Chapter 8

Leverage Points & Recommendations

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.

...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.

- 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)