Vice President for Equity and Community (VPEC) Benchmarking Report

Presented to the Lehigh University Senior Leadership and Board of Trustees by the Council for Equity and Community

Internal publication September 15, 2009
External publication December 7, 2009

VPEC Benchmarking Report   September 15, 2009

**Presented to the Lehigh University Senior Leadership and
Board of Trustees by the Council for Equity and Community**

Table of Contents

Introduction

In late May 2009, Dr. Henry Odi, a member of the Council for Equity and Community (an advisory group to President Alice Gast), was asked to gather benchmarking data from Lehigh's comparable and aspirational peer institutions. In order to produce a comprehensive study, Dr. Odi made the decision to include businesses and federal agencies who are at the forefront of diversity and inclusion efforts.

Industry has decades of experience embracing diversity and inclusion. Many major companies and federal funding agencies in the U.S. have already developed and currently maintain infrastructures in the area of diversity and inclusion. Their perspectives are important because they hire our graduates and, in some cases, act as our partners/collaborators in research. Higher education can learn important lessons from these organizations. And it was encouraging to discover in the course of this study that an increasing number of schools are becoming more progressive in meeting the challenges and taking advantage of the opportunities present in our rapidly changing society.

The current trend at U.S. colleges and universities is to establish a diversity and inclusion infrastructure that is supported with internal funding. National studies support this trend and identify best practices that promote the development and sustainability of the infrastructure. Each school takes these best practices and tailors them to their own unique needs and perspectives. For this reason, the initial approach to researching best inclusionary practices in higher education was to identify the key officials at select institutions and ask them to complete our survey, in the hope that it would provide valuable insights into their diversity and inclusion infrastructure.

However, there were two problems with this approach. First, the project was to take place during the summer, when people are often out of the office due to vacation and other commitments. Second, Dr. Odi's colleagues across the country informed him that these individuals are too busy to complete surveys and most likely would not respond. When only two institutions responded to the survey, a series of 60- to 90-minute one-on-one phone interviews and conference calls were scheduled. Not only were these interviews more effective for data collection, but additional information was provided that would not have been gleaned if the survey had simply been filled out with no opportunity for discussion. The personal contact was also

very important in establishing important connections for follow-up and networking moving forward.

Officials at 24 different universities were interviewed for this report. Many of the schools we spoke to are included in the August 2009 *U.S. News & World Report* ranking of the top 50 U.S. doctoral/research universities—Lehigh's aspirational peers. We also spoke to diversity officials at other schools where important strides have been made toward building equitable and inclusive campus communities. The complete list of interviewees can be found in Table 1.

Over the course of the information gathering, it became obvious that *perception* of one's title makes a big difference. If the VPEC/CDO's charge is merely a segment of the institution, a diversity initiative will not be as effective. But when the VPEC/CDO's charge encompasses the entire institution, everyone will be engaged.

The general consensus among the benchmarking participants, both from academia and industry, is that diversity and inclusion are permanent characteristics of the 21st Century. The rising number of retiring baby boomers in the U.S.—particularly in the science, engineering, and mathematics fields—coupled with the current shortage of racial diversity in the pathways from K-12 and colleges has led corporations to aggressively seek employees from other countries. As a result, corporations are becoming increasingly interested in what institutions of higher learning are doing to effectively address this shortage—a shortage that is only expected to worsen.

Diversity and inclusion are no longer perceived important just because they are the right or moral thing to do, but because of their fundamental importance to quality and excellence. It is widely accepted that, in the words of one interviewee, "The best learning and innovation occurs in a diverse environment."

Confidentiality: Due to the sensitive nature of some of the information provided in the course of the interviews (specifically with regard to salaries and budgets), the financial information in Table 2 has been restricted to internal access only.

