Advanced Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Evaluation-Critique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Social Agency &amp; Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Innovative Problem Solving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This indicates that most of the diversity-related CSUMB events focused on introducing or describing aspects of a diversity topic or issue as opposed to sustaining conversations around power issues, inequalities, privilege, and macro-structures related to diversity, culture, and identity.

Similarly, the mapped diversity trainings/workshops at CSUMB topped out at our DELTA Level 2 - Skills (53%, 18). Again, the higher engagement levels having to do with issues of power, privilege, social justice, and diversity were not reached or targeted in those trainings/workshops.

So, if California State University, Monterey Bay is indeed an institution that prioritizes diversity and social justice, why are those aspects not fully engaged in the learning function of those efforts (and especially when those effort types - events and trainings/workshops — occur so much in relation to other effort types)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trainings/Workshops By DELTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Knowledge/Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Advanced Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Evaluation-Critique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Social Agency &amp; Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Innovative Problem Solving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2.4 DELTA Levels Descriptions

**Level 7 - Innovative Problem Solving**
Innovative thinking
Uses multiple perspectives to develop new, original, unique, impactful strategies & solutions to problematics
Relies on multiple heuristics (from all cultures, contexts, arenas of life)

**Level 6 - Social Agency & Action**
Designing Actions, Personal-Social Responsibility
Able to see connections across differences
Problem-solving, Responsive decision making
Constructive-Resistive (from the marginalized side)
Action, Advocacy, Allies, Sharing with/Teaching Others

**Level 5 - Evaluation-Critique**
Evaluation/Critique of Power Differences, Positionality/
Compassion
Posing Complex Questions

**Level 4 - Advanced Analysis**
Perspective-Taking/Reflection/Analysis, Self-Other Dynamic
Personally invested in diversity
Unscripted/Off the Beaten Path
Free-flying among concepts, areas to ferret out the big, difficult questions and major problematics, stakes, urgencies

**Level 3 - Interaction**
Active Involvement in Intercultural Interactions
Motivation, Seeking Out, Participating Behavior

**Level 2 - Skills**
Application/Intercultural Competence/Skills-based

**Level 1 - Knowledge-Awareness**
Knowledge, Awareness, Appreciation
Touches on Social Approvability Level

Divisions By DELTA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA &amp; ES</th>
<th>Academic Affairs</th>
<th>Office of the President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• The target populations of CSUMB’s diversity efforts are generalized as an “undifferentiated mass” or designated for “all.” While this general embracing of the larger campus population serves a valuable inclusive function at CSUMB, it also detracts from the need to create differentiated and customized efforts for different segments of the CSUMB community, namely CSUMB staff members. CSUMB staff members have only 1% of diversity efforts designated for them. There are more diversity efforts for students, faculty members, and even community members than for staff members.

• There is limited guarantee of continued diversity action as the mapped diversity efforts are framed largely for the short term, with 54% (166) in the immediate/short term and 40% (124) through the next 1-2 years. A multi-year (5 year) diversity strategic framework will ensure that a sustained momentum on diversity and inclusive excellence can be achieved.

Enduring Factor Level

- 1 = Immediate, short-term
- 2 = 1-2 Years
- 3 = Next Diversity Strategic Cycle
- 4 = Transcending

The target populations of CSUMB’s diversity efforts are generalized as an “undifferentiated mass” or designated for “all.”
• When examining the type of diversity engagement captured in efforts driven by specific divisions, an interesting finding emerged: the Office of the President which featured the Office of Inclusive Excellence and CSUMB’s diversity infrastructure, contributed a smaller percentage (6%, 17) of diversity efforts than Academic Affairs (54%, 101) and Student Affairs & Enrollment Services (33%, 167), but those efforts (small in number) had the highest DELTA diversity engagement levels (especially with DELTA Level 4 - Advanced Analysis and DELTA Level 6 - Social Agency & Action which includes DELTA Level 5 - Evaluation-Critique of Power Differences). CSUMB’s extant diversity infrastructure should be continued and bolstered given its centralizing function and focus on diversity as well as its capacity to increase diversity engagement levels for the campus community.

• The range of change order actions (for e.g., 1st order, 2nd order, 3rd order, 4th order) are uniquely addressing and targeting power-based intersectionalities of diversity, or a focus on multiple dimensions of diversity in relation to one another (for e.g., race-gender, race-gender-socioeconomic class). Though CSUMB has fewer 3rd order and 4th order efforts, those efforts, though small in number, highlight and or focus on the more complex constructions of diversity via intersectionalities of race- gender and race-gender- socioeconomic class.

CSUMB’s extant diversity infrastructure should be continued and bolstered...

Another key leverage point in place at the California State University, Monterey Bay is its curricula (undergraduate, General Education, and graduate).

• Slightly under of half of CSUMB’s undergraduate curriculum (42%, 512 courses) are diversity-related. Over half (51%, 261 courses) of these diversity-related undergraduate courses are integrated which means that the diversity content and focus is embedded throughout a course and in relation to the disciplinary subject matter at hand.
This type of diversity integration in the undergraduate curriculum is especially unique and not seen to this extent by Halualani & Associates in its mapping of thirty (30) college & university campuses around the country in the last eight years. Such integration stands as a national model for how to connect aspects of diversity to all subject topics and treatments.

However, the diversity-related undergraduate courses are located in mostly the 200-300 level courses which highlights the need for CSUMB to strategize and life stage how diversity is engaged in the course bookends or the 100 and 400 levels. We encourage a thoughtful conversation among CSUMB faculty members about how diversity is discussed, theorized, approached, and interrogated across all course levels at CSUMB. What are the specific learning goals and processes that you want CSUMB students to experience in the first year on your campus and throughout each subsequent year? Are these goals and processes different if students transition from high schools or from community colleges? An important decision point stands here at this juncture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Level of Diversity-Related UG Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Integrated
- Partial
- Primary

Undergraduate Courses

Foci in Diversity-Related Courses
• Though the diversity-related undergraduate courses frame “diversity” more in terms of “International/Global” (46%, 234) and “Intersectionalities” (40%, 203) or a focus on multiple dimensions of diversity in relation to one another (for e.g., race-gender, race-gender-socioeconomic class), the most engaged framings of diversity on the highest DELTA Level 5 - Evaluation-Critique of Power Differences and Level 6 - Social Agency & Action are “Intersectionalities” (at 74%, 85, 75%, 60, respectively). This indicates that when CSUMB hones in on “Intersectionalities” in your undergraduate courses (and these are mostly events), those courses reach the higher DELTA engagement levels.

• As a contrast, the majority of the courses that focus on “International/Global” dimensions of diversity are located at the lower DELTA levels (Level 2 - Skills, 90% of that level, 111; Level 4 - Advanced Analysis, 49% of that level, 95).

### Engaged Definitions of Diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement Level</th>
<th>1-Knowledge/Awareness</th>
<th>2-Skills</th>
<th>3-Interaction</th>
<th>4-Advanced Analysis</th>
<th>5-Evaluation-Critique</th>
<th>6-Social Agency &amp; Action</th>
<th>7-Innovative Problem Solving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Framings of Diversity in Courses

- **International/Global**: 46%
- **Intersectionalities**: 40%
- **Broad Culture**: 9%
- **Disabilities**: 2%
- **Race/Ethnicity**: 1%
- **Age**: 1%
- **Local**: 1%
- **Sexual Orientation**: 0%
- **Language**: 0%
- **Gender**: 0%
- **Religion**: 0%
• DELTA Level 5 - Evaluation-Critique of Power Differences is mostly occurring in the 300 and 400 level courses (26%, 65; 32%, 26, respectively) as opposed to the 100 and 200 levels (8%, 6; 17%, 17, respectively). Another conversation ought to take place about how diversity is engaged and in what ways in the beginning years of the CSUMB learning pathway. Similarly, diversity is mostly framed as intersectionalities in the 300-400 level courses (46% of the 300 level, 111; 70% of the 400 level, 63, respectively) while diversity is mostly framed as international/global formations in the 100-200 level courses (76% of the 100 level, 58; 62% of the 200 level, 64, respectively).

As another positive leverage point, CSUMB diversity-related undergraduate courses that frame diversity in terms of international/global formations and intersectionalities do so as both historical and contemporary contexts. This is especially significant given that many campuses approach the international/global dimensions of diversity as well as intersectionalities predominantly in terms of contemporary issues and urgencies; CSUMB deepens the quality of diversity in its undergraduate curriculum by historically situating those framings.