Table 1: Participating Institutions and Personnel

U.S. News Ranking	Institution	Name	Title
1	Harvard	Dr. Judith Singer Dr. Lisa Lo	Sr. Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity Assistant Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity
2	Princeton	Dr. Terri Harris Reed	Vice Provost, Institutional Diversity
3	Yale	Dr. Deborah Stanley-McAulay	Chief Diversity Officer
4	Stanford	Dr. Pat Jones Dr. Rosa Gonzalez	Vice Provost, Faculty Diversity Director, Diversity & Access/Compliance Officer
8	Univ. of Chicago	Dr. Kenneth Warren	Deputy Provost for Research and Minority Issues
8	Columbia	Dr. Geraldine Downey Dr. Brian Van Buren	Vice Provost for Diversity (faculty) Associate Director, Diversity Programming
10	Duke	Dr. Benjamin D. Reese Jr.	Vice President for Institutional Equity
11	Dartmouth	Dr. Holly Sateia	Vice President for Institutional Diversity & Equity
14	Johns Hopkins	Dr. Ray Gillian	Vice Provost for Community & Diversity
16	Brown	Dr. Valerie Wilson	Associate Provost/Director for Institutional Diversity
21	CA-Berkeley	Dr. Gibor Basri	Vice Chancellor for Equity & Inclusion
22	Carnegie Mellon	Mr. Everett L. Tademy	Assistant VP for Diversity & Equal Employment Opportunity Services
23	Georgetown	Ms. Rosemary Kilkenny	Vice President for Institutional Diversity & Equity
24	UCLA	Dr. Rosina M. Becerra	Vice Provost for Faculty Diversity & Development
24	Virginia	Dr. William Harvey	Vice President for Equity and Diversity
28	Tufts	Dr. Lisa Coleman	Associate Provost and Executive Director, Institutional Diversity
35	**LEHIGH**		
39	Wisconsin-Madison	Dr. Damon A. Williams	Vice Provost/Associate Chancellor for Strategic Initiatives/Chief Diversity Officer

U.S. News Ranking	Institution	Name	Title
42	CA-Davis	Dr. Rahim Reed	Associate Executive Vice Chancellor for Diversity & Community Relations
42	Rensselaer (RPI)	Dr. Robert Palazzo	Provost

Additional Institutions			
	Institution	Name	Title
	Lafayette College	Dr. Shirley Ramirez	Vice President for Institutional Planning and Community Engagement
	Northeastern	Dr. Donnie J. Perkins	Dean and Director, Institutional Diversity and Equity
	Rochester Inst. of Technology	Dr. Alfreda Brown	Chief Diversity Officer
	Villanova	Dr. Terry Nance	Assistant Vice President, Multicultural Affairs
	Williams College	Mr. Michael Reed	Vice President for Strategic Planning/Institutional Diversity

Models and Structures

Until recently, there were three models of organizational diversity structure (Williams & Clowney, 2007). These models were: Affirmative Action (begun in the 1950s), Multicultural (begun in the 1960s), and Academic Diversity (begun in the 1990s). A new fourth model is now attracting a great deal of attention across the U.S. It goes by the name Inclusive Excellence (Williams, Berger, & McClenden, 2005).

The Affirmative Action model was designed to reduce or eliminate overt discrimination or sexual harassment in a learning or workplace environment. There are problems with this model because of the misinterpretation of what it was originally designed to do. The Multicultural model was designed to bring together different cultures by promoting understanding of their similarities and differences. The Academic Diversity model was designed to link diversity with academic activities within the institution. This was the model recommended by the committee who authored Lehigh's 2007 benchmarking report.

The new Inclusive Excellence model calls for real change to be embedded at all levels of the institution. There are six core assumptions based on this model (Williams & Clowney, 2007). The entire University of Wisconsin system, the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education, and other institutions have recently implemented this model across the board. It is too early to evaluate its success. While this model seems to downplay the word "diversity," it makes a strong case for inclusive excellence and seems to be tightly aligned to the "Providing a Best-in-Class Experience" component of Lehigh's strategic plan.

We discovered in our interviews that institutions continue to choose and develop the model that will work best for them. Of the 24 institutions interviewed, two utilize a combined Affirmative Action/Multicultural model; however, they have made recommendations to their respective presidents to focus their efforts at the institutional level (so-called institutional diversity). They agree that the institutional diversity approach (very similar to the Inclusive Excellence model) is best for broader engagement across the university. These days, the Affirmative Action model is typically housed in the Office of Human Resources.

Eight of the top diversity positions are housed in the provost's office, with a dotted reporting line to the president; their emphasis is on faculty development and diversity. The other 16 top diversity positions report to the president, with a dotted reporting line to the provost.

Strategic Plan

While none of the 24 institutions have a diversity strategic plan, they all have a diversity action plan. The consistent feedback from the interviews was that having a separate strategic plan for diversity serves to marginalize the efforts. The current best practice nationwide is having one overall strategic plan that effectively addresses diversity and inclusion along with other institutional matters. Having the top diversity officer "at the table" ensures that diversity will be systematically integrated into all facets of the institutional plan, including teaching and scholarship.

Staff

Those individuals with the title of vice provost or associate provost have an average staff of two to four people, including an administrative assistant. A vice president has an average staff of four to six. None of the top diversity positions have any responsibility for women or ethnic studies; all are housed in the respective schools or colleges. One unique structure features several individuals with diversity as part of their title, but they are housed in academic and nonacademic departments/schools/colleges with dotted reporting lines to the vice provost or vice president position. In addition, they also serve on the institutional diversity council. These individuals report directly to their respective dean or department head. This approach allows for institutional engagement across the university.

Key Partners

Developing and sustaining key partnerships within any organization is critical to achieving innovation and inclusive excellence. To that end, we sought to explore the role of two specific areas of influence: the Board of Trustees/Board of Directors and the Office of Development/Institutional Advancement. It became obvious during the course of the interviews that there is a third influential group that plays a critical role with regard to diversity and inclusion efforts: the faculty. Questions were added to the survey to explore the level of engagement and support from these institutional areas.

Every interviewee recognized the importance and value of having strong commitment from their Board of Trustees. They also identified the crucial role that the Office of Development/Institutional Advancement can play, notably by raising additional funds designed to support new academic initiatives for broader impact. Some development offices have taken the additional step of rewriting the job title of one of their staff members to include a diversity component, i.e., from leadership gifts to leadership gifts

and diversity. This individual is then responsible for identifying external funding sources for the school's diversity effort.

The interviewees were quick to point out that the leadership on this issue must come from the top: president and provost. All agreed that having commitment from the president and provost is critical to building a diversity and inclusion infrastructure that can be sustained. Leadership at the top, in combination with the buy-in of the Board of Trustees, has been proven to be the most effective approach.

A Unique Approach: Tufts University

The diversity and inclusion infrastructure at Tufts University seems to be one of the best models in the country. Dr. Lisa Coleman is the executive director of institutional diversity and associate provost. She reports directly to the president and the provost, so she sits on both cabinets. Dr. Coleman heads the Office of Equity, where she has five staff members (three direct reports and two administrative assistants) and five dotted line reports. The diversity officers in each of the following areas has a dotted reporting line to Dr. Coleman:

- Each of the professional schools has a staff person at the associate dean level who reports directly to the dean, with 35% of their time devoted to diversity responsibilities.
- The engineering school has a diversity coordinator who reports directly to the dean.
- In the provost's office, there is a coordinator responsible for graduate diversity and pipeline programs.
- Admissions has two staff members responsible for diversity recruitment.
- Student services has four staff members with 50% of their time devoted to diversity responsibilities.
- In the dean of students office, the six staffers who report to the dean have a dotted reporting line to the senior diversity officer within that division.
- In the Office of Development/Institutional Advancement, two positions were created with 50% of the charge dedicated to diversity, including outreach to industry/foundations to support diversity initiatives and alumni of color.

This structure is designed to integrate diversity and its management across the whole of Tufts University, with Dr. Coleman directing the institutional effort.

Funding Support

Among American colleges and universities, the average annual salary of CDOs/VPECs is $250-$300,000. The salaries at those institutions we spoke with range from $75,000 to $450,000.

The annual operating budgets for diversity and inclusion at the institutions range from $100,000 to $5 million.

As for funding sources, every one of the schools we spoke with has the institutional commitment, via internal funds, to sustain and advance their diversity and inclusion infrastructure. Some are making additional financial commitments beyond their budget to develop new initiatives.

Table 2: VPEC or (Equivalent) Salaries and Institutional Budgets

U.S.News Ranking	Institution	Salary of VPEC or equivalent	Annual budget	Funding source
1	Harvard			Internal
2	Princeton			Internal
3	Yale			Internal
4	Stanford			Internal
8	Univ. of Chicago			Internal
8	Columbia			Internal
10	Duke			Internal
11	Dartmouth			Internal
14	Johns Hopkins			Internal
16	Brown			Internal
21	CA-Berkeley			Internal
22	Carnegie Mellon			Internal
23	Georgetown			Internal
24	UCLA			Internal
24	Virginia			Internal
28	Tufts			Internal
35	**LEHIGH**			

U.S.News Ranking	Institution	Salary of VPEC or equivalent	Annual budget	Funding source
39	Wisconsin-Madison			Internal
42	CA-Davis			Internal
42	Rensselaer (RPI)			Internal

Additional Institutions				
	Lafayette College			Internal
	Northeastern			Internal
	Rochester Inst. of Technology			Internal
	Villanova			Internal
	Williams College			Internal

Industry Perspectives

Initially, this benchmarking study was designed to focus exclusively on select colleges and universities across the country. But after the first two phone interviews were conducted, it became obvious that it would be important to include select global companies who are proven leaders in the area of diversity and inclusion. In order to identify the executives to speak to and the pertinent questions to ask them, assistance was solicited from Hayward Bell, chief diversity officer at Raytheon Corporation and a member of the Lehigh Board of Trustees' Diversity Sub-Committee.

The industry executives were interviewed via phone and conference calls. The complete list of industry participants can be found in Table 3.