### Temporality of Culture By Definition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Historical</th>
<th>Both Historical &amp; Contemporary</th>
<th>Contemporary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International/Global</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersectionalities</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Culture</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabilities</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Although 41% of the total CSUMB undergraduate curriculum relates to diversity (thus has been created), only 40% of those diversity-related courses has been offered in the last two years. Only 11% of CSUMB’s diversity-related undergraduate courses have been offered every semester in the last two years. This finding indicates that CSUMB has more diversity-related courses on the books than it actually offers for students to experience. In terms of diversity exposures (or the exposure that a student has to a diversity-related course in a semester with respect to the number of seats offered in the number of diversity-related course sections), there have been 20,406 diversity exposures in the diversity-related undergraduate course offerings in the last two years.

• By stark contrast, 86% of the CSUMB’s General Education (hereafter GE) curriculum relates to diversity (thus has been created) and 90% of those diversity-related GE courses have been offered in the last two years. 33% of CSUMB’s diversity-related GE courses have been offered every semester in the last two years. This finding indicates that CSUMB offers almost all of its diversity-related GE courses on the books, which is a positive sign of commitment and diversity exposure for its students.
In terms of diversity exposures (or the exposure that a student has to a diversity-related course in a semester with respect to the number of seats offered in the number of diversity-related course sections), there have been 33,744 diversity exposures in the diversity-related undergraduate course offerings in the last two years. CSUMB provides more diversity education through its GE offerings than its non GE course offerings.

The majority (5 of the 6) of the GE areas that feature diversity-related courses, frame diversity in terms of complex constructions such as intersectionalities.

### How Do the GE Areas Define Diversity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intersectionalities</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Broad Culture</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td></td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td></td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Offered in the Last 2 Years**

- **90%** Offered Regularly (every semester for the last 2 years)
- **10%** NOT Offered in the Last 2 Years

**Availability for Diversity Related Courses**

- **33%** NOT offered every semester
- **67%** Offered Regularly (every semester for the last 2 years)
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Key Insights & Findings
The total baseline number of CSUMB’s diversity efforts and the specific percentages of primary and partial diversity efforts

This measure provides a larger baseline against which to compare the number of division/unit efforts. Ultimately, the baseline draws a portrait of the level of contribution of each operating division at CSUMB toward inclusive excellence and diversity.

- As of June 2014, there were 309 active diversity efforts at CSUMB (not including the curricula).

- A total of 86% (265) of these active diversity efforts were deemed “primary,” whereas 14% (44) stood as “partial.”

![Diversity-Related Efforts - Level of Focus](image)

- This item of analysis illustrated that a significant portion (over 3/4) of extant diversity efforts had a major emphasis on the appreciation of diverse backgrounds, identities and experiences (in terms of cultural groups). In addition, these efforts were driven by this very objective. In contrast, 14% of the diversity efforts had a secondary emphasis on the promotion or inclusion of various cultural groups and backgrounds.

- We conclude that there was already a sizable amount of primary efforts made at the university regarding diversity (as its main purpose) and set out to intentionally shape an environment of inclusion, belonging and cultural acknowledgement for campus members. While only 14% of the efforts were deemed “partial,” these were efforts that served a broad function (such as mission statements) and did not fully address or focus on inclusion and diversity. Although this 14% may represent efforts that have fully integrated a broader function with a diversity/inclusion purpose - such a notion deserves continual review and evaluation.
The percentage of diversity efforts by division

We calculated the percentage of diversity efforts in each major division and compared it to the overall baseline percentages. The visual mappings and accompanying spreadsheet inventory make this analytical step easy. This specific point of inquiry illustrates which divisions have infused diversity into its operations and how, and which have not.

- At CSUMB, Student Affairs & Enrollment Services led 54% (167) of all diversity efforts offered on campus followed by Academic Affairs (33%, 101). Office of the President (6%, 17), University Advancement (4%, 11), and Administration & Finance (3%, 10) also contributed diversity efforts. Only 1% (2) of the diversity efforts were University-Wide (or when all divisions and units are aligned on a diversity strategic goal and work in cooperation with one another).

- In positive fashion, the major divisions (Student Affairs & Enrollment Services, Academic Affairs) that contribute the most to diversity efforts on our campus had a large majority of their efforts classified as “primary” diversity programs. Thus, the focus of the ones they did have were principally and explicitly emphasizing the mission of diversity, inclusion and, in the case of Student Life, social justice. The divisions that had fewer diversity efforts (Office of the President, University Advancement, Administration & Finance) also displayed this pattern; they had a small number of diversity-focused activities but the ones that did exist (which were either one or two) represented major efforts with a paramount focus on diversity. Thus, most of the divisions/units at CSUMB had at least one to two major efforts on diversity.
Analysis of the percentage of diversity efforts by theme

Our next analytical move was to calculate the percentage of diversity efforts by theme, regardless of division. The mere quantity of diversity efforts is not enough; the qualitative nature and focus of such efforts helps to situate the state of diversity on a campus. Specifically, we wanted to know the thematic forms of the mapped efforts. Thematic form was defined as the nature of the program in the university context, or the extent to which an effort represented a curricular program, an academic support program, a policy or procedure, an award or a mission statement. Such information highlights how an institution operationalizes and spends its time shaping diversity. The form often determines the function and reach of an effort in terms of what can be gained and achieved.

- We found that CSUMB featured diversity efforts across several different themes (18) and not in one or two key thematic areas. For example, 49% (152) of the diversity efforts were Events with the subsequent as Trainings/Workshops (11%, 34), Clubs/Organizations (7%, 23), Mission Statements/Directives (6%, 20), and Campus Resources (6%, 17). The remaining 21% of diversity efforts are spread out across 14 different themes.

- Thus, CSUMB has taken action on diversity but not centrally in any one area. This meant that a varied (and less unified) approach to diversity was taking place at CSUMB. Here the question “What should an institution committed to the values, principles and practices of inclusive excellence look like?” emerges for consideration. A more intentional and unified strategy around diversity is important for CSUMB to put into place. CSUMB is taking responsive action in this regard but it will need to direct more of a targeted diversity strategy in the future as well (through a specific diversity master plan and infrastructure).
Initiation Point: University-Wide or Program-Driven:

- There is a combination of university-wide and program-driven diversity efforts at CSUMB, with the majority of efforts (84%) being program-driven efforts. In contrast, only 16% of the diversity efforts were university-wide. University-wide efforts represent centralized operational acts to propel and advance the diversity strategic goals and implementations of CSUMB. We typically look for the “silo” effect or if diversity efforts live in specific program-focused activities. There does appear to be a predominant silo effect; in fact, the data reveal that CSUMB’s divisions and offices are NOT working in alignment with one another on larger university-wide directions in diversity. University-wide initiation points help drive consistent and sustainable diversity efforts; however, these may also stifle programs from creating their own context-specific activities and initiatives in vibrant and robust ways. A healthy blend of both university-wide and program-driven efforts delivers the most promise. A diversity strategic framework will push CSUMB towards university-wide alignment.
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Level of Integration

Level of Integration: Connections & Linkages Among Divisions:

• There are several connections and linkages among divisions and units for diversity efforts and actions at CSUMB but not in terms of a larger framework logic. The only key integrative organizing logic around diversity exists within the position of the Associate Vice President of Inclusive Excellence, which stands as the relational bridge and connector among units and divisions. Having the Associate Vice President of Inclusive Excellence role and the Office of Inclusive Excellence as the sole key integrators of diversity efforts on campus (as opposed to collaborative chains of campus members and a streamlined organizational structure) may be sufficient to drive the diversity success of CSUMB given the campus size and scope. Or it may require more points of integration and connection among all units/divisions and or an accountability system that details an elaborate process for how divisions and units work together and in isolation (“on their own paths”) on diversity goals. By establishing more connections and a systematic way of organizing linkages among divisions on diversity work, CSUMB must safeguard the “energy” level and productivity of the Associate Vice President of Inclusive Excellence role and the Office of Inclusive Excellence; if not, these vehicles will be fully exhausted, depleted, and possibly frustrated. In addition, the campus needs to understand that diversity and inclusion work is “everyone’s” responsibility and the aforementioned roles and a more cohesive and formal diversity infrastructure (as suggested in our recommendations) will help coordinate and sediment such collaborations.
Halualani and Associates has developed a unique numbering (change order) sequence that delineates the degree of evolution and development of a diversity effort/ practice (from 1st order to 4th order).

Change Order Sequence: 1st to 2nd to 3rd to 4th Order Items

- As of June 2014, CSUMB houses a significant amount (88%) of second-order efforts (efforts that demonstrate the commitment to diversity through specific action). CSUMB is clearly in a diversity action stage (as opposed to being in just a diversity declaration or first-order stage). In order to reach the third-order stage, CSUMB should make sure that the aforementioned 88% (second-order efforts) are framed to be assessed with concrete evidence so as to determine the impact of such efforts. There was a smaller number of third and fourth-order efforts (3%, 5% respectively);

Figure 3.1 Change Order Sequence Description

- These categories remain the notion of “business as usual.”
- The goal is to have a balanced representation of diversity efforts, practices, and processes across designations, as each change order foregrounds its successor.