These interviews made it clear that diversity and inclusion as a topic and a discipline is, at its core, a journey—one that is not specific to industry or higher education. The word "journey" was emphasized several times by multiple people during the interviews to illustrate the point that many in industry have been working aggressively in their respective approaches to diversity and inclusion. The underlying challenges and opportunities relate to the human dynamics of working across differences. As such, the work in industry is relevant and germane to higher education.

As mentioned earlier, industry has decades of experience in the area of diversity and inclusion, and higher education stands to gain from this experience. The benefits of lessons learned by industry will be useful for higher education, particularly because industry is an important stakeholder via the hiring of undergraduate and graduate students. One such lesson is the broad definition of diversity that must be understood. Diversity is much more than black and white; it encompasses academic, cultural, gender, sexual, social, religious, class, and economic issues.

A strong case can be made in support of why industry and higher education should work in concert; after all, diversity and inclusion cut across business, education, economic, and social issues. Industry experience may be value added in helping to shape diversity and inclusion efforts in academia through strategically developed collaborations. Furthermore, if diversity and inclusion are truly more than just an academic exercise, everyone at the institution must be able to function effectively within a diverse environment. This includes diversity competence, skill development, practicing the behavior, experience in an organization that embraces diversity, and emphasis on mutually beneficial collaboration versus working in isolation.

The degree to which leadership is effective at the highest level will determine the degree of success of an organization's diversity and inclusion efforts. In the case of many companies, the president/chairman/CEO is seen up front leading the effort by his or her actions and directives. Metrics are clearly defined and well integrated to measure progress across the organization.

Table 3: Participating Companies and Agencies

Name	Position	Company
Ms. Shinder Dhillon	Director, Global Diversity & Inclusion	Air Products
Mr. Ron Glover	Vice President, Global Diversity and Workforce Programs	IBM
Mr. Donald L. McCoy	Manager, Diversity Delivery Program	IBM
Ms. Deborah Dagit	Vice President and Chief Diversity Officer	Merck & Co., Inc.
Mr. Walter Hurdle	Diversity Leader, Latin American	Merck & Co., Inc.
Mr. James Kennedy	Manager, University Relations	Merck & Co., Inc.
Dr. Robert Gabrys	Chief Education Officer & Deputy Chief, Public Affairs	NASA Goddard Space Flight Center
Mr. Hayward Bell	Chief Diversity Officer	Raytheon Corporation
Mr. Phillip Harlow	Chief Diversity and Labor Relations Officer	Xerox Corporation
Mr. Ernest L. Hicks	Manager, Xerox Corporation, Diversity Office	Xerox Corporation

Conclusion and Recommendations

<u>Conclusion</u>

It is the hope that this comprehensive study on diversity infrastructure at 24 institutions across the country, including feedback from five top companies and one federal agency, will provide valuable data to facilitate the decision on the next critical step for Lehigh University. The individual interviews exposed the interviewer and Lehigh University to the challenges and opportunities in the area of diversity across the country and globally. It also confirmed the fact that institutions ranked above Lehigh, peer institutions, liberal arts institutions, and key industries are taking concrete and strategic steps to embrace institutional diversity.

Several of these institutions, through their efforts to embrace diversity and inclusion, are repositioning themselves for today's changing demographics, to meet the need to educate *all* students, and to recruit and retain a diverse faculty and staff. Based on the feedback from the participating companies, the lessons learned from decades of experience can be valuable for higher education.

Many companies are instituting metrics to evaluate which universities will be selected as partners. The criteria will be based on the quality of academic programs and the established diversity infrastructure.

There are numerous examples of opportunities being missed due to a lack of diversity and inclusion infrastructure. For instance, a company had been providing scholarship grants every year for 10 years to support Hispanic undergraduate and graduate students in engineering and business. However, two years ago the industry representative informed the faculty advisor for the Society for Hispanic Professional Engineers (SHPE) at Lehigh that the scholarship grant will be discontinued due to lack of student diversity here.

There are institutions in the Patriot League, such as Lafayette College, Bucknell, and Colgate, that have established cabinet positions and diversity infrastructures at their respective campuses. Of the three schools, Lafayette College was invited to participate in this study. Bucknell participated in a previous benchmarking study.

Note: Each of the participating institutions and companies has requested a copy of the executive summary of this study.

<u>Recommendations</u>

Lehigh University is now well positioned to move forward in creating the position of Vice President for Equity and Community.

Lehigh University should consider replicating an institutional diversity infrastructure model similar to that at Tufts University. The Inclusive Excellence model seems to be the way to go.

Lehigh University should consider hosting a "Summit on Lessons Learned" in collaboration with select industry leaders.