Diversity Change Order Sequence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

however, these efforts had a continual, sustained history of commitment to action to impact and thus, represented a marker of diversity excellence according to our change order sequence. Another focus for the future should be on considering the potential of all second and third-order items for transforming into fourth-order items (sustained, positive impact, culture-changing, reaching all campus members and beyond, linked to a diversity strategic framework). A diversity strategic plan or framework would help in this regard.
Target Population: All Campus, Leadership, Faculty, Staff, Students, Community Members

- CSUMB’s diversity efforts are primarily targeted toward all campus members (52%), followed by all students (27%) and faculty (6%). Indeed, there is a more generalized, inclusive approach to diversity efforts. However, dedicated efforts for staff members and graduate students are lacking. Because staff members and graduate students have unique aspects to their campus roles, intentionally focused and designed diversity efforts for these groups may help to create more diversity engagement and support for their success on campus. Specific efforts at honing leadership towards development of diversity competencies and attitudes may also be a rich area for response as well.
Topical Focus: Mainstream or Specific Group-Focused

- Diversity efforts at CSUMB represent mainstream-framed acts as opposed to specific group-focused ones. The majority (81%) of campus diversity efforts at CSUMB focus on mainstream audiences while 19% highlight specific (identity-based, cultural) groups in terms of the target locus of diversity efforts. This finding indicates that a more generalized approach to diversity and inclusion is at work at CSUMB. While such an approach embraces all students and campus members, it also may neglect the implementation of targeted interventions towards specific groups (for e.g., retention and graduation initiatives for first-generation students, racially/ethnically different students, and for groups that are historically disadvantaged in higher education). An approach that integrates both a mainstream and specific group-focused strategy for diversity efforts may yield more success and support for campus members. Another issue is that being too generalized about diversity may gloss over a necessary degree of historical specificity and cultural context that further informs the knowledge and skill development of campus members.
Diversity Engagement/Learning Taxonomy Assessment (DELTA): Based on 7 levels of diversity engagement and learning

- Our Diversity Engagement/Learning Taxonomy Assessment (DELTA) scale features 7 levels of engagement and learning around issues of diversity modeled after Bloom's Taxonomy of Learning. Each level scaffolds up; meaning that a level subsumes all levels beneath it. Level 3 - Interaction subsumes Levels 2 (Skills) and 1 (Knowledge Awareness). The highest the level, the more advanced the cognitive, affective, attitudinal, and perspectival processing of diversity is occurring.

- The diversity efforts at CSUMB mostly feature DELTA Level 1 - Knowledge Awareness (56%), followed by DELTA Level 3 - Interaction (17%) and DELTA Level 2-Skills (15%). Thus, diversity efforts are mostly promoting knowledge awareness, intercultural interaction, and skills. However, these same efforts do NOT embed or traverse DELTA Level 5 - Evaluation-Critique of Power Differences and Issues of Privilege as well as DELTA Level 6 - Social Agency and Action, or using diversity knowledges, skills, and perspectives to re-imagine solutions to intercultural and diversity challenges. Thus, CSUMB should consider what kind of engagement level should be targeted in campus activities and programs (is it the full spectrum or just up to DELTA Level 3 - Interaction). How can some of these efforts highlight productive conversations around power?
differences, privilege, and inequalities? Or can there be an unfolding strategy of setting up a goal of having a certain percentage of efforts strive for the higher levels of DELTA (5, 6, 7) each academic year via events, trainings, workshops, and programs? Should there be an incremental approach of engagement in terms of a timeline or should such an approach depend on the kinds of diversity and difference being discussed and covered?

### Diversity Efforts By DELTA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DELTA Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Knowledge Awareness</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Skills</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Interaction</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Advanced Analysis</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Social Agency &amp; Action</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Definitions of Diversity in Efforts

- Our team also qualitative analyzes the framings of diversity/culture in each campus diversity effort. These framings reveal how a university “defines” or “constructs” diversity for its campus environment. CSUMB mostly features framings that highlight Race/Gender (42%, 129), Broad Culture/Diversity (21%, 65), and Race/Gender/Socioeconomic Status (15%, 45). The remaining 21% of framings are spread out across 11 different thematic constructions of diversity. Such a finding indicates that CSUMB is uniquely approaching diversity in terms of some key intersectionalities (Race/Gender, Race/Gender/Socioeconomic Status). However, an opportunity exists for the campus to engage how its efforts and activities speak to other lesser invoked kinds of diversity (disability, sexual orientation, generation, political ideology, veterans, language, religion) and or how these generally frame diversity. What does it mean for a campus that vigorously pursues a vision based on service, social justice, and serving diverse communities? To what extent does CSUMB fulfill its mission? How might a different approach enable the campus to engage other significant differences and identities and in ways that fulfills this vision? How can other forms of difference (sexual orientation, disability, region, age/generation, political ideology, intersectionalities among race, gender, class, and sexual orientation) be engaged more fully?

Framings of Diversity in Efforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framing</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race/Gender</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Culture/Diversity</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Gender/Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International/Global</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language/Ethnicity</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersectionalities</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Class</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Ideology</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.3 Tag Cloud of Diversity Efforts’ Descriptions
Prospective Reach Level: How Many People Were Likely Impacted?

• Halualani & Associates aims to provide an estimate of how many campus members were impacted by an institution’s diversity efforts. CSUMB appears to be impacting campus members and community members (47%). The second highest percentage (32%) lies in reaching from impacting the staff/faculty which then indirectly touches upon their students followed by (15%) from top-down, administrations to staff to faculty to the student level (historically disadvantaged, underrepresented students to all students).

• Such a finding indicates that CSUMB’s diversity efforts exude a far-reaching level and extend from the administrative structure toward students and community members. More, however, could be done to reach more of the units in their climates/environments as well as to benefit staff and faculty which then has both an indirect and direct effect on students.

Prospective Reach Level

Reach Level 1 = Immediate Participant in Effort
Reach Level 2 = Entire Unit
Reach Level 3 = Toward Staff/Faculty & Students
Reach Level 4 = Toward All Students
Reach Level 5 = Toward Campus & Community
Enduring Factor Level: Time Frame/Sustainability of Efforts

- We also analyzed how sustainable and long-lasting diversity efforts were for the long-haul time frame. The more sustainable an effort, the more pronounced its benefits and yield are for an entire campus.

- CSUMB’s diversity efforts predominantly indicated an endurance level for the immediate short-term (54%) followed by endurance through the next 1-2 years (40%). Thus, these efforts were either exploratory or one-shot occurrences and did not indicate lasting through to the next diversity strategy cycle. Conversations and planning around the sustainability of a diversity approach should be discussed. If not, “piecemeal” tactics for creating efforts and initiatives will reign and “short-fuse” any enduring strategy for bringing about an authentic, permanent, sustained, and vibrant environment around inclusive excellence for all campus members. A diversity strategic framework that spans five (5) years is highly recommended.
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Efforts Mapping Analysis
There is no clear or unified sense of what CSUMB means by diversity in terms of a larger diversity strategic framework.

The majority of diversity efforts do not work in an alignment approach given that there is no current diversity strategic framework. The only semblance of alignment is the fact that several efforts have been facilitated by the Associate Vice President of Inclusive Excellence and Office of Inclusive Excellence. Typically, without a diversity strategic framework, there is some institutional risk at sustaining diversity progress (as the efforts should be implemented at every level and through every division and via a maintained, resourced organizational structure).

There is a multitude of collaborations between and across distinct offices and divisions in terms of diversity efforts. Thus, with more university alignment, the extant interactivity and collaboration on diversity efforts will help to solidify the relational energy that propels diversity action for the future and take CSUMB to that next level of diversity excellence.

Current diversity efforts represent mostly first and second-order items; thus, impact assessment needs to be conducted with regard to these efforts. At the same time, though, these efforts are mostly topping out at DELTA Level 3- Interaction and thus, trying to examine intercultural interactions, connections, and perspective-taking among campus members without connecting these to power differences, structural inequalities, and structures of power.

Student Affairs & Enrollment Services features mostly second-order items but at a DELTA Level 1 - Knowledge Awareness. A conversation should take place in terms of the kind of diversity engagement that SA&ES would like to cultivate for students depending on student level and year. An intentional diversity approach to diversity engagement would be a powerful action step for this division.

Academic Affairs features many second-order items. However, the majority of these efforts focus on diversity in terms of the “mainstream” or general “diverse” community as opposed to specific diverse groups. Though this may represent a strategy of inclusion, this division needs to examine if there are specific groups and identities that need customized diversity efforts (for e.g., female students, staff, and faculty or of a specific racial/ethnic/sexual orientation/socioeconomic class/disability background).

The diversity efforts in Administration & Finance represent mostly first-order items and thus need to connect the declared commitment to diversity to action and impact assessment. In this division, Human Resources & Academic Personnel has several diversity efforts in motion and as mostly first and second-order items. Given this, these items...
— especially the second-order ones — need to be assessed with a specific protocol and impact measures.

• Campus events related to diversity need to be assessed and tracked/traced for quantifiable and qualitative impact.

• Other demarcated empty zones at this stage: diversity rewards/evaluation system, teaching excellence/training around diversity system, university-wide approach to faculty recruitment, communication network around diversity, professional development on diversity for leadership & staff, community outreach, and co-curricular efforts.
Section 2

Diversity By Theme Mapping

- Thematically, diversity efforts at CSUMB are diffuse and without any driving logic or purpose.

- CSUMB has mostly engaged in diversity efforts that are events, trainings/workshops, clubs/organizations, and mission statements/directives.

- Efforts that stand as trainings/workshops and mission statements mostly focus on the “mainstream” or a “diverse group in general” as its topical area of content. How does CSUMB engage in diversity efforts that speak to and about specific diverse groups and identities (in terms of race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, disability, religion, language)? By contrast, diversity-related awards have a healthy balance of addressing a mainstream “diverse” group and specific diverse groups in terms of gender and race/ethnicity.

- Significant to limited empty zones for CSUMB are: Co-Curricular, Academic Program Support, Faculty Recruitment, and Committees in terms of diversity efforts.
Section 3

Diversity By Change Sequence Mapping

- The majority of diversity efforts are located in a second-order stage with a focus on action and implementation.

- CSUMB features several third-order items with a focus on impact assessment; however, it is critical for the institution to create assessment protocols and outcomes for all of the current second-order items.

- While there are first-order items, a review in the next two years should be conducted regarding what second-order items have emanated from those first-order declarations of the university commitment to diversity. This can coincide with the creation and implementation of the diversity strategic framework.

Figure 4.3 Change Order Sequence Description

Figure 4.4 CSUMB Diversity by Change Sequence Map
Section 4

Diversity By DELTA Mapping

- The majority of diversity efforts reside in the DELTA Level 1 - Knowledge Awareness and top out mostly at the DELTA Level 3 - Interaction.

- The efforts in the DELTA Level 4 - Advanced Analysis fall mostly in areas of “analysis” related to campus institutional data measures (recruitment, retention, enrollment, demographics) and strategic plan goals and objectives. The efforts in the DELTA Level 3 - Interaction revolve around campus events and student organizations.

- The DELTA Level 1 - Knowledge Awareness efforts and DELTA Level 3 - Interaction efforts, however, are mostly second-order items and thus are not being fully assessed and measured for impact. A systematic and rigorous assessment of these type of DELTA Level 1 and 3 items can help to understand the cognitive, affective, and attitudinal impact (“mind and heart”) of such events and student activities on campus for diversity engagement and learning. These items should be connected to and embedded with questions or activities that push those up to DELTA Level 5 - Evaluation-Critique and beyond.
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Undergraduate Curricular Analysis

Our team conducted a thorough curricular analysis of all curricular components across all academic programs at CSUMB. We examined the following data sources via line by line, itemized coding analysis via grounded theory, emergent theme and domain analysis, & NVIVO, QDA Miner qualitative analysis software (see Rossman & Rallis, 1998).¹

- Course Descriptions
- Departmental/Academic Program Descriptions and Content
- Program Learning Objectives
- Student Learning Objectives (SLOs)
- Syllabus content, topical coverage, reading materials
- Assignments
- Schedule Analysis of All Coded Diversity-Related Courses (Within the last two years)

It should be noted that our team examined every course and conducted a qualitative analysis overall with all of the above data sources to discern key themes and to see if (at all) the themes “diversity,” “inclusion,” “cultural competency,” “intercultural/international/global” and or “difference/identity” in terms of all major group differences - race/ethnicity, gender, age, sexual orientation, socioeconomic class, religion/spirituality, region, nationality, language, disabilities, political perspective, veteran’s status - emerged in any form. The analysis that follows reveals our findings.
Section 1

Analysis of the percentages of diversity-related courses in the university curriculum

Our team needed to examine the curricular mappings and inventory for what these data revealed about the curricular priorities on campus. Because CSUMB is an educational institution, it was essential to explore the kind of diversity approached in the curricular and the scope of the content.

• We found that 41% of the total university curriculum (including General Education) was diversity-related courses (for 512 diversity-related courses).

• “Primary” Diversity-Related Course:
  • Any course that engaged students in critical analysis around issues of power, privilege, and interculturality in terms of race/ethnicity, gender, age, sexual orientation, socioeconomic class, religion/spirituality, region, nationality, language, disabilities, political perspective, veteran’s status.
  • Any course that meaningfully engaged students on how their own identities and perspectives interface with difference, culture, diversity, and or issues of power.
  • Promotes diversity as a practice (active appreciation of difference & perspective taking)
  • Explicitly features a name, course learning objective, course description, course content, and assignments that direct students toward objectives of diversity awareness and beyond (in our DELTA scale).

• “Partial” Diversity-Related Course:
  • Any course that contains some elements of critical analysis around issues of power, privilege, and interculturality in terms of race/ethnicity, gender, age, sexual orientation, socioeconomic class, religion/...
spirituality, region, nationality, language, disabilities, political perspective, veteran’s status.

- Any course that may require students to think critically about the above topics.

- Highlights some aspect of difference in at least one unit of the course

- Relies on nonspecific categorization of identity groups such as “community” or “population”

- Are not explicitly named or described to indicate that they are related to diversity

- **“Integrated” Diversity-Related Course:**

  - Any course that embeds elements of critical analysis around issues of power, privilege, and interculturality in terms of race/ethnicity, gender, age, sexual orientation, socioeconomic class, religion/spirituality, region, nationality, language, disabilities, political perspective, veteran’s status throughout the entire course and in relation to the core subject matter at hand.

  - Any course that may require students to think critically about the above topics

  - Highlights some aspect of difference throughout each unit of the course and in relation to the core content of the course
Section 2

Level of Focus: Primary or Partial Diversity-Related Courses

- Our team found that there are 512 diversity-related courses with 51% (263) as “integrated” and 42% (215) as “primary.” These diversity-related courses make up 41% of all courses offered at CSUMB. Only 7% (34) of the diversity-related courses are “partial.” Such a finding indicates that CSUMB prioritizes the embedding and integration of diversity content throughout its undergraduate courses and across multiple disciplines and fields. We commend CSUMB for this finding in that we do not typically see such a high level of integration from other campuses across the country.

- Thus, the diversity-related course offerings are connecting diversity to subject matter content and or centrally focusing on a diversity perspective or focus and featuring topical coverage in over 50% of the course.

![Level of Focus in Diversity-Related Courses](image-url)
As indicated in the chart above, Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences (74%, 379) houses the majority of diversity-related courses. We urge caution in basing conclusions solely off of the numerical figures provided above. Instead, the proportionality or the size of the academic program (and its encapsulated resources of budget and faculty -- FTEF) in relation to the curricular offerings needs to be considered in terms of assessing the curricular output and “work” in the area of diversity of academic programs at CSUMB. It is also evident that diversity is incorporated into various majors and departments across the university, with the majority in the School of World Languages & Cultures (30%, 155), Human Communication (19%, 99), and Social & Behavioral Sciences (13%, 66).
Our team examined the student/class level of the identified diversity-related courses. We found that the majority (49%, 82) of diversity-related courses at CSUMB are at the 300 (Junior) level, followed by 20% (103) at the 200 (Sophomore) level. The smallest number of diversity-related courses are positioned at the 100 (First Year) level and 400 (Senior) level. A conversation needs to occur around an intentional curricular strategy for having diversity-related course offerings at each student level or diversity curricular thematization (or life-staging diversity) throughout a student’s educational journey at CSUMB.
The majority of the diversity-related courses are disciplinary content courses applied to cultural contexts (43%, 220) and language instruction (24%, 125). This indicated that issues of culture, intercultural competency, and diversity are being addressed in disciplinary core subject matter across the university which is a promising sign of curricular integration and breadth of diversity engagement in courses. However, the second largest grouping of courses is based in language instruction which has more of predominant focus on the “international/global” dimensions of culture. While important, oftentimes, an “international” or “global” approach does not address the racialized, gendered, sexualized, “Othered,” power-based differences and societal inequalities that are part of culture and diversity. Thus, this signals an opportunity for CSUMB to consider the types of diversity-related courses it has and if it spans across all forms of differences for their students.
The majority of diversity-related courses focus on 2 or more cultures (62%) in comparison to those that focus on a single culture/identity (27%). This finding indicates a healthy balance in terms of highlighting frameworks that connect to multiple cultures as well as engaging in specialized coverage of individual cultures. An intentional curricular strategy that connects these two foci and the ensuing dialogue that occurs between culture-general and culture-specific forms of knowledge, should be explored.
The topical/content coverage spread of the diversity-related courses highlight the “Domestic” (43%) (local, regional, national U.S. issues of difference on race, ethnicity, socioeconomic class, gender, sexual orientation, age, generation, disability) and the “International/Global” (38%). CSUMB is clearly engaging a laudable balanced approach to framing culture in both domestic and intercultural contexts. Such a practice will surely equip students with the perspectives and skills to serve diverse communities. The connections and interworkings of both the global and domestic aspects of culture should be more fully explored by CSUMB in terms of the power dynamics and historical contexts that fuel and link both of these dynamics. (Note: we see little of this happening at other campuses and CSUMB is poised to take advantage of this curricular practice.)
We found that in terms of covering the temporality of culture, the diversity-related courses feature more of a focus on the contemporary (present-day topics, experiences, content) aspect of culture as opposed to the historical (past topics, experiences, content) aspect. It would be interesting to see what kinds of associations and sense-makings students leave with at the end of their coursework in terms of specific cultures and groups they have learned about and their understanding of the contemporary and historical issues that inform those groups’ experiences. Or if in fact a specific temporality dominates their understandings of specific cultural contexts and groups (for e.g., a “historical” framing of Europe and Asia versus a “contemporary” framing of the U.S., which often reinforces cultural stereotypes). Although, we also find that there is a more balanced treatment of the contemporary and historical aspects of culture for courses that primarily frame diversity as “International/Global” and “Intersectionalities.”
47% of diversity-related courses at CSUMB feature a cultural-specific focus on diversity. This means that these courses highlight a specific view from within a culture as opposed to a more general, larger view of cultures and diversity. While such a curricular tendency helps students to ground cultures in their own historical and political contexts, it also risks framing cultural knowledge in terms of just areas or parts of the world or individual groups (which runs into the aforementioned issue of focusing on a single culture/identity at the expense of an interculturally larger focus on mindsets, practices, and behaviors that are adaptable to cultures at hand). The dilemma that surfaces is the extent to which such a culture-specific view either instills an overly particularized understanding of a culture (which then creates stereotyping profiles of cultures) and an unrealistic, adaptive sensemaking of the intercultural world.
The predominant framing of diversity in CSUMB’s diversity related courses is on the “International/Global” (46%) followed by “Intersectionalities” (40%). So while the more typical focus of “International/Global” is also occurring, CSUMB has ample focus on defining diversity in terms of various aspects of cultural difference (gender, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic class, disabilities, sexual orientation) in its undergraduate curriculum. However, it is still important for CSUMB to have a curricular decision about the kinds of diversity and culture to be addressed in the curriculum. Will such an “international/global” focus undermine the diversity and inclusion strategy of the university as it clearly leaves our and often marginalizes localized/domestic intercultural politics? How might CSUMB use this focus on international/global aspects of culture and integrate it with its focus on invisible issues of power differences and inequalities which constitute cultural identities, experiences, and contexts both internationally and domestically. Thus, a critical orientation (one infused through notions of power, positionality, oppression, privilege, ideology, hegemony, social agency) should be examined as a means to connect the “International/Global” with the “Domestic” and make both aspects connected and meaningful (see Halualani, 2011). To not engage this immediately is to stifle the preparation of students for the real, complex contexts of historicized, politicized, and sociopolitical differences of culture.
Figure 5.1 Tag Clouds of Diversity Courses' Descriptions
As previously discussed, the identified diversity-related courses top out at the highest level of DELTA Level 6 - Social Agency & Action (16%), followed by DELTA Level 5 - Evaluation-Critique (17%). The highest DELTA levels (5, 6, 7) are touched upon the least (or not at all) with most courses reaching DELTA Level 4 - Advanced Analysis (38%). Engaging students on issues of power as it relates to DELTA Level 5 - Evaluation-Critique is key to fully preparing them to re-imagine the social world, creatively, compassionately, and effectively solve intercultural challenges, advocate for social change, and to do what CSUMB strives for: engage in service, work for social justice, and reach diverse communities. In order to do this, a strategy for reaching DELTA levels 5, 6, and 7 should be life-staged or for example, designed into every course or at least every course of each student’s course load per year.

Figure 5.2 DELTA Levels Descriptions

Diversity Courses by DELTA

- 1-Knowledge/Awareness (0) 0%
- 2-Skills (123) 24%
- 3-Interaction 0%
- 4-Advanced Analysis (195) 38%
- 5-Evaluation-Critique (115) 22%
- 6-Social Agency & Action (81) 16%
- 7-Innovative Problem Solving (0) 0%
Chapter 6

Diversity-Related General Education (GE) Courses
• There are 214 diversity-related courses in the entire General Education curriculum (total of 249), thereby representing 86% of the total General Education curriculum.

Diversity Related Courses within All GE

- 86%
- 14%
Section 2

Level of Focus: Primary or Partial Diversity-Related General Education Courses

- Our team found that there are 214 diversity-related courses with 60% (128) as “integrated” and 37% (79) as “partial.”

- Thus, the diversity-related course offerings are predominantly embedding diversity aspects and topics to the core subject matter at hand. In addition, the integrated diversity-related courses span the biggest range of GE areas (which means that breadth is being addressed). Interestingly enough, only 3% of diversity-related GE courses are primary focused on diversity (or centrally highlighting diversity as the main subject matter in the course). CSUMB should examine if a high quality of depth is being reached in these courses while also being in line with the diversity breadth coverage that is being met.
Our team examined the student/class level of the identified GE diversity-related courses. We found that the largest percentage (43%) of GE courses at CSUMB are at the 200 (Second Year - Sophomore) level, followed by 37% at the 300 level (Third Year - Junior). The smallest number of AD courses is positioned at the 400 (Senior) level. An opportunity exists for CSUMB to create an intentional curricular strategy for having General Education diversity-related offerings at each student level or diversity curricular thematization (or life-staging diversity) throughout a student’s educational journey at CSUMB. In addition, D1 and C2 GE areas features courses at all student levels.
The majority of the GE diversity-related courses are disciplinary content courses applied to cultural contexts (44%), service learning courses (21%), and language instruction (15%). This indicates that issues of culture and diversity in GE courses are being addressed in disciplinary core subject matter across the university which is a promising sign of curricular integration and breadth of diversity engagement in courses as well as area studies courses.

**Course Type: The Kind of Course (Core Content, Disciplinary Content Applied to a Cultural Context)**

- Disciplinary Content Applied to Cultural Context Course (95)
- Service Learning Course (44)
- Language Instruction (33)
- Core Competency/Skill Course (13)
- Area Studies Content Course (10)
- First Year Seminar (10)
- Ethnic Studies Content Course (9)
• The majority of GE courses focus on 2 or more cultures (44%) followed by intersectionalities (34%). Given this insight, it appears GE diversity-related courses highlight a discussion of multiple cultures in terms of diversity (and in many cases, a continual comparison) to address cultural differences and perspectives as well as the complex intersectionalities among different, interlocking dimensions of diversity. Such a finding reflects a positive aspect of your GE program in that on the national scene, General Education courses mostly highlight either 2 or more cultures or single culture/identity but rarely on intersectionalities. Another question that arises is: how are those multiple cultures framed and discussed? In terms of differences? On an equal comparative scale? Or in terms of a historically specific and contextualized approach? Exposure to more than one culture in terms of “American Diversity” is a strength to the program but understanding how this is engaged in terms of content and pedagogy stands as the next consideration.
The topical/content coverage spread of the diversity-related courses highlights a nice even blend of “International/Global,” “Domestic” (local, regional, national U.S. issues of difference on race, ethnicity, socioeconomic class, gender) and “Both Domestic & International.” Thus, CSUMB can be reassured that the majority (63%) of the focus in the GE diversity-related courses is on what was intended to some degree: U.S. domestic diversity contexts. However, further examination of the remaining 37% that highlights the “Global-Domestic” and the “International/Global” should be conducted. Is it the goal of General Education to cover that dynamic between the “Global-Domestic”? And if so, how is this dynamic approached and covered? Or how might this area be better served to focus completely on U.S. domestic issues (which do touch upon global aspects of diversity) so that historically specific issues of racialization, power differences, societal inequalities, and U.S. framings/containment of oppressions can take the spotlight. These questions need to be explored by CSUMB faculty and students to strengthen the entire General Education program.
We found that in terms of covering the temporality of culture, the GE diversity-related courses feature focus more on contemporary (present-day topics, experiences, content) (83%) and both historical and contemporary aspects of culture (15%). This finding is surprising given that most types of General Education courses typically feature a close to even split between coverage on contemporary and historical aspects of culture and diversity. If, in fact, only contemporary experiences of culture and diversity are covered at the expense of historical contextualizations, CSUMB needs to address this gap. GE diversity-related courses are especially well suited to address the lack of historical knowledge and placement that we as a society have about other cultural groups and especially those that have been marginalized in the past. Students' knowledge of diversity and cultural groups need to be historically grounded in the past and how such happenings have shaped the contemporary identities, experiences, and discourses associated with those groups and communities.
30% of GE diversity-related courses at CSUMB feature a cultural-specific focus on diversity while 64% focus on a culture-general approach. This means that these courses highlight a more general, larger view of cultures and diversity. This finding seems to depart from the curricular design of General Education diversity-related courses in honing in on specific diverse groups in the U.S. (such as racial/ethnic groups, women, gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender communities, non-Western religious groups) that may need more singular treatment for knowledge awareness and advanced analysis. A key question is the extent to which all of the different marginalized groups in the U.S. are being covered in GE diversity-related courses (which will be partially answered by the “Definitions of Diversity” analytical layer later in the next section). There also needs to be discussion about the quality of coverage in the more generalized course that highlights the evolution of diversity in this country in terms of historical events, group experiences, interface with U.S. institutions and inequalities, and contemporary responses to this history.
• The primary framings of diversity in CSUMB’s GE diversity-related courses are in terms of: Intersectionalities (47%, 100), and International/Global (31%, 67). Other aspects of cultural difference (language, political ideology, disabilities, sexual orientation) are not featured much or at all in these courses. While these framings may align with the vision for General Education, CSUMB should re-engage this area and examine the extent to which neglected key differences/identities (as delineated above) in the U.S. are covered or focused on in the GE courses and if some identities deserve more specialized and singular focus in courses.

**Framings of Diversity in Courses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framing</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intersectionalities (100)</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International/Global (67)</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Culture (25)</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity (5)</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability (3)</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How Do the GE Areas Define Diversity?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GE Area</th>
<th>Intersectionalities</th>
<th>International/Global</th>
<th>Broad Culture</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 6.1 Tag Cloud of GE Courses’ Descriptions**

- **Assessment**, **Social**, **Learning**, **Global**, **Service**
As discussed previously, GE diversity-related courses top out at the highest level of DELTA Level 4 - Advanced Analysis (45%) and DELTA Level 5 - Evaluation-Critique of Power Differences (26%) and. The highest DELTA levels (6, 7) are minimally touched upon (or not at all). Ways in which to reach or embed all AD courses with higher levels of DELTA (5, 6, 7) should be explored and pursued, especially when it comes to the area of social change, cultural transformation, and social advocacy and action. A4, D1, D3, and D4 feature the highest DELTA engagement levels.
Chapter 7

Diversity-Related Graduate (GR) Courses

Our team needed to examine the curricular mappings and inventory for what these data revealed about the curricular priorities on campus. Because CSUMB is an educational institution, it was essential to explore the kind of diversity approached in the graduate curriculum.
• We found that 48 percent of the total university graduate curriculum was diversity-related courses (for 87 diversity-related graduate courses).
Section 2

Level of Focus: Primary or Partial Diversity-Related Graduate Courses

- Our team found that there are 87 diversity-related graduate courses with 61% (53) as “integrated” and 29% (25) as “primary.” These diversity-related courses make up 48% of all graduate courses offered at CSUMB.

- Thus, the diversity-related course offerings have embedded diversity content in relation to the core subject matter at hand and are centrally focused on a diversity perspective or focus and featuring topical coverage in over 50% of the course.
As indicated in the chart below, Professional Studies (52%, 45) and Health Sciences & Human Services (39%, 34) house the majority of diversity-related graduate courses.

Social Work (39%, 34) and Teacher Education (41%, 35) house the most diversity-related graduate courses. We urge caution in basing conclusions solely off of the numerical figures provided above. Instead, the proportionality or the size of the academic program (and its encapsulated resources of budget and faculty -- FTEF) in relation to the curricular offerings needs to be considered in terms of assessing the curricular output and “work” in the area of diversity of academic programs at CSUMB.
Our team examined the student/class level of the identified diversity-related courses. We found that the majority (66%, 57) of diversity-related courses at CSUMB are at the 600 level, followed by 34% (30) at the 600 level. A conversation needs to occur around an intentional curricular strategy for having diversity-related course offerings at each graduate student level or diversity curricular thematization (or life-staging diversity) throughout a student’s educational journey at CSUMB. Most campuses exert their focus and energies on the incorporation of diversity in the undergraduate curriculum. CSUMB could gain so much by focusing their attention on the role of diversity in graduate education and how it takes a different shape and type of commitment.
Section 5

Course Type: The Kind of Course (Core Content, Disciplinary Content Applied to a Cultural Context, Language Instruction, Area Studies, Ethnic Studies, Cultural Appreciation)

- All of the diversity-related graduate courses are disciplinary content courses (100%, 87). This indicated that issues of culture, intercultural competency, social justice, and diversity are being addressed in disciplinary core subject matter across the university which is a promising sign of curricular integration and breadth of diversity engagement in graduate courses. It is also encouraging that the professions-based graduate courses are incorporating and integrating diversity content throughout their curriculum. It would be interesting to further examine how such integration takes place and the kind of learning (analytical processes and questions developed) that occurs as a result.
The great majority of diversity-related graduate courses focus on 2 or more cultures (99%). Given this insight, several questions arise: To what extent might graduate students need some specialized focus on specific cultures and identities throughout the world? To what extent might there be too much integration and too much of a focus on cultures in relation to one another which may dilute the intricate theories and concepts that are fastened to singular cultural contexts?
The topical/content coverage spread of the diversity-related courses highlight the “Both Domestic & International/Global” (52%) followed by “Domestic” (local, regional, national U.S. issues of difference on race, ethnicity, socioeconomic class, gender, sexual orientation, age, generation, disability) (48%). The connections and interworkings of both the global and domestic should be more fully explored in terms of the power dynamics and historical contexts that fuel and link both of these dynamics. A detailed assessment of the kind of diversity engagement that occurs among CSUMB graduate students from the focus on the combined domestic and international focus, should be undertaken.
We found that in terms of covering the temporality of culture, the diversity-related courses feature mostly a contemporary focus (present-day topics, experiences, content) rather than on the historical (past topics, experiences, content) aspects of culture. It would be interesting to see what kinds of associations and sense-makings students leave with at the end of their coursework in terms of specific cultures and groups they have learned about and their understanding of the contemporary that inform those groups’ experiences. Or if in fact a specific temporality dominates their understandings of specific cultural contexts and groups (for e.g., a “historical” framing of Europe and Asia versus a “contemporary” framing of the U.S., which often reinforces cultural stereotypes).

There is a positive finding in that these diversity-related graduate courses expose students to both historical and contemporary aspects of intersectionalities. Graduate courses that frame diversity in terms of international and global dimensions do so through a contemporary temporality. This should be examined in terms of the kind of questions and analyses about past historical contexts on global issues and topics to which students are exposed.
94% of diversity-related courses at CSUMB feature a cultural-general focus on diversity. This means that these courses highlight a more general and larger view of cultures and diversity. We ask CSUMB to consider if a culture-general approach best situates graduate students in terms of the specific intricacies of cultural contexts and identities or if a generalized focus glosses over key dimensions of culture that graduate students need for their fields of study and professions.
The predominant framing of diversity in CSUMB’s diversity related courses is on the “Intersectionalities” (77%). Aspects of cultural difference (gender, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic class, disabilities, sexual orientation) are prioritized in the graduate curriculum. The next step is to engage if a critical orientation (one infused through notions of power, positionality, oppression, privilege, ideology, hegemony, social agency) should be examined as a means to deepen the learning of “Intersectionalities” (see Halualani, 2011).1

Figure 7.1 Tag Cloud of Diversity Courses’ Descriptions

1 Halualani, R.T. (2011). In/visible dimensions: Framing the intercultural communication course through a critical intercultural communication framework. Intercultural Education, 22 (1), 43-54.)
As discussed previously, the identified diversity-related courses top out at the highest level of DELTA Level 6 - Social Agency & Action (49%), followed by DELTA Level 4 - Advanced Analysis (30%) and DELTA Level 5 - Evaluation-Critique of Power Differences (21%). An intentional strategy for maintaining a focus on DELTA levels 5, 6, and 7 should be life-staged for the graduate curriculum by the different graduate programs.

**Figure 7.2 DELTA Levels Descriptions**

- **1-Knowledge/Awareness (0)**
- **2-Skills (0)**
- **3-Interaction (0)**
- **4-Advanced Analysis (26)**
- **5-Evaluation-Critique (18)**
- **6-Social Agency & Action (43)**
- **7-Innovative Problem Solving (0)**

**Diversity Courses by DELTA**

- **1-Knowledge/Awareness (0)**
- **2-Skills (0)**
- **3-Interaction (0)**
- **4-Advanced Analysis (26)**
- **5-Evaluation-Critique (18)**
- **6-Social Agency & Action (43)**
- **7-Innovative Problem Solving (0)**

**Engagement for Definitions of Diversity**

- **Intersectionalities**
  - 42% (78%)
  - 78% (98%)
- **International/Global**
  - 46% (6%)
  - 6% (17%)
- **Disabilities**
  - 12% (0%)
  - 0% (6%)

**Table of Diversity Courses by DELTA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DELTA Level</th>
<th>Knowledge/Awareness</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Advanced Analysis</th>
<th>Evaluation-Critique</th>
<th>Social Agency &amp; Action</th>
<th>Innovative Problem Solving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Halualani and Associates has identified the following leverage points and recommendations for California State University, Monterey Bay in terms of the future directions and pathways with regard to maximizing its work on diversity, inclusion, and equity.
From this mapping project, it is clear that California State University, Monterey Bay has mostly second order items (demonstrations of diversity commitment through concrete actions and efforts). We note that California State University, Monterey Bay should feel heartened by such progress; however, it will need to make a concerted effort to transition from the second order stage to the third/fourth order stages (sustained, meaningful, and assessed actions that demonstrate high impact and campus transformation). Assessment of efforts needs to be strengthened.

While every major division at the university is involved in some diversity effort and there is some solid momentum (with 309 diversity efforts and 214 diversity-related undergraduate courses) in diversity and inclusion work at California State University, Monterey Bay, there is no evidence of a concerted or intentional, organizational approach/strategy to diversity and inclusion on campus. Such an approach or strategy is needed to make major strides and sustain targeted momentum in diversity achievement on all levels. Higher educational institutions can no longer rest on the “laurels” of past diversity efforts or commitments; efforts and commitments in this vein must be continually re-articulated and planned out to actualize true inclusive excellence.

In this regard, Halualani & Associates recommends two major components related to a diversity organizational change approach/strategy at California State University, Monterey Bay:

1) the formation of a diversity strategy or master plan with a clear vision, framework, and set of goals (this diversity strategy or master plan would identify specific action steps, needed processes and resources, outcome measures and metrics, and an assessment schedule); and
2) a key, resourced, diversity organizational structure (like your own Office of Inclusive Excellence) that is conducive to facilitating transformative change (4th order) around diversity and inclusion.

By “key diversity organizational structure,” we refer to a comprehensive, multi-layered division or office led by your diversity leader (Associate Vice President of Inclusive Excellence) that incorporates the following functions:

a) visioning (“charting the path”) function: the proactive strategizing and planning for the future needs of making California State University, Monterey Bay a highly engaged, inclusive, and productive climate around diversity and inclusion;

b) support and engagement function for faculty, staff, leadership, and students (“building up the campus community with skills and perspectives”): the strategic delineation, planning, and provider of professional development training and support for the following campus constituencies:

• faculty members [on issues of inclusive pedagogy and engaged learning through diversity as connected to core subject matter; the idea being that when students are fully engaged around diversity considerations and learning levels, student learning increases in core subject matter as well (disciplinary content, theory, core subject matter, core skills such as writing, research methods, critical analysis, relational building), intercultural competencies, discussion facilitation];

• staff members (on issues of intercultural competency, discussion facilitation);

• leadership (on issues of intercultural competency, discussion facilitation, mentoring);

• students (on issues of intercultural competency, discussion facilitation, allies and coalition building);

c) student success and academic achievement capacity (“facilitating and ensuring” academic excellence for historically disadvantaged groups): working with all other campus divisions regarding high-impact strategies and interventions for reducing the achievement gaps and facilitating optimal conditions for the student success of all students (women, historically underrepresented racial/ethnic/classed groups)
d) diversity assessment and analytics (connecting all diversity strategies and actions to impact measures, outcomes, and rigorous analytics)

*We recommend that issues of equity NOT be contained within this division. The current dilemma in higher education is how to integrate diversity building efforts with equity issues (for e.g., discrimination, hostile interactions) without diverting attention away from either. Because this diversity division will be focused on the strategic visioning, implementation (the “building” of diversity), and assessment, it is important not to “swallow” its energies up with the exhausting work of equity and compliance; these areas can be more adequately managed by Human Resources.

This above delineated structure requires more than just 2-3 individuals; it will need to be “all hands on deck” with the strategic incorporation of related offices (multicultural center, support services for specific underrepresented groups, related roles, and positions). If not, the momentum driving the diversity work may diminish or cease altogether if it is centered around a few individuals who may move on from the university. Structures stand as more stable vehicles to bring about change and strategic efforts. Universities that are beginning their work in diversity and inclusion often commit to an unfolding organizational structure of at least 2 - 3 layers thick (with the diversity leader, support team, and key related offices and positions framed under the aforementioned functions) over two years. By incorporating key functions to a division that is dedicated to diversity and inclusion, greater credibility and valuation is afforded to that division so that it does not become perceived as a mere “nod” to diversity and inclusion [or an isolated unit that solely works on special case issues or circumstances (for e.g., discrimination, inequities, grievances)].

● More specifically, for a future diversity master plan, we recommend the following goal areas for CSUMB to focus on (as informed by the diversity mapping):

▶Diversifying Faculty (A Goal Based on the Limited Attention/Action To This Area)
Building Our Skills & Perspectives Towards Diversity Excellence (Professional Development on Diversity Engagement for Faculty & Staff Members) (A Goal Based On the Limited Attention/Action To This Area)

Building Our Skills & Perspectives Towards Diversity Excellence (Curricular Focus, Specific Learning Competencies and Outcomes Related To Social Justice and Diversity Engagement for Students) (A Goal Based On CSUMB’s Current Strength In This Area — Strong, Integrated, Social Justice Focused Curriculum)

Educational Excellence For Our Students (Specific Retention-Graduation Initiatives for Your Diverse Students, HSI Students)

Community Alliances and Partnerships as Learning Labs (Community Projects as Learning and Research Labs for Students and Faculty - Allows for Maximum Diversity Engagement (A Goal Based On CSUMB’s Current Strength In This Area)

Please note that we do not want to force these areas above but we do see the above areas as optimal goal areas either because of the absence of any recent activity or commitment or because of a current leverage point in the area so as to make sustained, significant progress (i.e., turning the corner on excellence). CSUMB’s Diversity Master Plan should be an organic, collaborative process through which all campus members are consulted.

There were many collaborations between campus divisions on issues of diversity (although it appears that campus divisions and offices work in alignment on university-wide diversity efforts). The aforementioned diversity organizational approach/strategy will help to actively facilitate and sediment these connections and linkages across campus. For example, more productive collaborations can occur between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs and Enrollment Services in terms of diversity engagement, diversity/intercultural leadership, global citizenship, and coalition building through curricular pathways, co-curricular and beyond the classroom activities and participation by California State University, Monterey Bay students.
Bay students. A “diversity engagement bundle” can be shaped through these collaborations that incorporate specific curricular pathways (on the academic side) with concrete/demonstrative activities and roles (on the Student Affairs side). This type of integrated model could involve events, student organizations, peer roles, and course work as well as shared learning rubrics to gauge student performance and achievement on diversity and engagement scales. In a type of Diversity Passport program, events could be assigned to specific courses and their embedded student learning objectives and then its impact or learning about diversity could be linked to an assignment. In this way, Academic Affairs and Student Affairs could powerfully connect the curricular, cognitive, co-curricular, and experiential sides of student learning in diversity education at the university. Our firm would love for your campus to use our DELTA (Diversity Engagement Learning Taxonomy Assessment Scale) to help in this possible endeavor.

- A decision needs to be made regarding the need for differentiated and targeted diversity efforts for graduate students and staff members. These campus constituencies are not the current beneficiaries of the university’s active diversity efforts. Differentiated efforts often acknowledge the importance and specificity of these campus constituencies in terms of their diversity needs.

- The majority of California State University, Monterey Bay’s diversity efforts are geared for the larger campus audience which helps in terms of including everyone, especially students. However, there may be a need for targeted diversity efforts for specific groups of students (for e.g., first generation, female, male, international students, Generation 1.5, and based on socioeconomic classes, age/generation, race and ethnicity, and sexual orientation). A high-impact practice in higher education involves the creation of graduation and retention efforts that are generalized for all students as well as localized ones for specific groups with different conditions of access and educational histories. We recommend that such a decision point be made by California State University, Monterey Bay as well.

- A major diversity assessment effort needs to be undertaken by California State University, Monterey Bay.
Because we locate your campus in a 2nd order phase, the next phase involves examining all current diversity efforts in terms of the kind of impact that is being made and the university’s decision to continue with such efforts. Thus, a systematic, university-wide assessment protocol should be adopted in terms of specific metrics, milestones, indicators, and data collection schedules on key diversity-related goals and objectives (perhaps those from a future diversity master plan). Key leaders and participants (faculty, staff, administrators) may benefit from assessment training in terms of how to design data collection mechanisms and evaluate progress on diversity-based outcomes. Moreover, all 2nd and 3rd order efforts as outlined by our mappings, should be examined to gauge the potential for 4th order transformation.

Our mappings reveal that California State University, Monterey Bay’s diversity efforts are spread across 18 different themes (Events, Trainings/Workshops, Clubs/Organizations, Mission Statement/Directive, among others). While this may indicate a level of breadth for diversity efforts, Halualani & Associates privileges the benefits of “depth” in terms of an university strategically identifying key thematic areas of diversity to focus on for the future. Such a strategy can be informed by what is currently being done and how this can be leveraged and extended further or by the “gaps” or “untapped areas” (or those thematic areas that have not been touched upon as of yet). We have identified the following “untapped areas”: diverse faculty recruitment and retention, diverse staff recruitment and retention, diversity professional development for faculty and staff, diversity pedagogies and teaching excellence for faculty, and co-curricular items. Again, though, this finding should lead into a campus collaborative decision on what thematic priorities exist for the future.

California State University, Monterey Bay needs to identify its desired campus engagement level around diversity. Based on our DELTA taxonomy scale (on next page), the majority of campus diversity efforts top out at Level 1 - Knowledge Awareness. The questions that arise are: Is this desired by the campus? How much diversity engagement is going on in campus programs and events? How productive and meaningful are the campus conversations and sense-makings around diversity and inclusion (and related topics)? What would it take for the diversity efforts to reach
Level 5 - Evaluation-Critique of Power Differences, Privilege, and Social Inequalities? How can the higher levels be incorporated and facilitated in campus diversity efforts? Through program development, built-in learning objectives, shared rubrics, training of campus members?

- There exists an “exciting” opportunity for California State University, Monterey Bay to propel its extant focus on “intersectionalities” or diversity in relation to co-existing combinations of socioeconomic class, race/ethnicity, gender, and religion. Our students and campus members today highlight how diversity is more than just one or two demographics or aspects in isolation but several in combination and collision with one another, and we applaud CSUMB on this focus. Given the extant focus on intersectionalities, understanding how your students think about, view, and engage diversity can be extremely fruitful. An assessment protocol for gauging the unique kind of learning around intersectionalities that occurs at California State University, Monterey Bay, should be created and implemented. Private grant foundations would be interested in working with CSUMB in this area especially since your university is so unique in its focus and as an HSI.

- There are also “unrealized” opportunities to engage the following areas of diversity that do not show up as much in campus diversity effort framings: disabilities, generation, and sexual orientation. Strategies to highlight these areas can be gradual and time-specific. Many colleges and universities dedicate one to two years to a specific aspect of diversity (“race,” for example, at the University of Michigan). Given this, all campus events, first-year seminars, writing courses, faculty/training workshops, study abroad/exchanges, co-curricular activities, and profiled faculty research focus on that thematic topic for that period of time. Another campus is highlighting “intercultural justice” and aligning all campus activities and curricula toward that theme.

- California State University, Monterey Bay features an exciting, robust curricular structure around diversity that can be maximized further. However, there needs to be an analysis of the extent to which diversity is engaged at
the graduate level. It was not clear from the syllabi as to the curricular components in the graduate offerings.

- We found that there are more diversity-related undergraduate courses on the books at CSUMB than are actually offered. As such, we strongly recommend that academic leaders discuss this and see if there are gaps in instructional expertise to teach those courses and therefore, if these gaps and needs in diversity learning translate into a need for more tenure-track hires in areas of diversity to teach diversity-related courses. If those courses do not have needed faculty to teach these, we encourage an investigation as to why this is the case and how to remedy this issue. Are diversity-related courses not prioritized across the academic side of the house? Or are these courses not attached to major requirements and or appealing high-yield FTES bearing units? Faculty conversations around this issue need to happen.

- It is important to note that high impact and innovative practices in higher education reveal that diversity is no longer viewed in terms of just a content-based course. Instead, as a way to be truly inclusive of all disciplines (including STEM) and core subject matter and skills (writing, communicating, public speaking, analysis, and research inquiry), diversity is now framed as an inquiry focus (way of thinking, viewing the world, a process of navigating complex questions and logics across all subject matters). Given this, a campus discussion among faculty members, department chairs, deans, and students should be conducted with regard to maximizing diversity in terms of course content and inquiry perspectives across all courses and disciplines.

  ...we strongly recommend that academic leaders discuss this and see if there are gaps in instructional expertise to teach [diversity related] courses...

- Student learning objectives and or competencies related to diversity can also be discussed in town hall campus forums among faculty and students so as to be intentional about the kind of learning to be planned for students around diversity. (Such competencies do not have to happen just in General Education courses.)

- Diversity and inclusion should be life-staged as an educational resource and learning outcome throughout students’ education at California State University, Monterey Bay. Meaning, that there could be an introductory point through which upon entry to California State University, Monterey Bay, students...
discuss and engage diversity in terms of cultural competence and or the university’s established diversity mission and commitment. At a midpoint stage, there may be some specific connection to diversity via a practical context and or specific population. An endpoint to students’ education may be in terms of making the connection to critique and or engage in advocacy to help transform the social world. A rich discussion around this idea is ripe for fruition at California State University, Monterey Bay.

In examining the diversity-related curriculum, our team noted the predominant focus on diversity in terms of an international and global framing. When combined with the finding that the highest level of DELTA in these courses tops out at Level 4 - Advanced Analysis which is just shy of Level 5 - Evaluation-Critique of Power Differences, we recommend that the “international/global” be connected with localized politics and contexts dominated by racialized, classed, gendered, and sexualized dimensions of diversity (this could again be connected to “intersectionalities” which helps students in terms of cultural adaptation competencies). The “international/global” focus needs to be actively linked to power-based differences, positionalities, and inequalities, which then more realistically frame the globalized world for your students.

- Another recommendation is to create conditions so that every student accesses DELTA Level 5 - Evaluation-Critique each year of their educational journey either through courses or co-curricular experiences (events, applied programs, community partnerships, Student Life programs) at California State University, Monterey Bay.

- Another rich finding from our mappings is that the majority of the diversity related courses stand as disciplinary content courses applied to cultural contexts. This proffers an opportunity for California State University, Monterey Bay to create vibrant faculty learning/research communities around these core courses -- with shared rubrics, collaborative assessment research, shared expertise, demonstrations of multiple faculty perspectives across courses and much more.

- Diversity assessment in terms of rigorous diversity or intercultural competency rubrics, should be conducted
for all of the study abroad/cultural exchange programs so as to identify the key impact. Such research is needed in higher education as well (and beyond indirect survey measures of student experiences in these programs -- actual student work that demonstrates competency is now the much pursued type of evidence).

Because CSUMB is a Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI), one of your Diversity Master Plan goals should be to engage in alignment activities or appropriate actions that prioritize Hispanic student success and excellence. More specifically, has CSUMB reflected on the extent to which its divisions and units are aligned on creating the most optimal conditions (fiscally, enrollment-wise, curricularly and co-curricularly, faculty hires, staff hires, peer mentorship, leadership attention, community connections, alumni connections) for Hispanic student success? If CSUMB focuses in on diversity excellence, that momentum and alignment can also transfer to a Hispanic student success focus. But this will require explicit attention and resourcing towards this priority.

If a campus climate survey is undertaken to assess campus members’ experiences with and perceptions of diversity, we recommend that the following areas of diversity be explored in the survey instrument:

- Perceptions of diversity-related events and experiences at CSUMB
- Perception of the importance of diversity for CSUMB
- Students’s classroom experiences in relation to diversity (the perspectives they are gaining and missing, difficult dialogues in the classroom, microaggressions among peers and faculty instructors, explicit conversations about power and inequalities)
- Faculty and staff professional development related to diversity learning and competencies
- Faculty exposure to training on diversity pedagogy (content coverage, inclusive pedagogical approaches, diversity issues)
- Discrimination experiences and observations
- Microaggression experiences and observations
- Role of service in the name of diversity (from the perspective of students)
Perception of faculty and staff diversity from all campus members’ points of view

Campus members’ desires of what should be in a Diversity Master Plan

Open-ended items on the most important aspects of diversity for CSUMB

- We especially recommend the use of the Diverse Learning Environments Survey by UCLA’s Higher Education Research Institute which gauges students’ experiences with diversity. There is currently no all inclusive climate instrument that connects students’ learning experiences with diversity and those experiences related to faculty and staff members.

- All in all, California State University, Monterey Bay has so much to be proud of with regard to creating a foundation for meaningful diversity and inclusion work in higher education. We were impressed with key facets of your efforts and curricula. We also find great potential in “what can be” at your university and the pursuit of further excellence in diversity and inclusion to become the ultimate “game changer.”