

CAPD

OPENING CLOSING DOORS, CLOSING OPENING DOORS: EFFORTS TO INCREASE AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENT ACCESS AND SUCCESS INSIX SOUTHERN LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES (A Report Prepared for The Jessie Ball duPont Fund)

**BERNARD J. MCMULLAN
CHERYL SMITH GARRETT
MARCH 1993**

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	3
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
I. INTRODUCTION	12
THE INSTITUTIONS	12
Key Similarities	13
Main Differences	15
Experiences in Institutional Change	16
A Set of Shared Goals and Objectives Concerning Minority Students	17
A REFLECTION ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INCREASING THE POOL AND INCREASING CAMPUS DIVERSITY	19
REPORT ORGANIZATION	19
II. PROGRAMS FOCUSED ON INCREASING THE POOL	21
PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS	21
Davidson College: Love of Learning	22
University of the South: Sewanee Summer Scholars Program	22
Washington and Lee: FUTURES	23
ASSESSMENT OF ADEQUACY OF MODELS AND MODEL IMPLEMENTATION	24

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

Selection of Target Population	24
Point of Initial Contact	24
Nature of Contact with Youth.....	25
Nature of Academic Focus	26
Service Delivery Plan	27
Relationship with the Regular Educational System	27
SUMMARY	28
III. EXPERIENCES OF AFRICAN AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS	36
IV. EFFORTS TO INCREASE DIVERSITY ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES	36
THE RATIONALE FOR DIVERSITY	36
ON THE MEANING OF DIVERSITY	38
CAMPUS-BASED STRATEGIES TO INCREASE DIVERSITY.....	38
Efforts to Increase Numerical Diversity	38
Efforts to Change Campus Diversity.....	43
SUMMARY	52
V. REFLECTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	52
ISSUES OF DIVERSITY	52
Broadening Institutional Retention Goals to Campus Diversity	53
Marginalization	53
Multi-cultural Remediation.....	53
Institutional Will.....	54
CONTINUING SUPPORT OF THE INITIATIVES TO INCREASE THE POOL OF ELIGIBLE AND INTERESTED AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS	54
BIBLIOGRAPHY	56
APPENDIX I.....	57
NOTES	59

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research for this report and its preparation were supported by the Jessie Ball duPont Fund. The authors wish to thank Ron Gallo and Sherry Magill of the Fund for their continuing support and advice throughout the project. Both contributed heavily to the conceptualization of the research and provided valuable comments and insights on an earlier draft of this document.

The authors also express sincere appreciation to the people who spent time with us discussing programs, colleges and educational issues. Individuals involved in all aspects of the colleges and programs studies — administrators, faculty, program directors, college students, alumni, high school teachers and program participants — willingly gave of their time and insights. At each institution we were made to feel welcome throughout our visits.

The authors also express thanks to staff within the Center for Assessment and Policy Development. Wendy Wolf greatly strengthened the document by carefully reading our text and challenging our assumptions and evidence. We also thank Mirta Diaz and Judy Barci of CAPD who provided essential support throughout the project.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

College attendance and graduation rates of minority youth lag substantially behind those of white students. Such a gap portends significant problems for the nation and for key regions as projected demographic shifts result in "minorities" constituting a plurality in many cities and states. If the college-going and success rates of minority youth continue to lag behind those of their white peers, the prospect looms of a bi-modal economic and social community structure in which the experiences of highly educated whites aspiring and achieving economic self-sufficiency contrast sharply with those of a large, predominantly minority population with relatively low levels of education and limited economic opportunities.

This study considers the efforts of six Southern, predominantly white, liberal arts institutions that have begun the process of grappling with the gap between minority and white student college attendance and success rates. The six institutions — Davidson College, Furman University, Lynchburg College, Rhodes College, University of the South and Washington and Lee University — share a range of common characteristics and experiences. In addition, each has its unique history and heritage that distinguish it from the other institutions. The Jessie Ball duPont Fund commissioned a study of these specific schools for several reasons. First, during the past decade, the Fund has provided substantial funds to four¹ of these institutions including grants to initiate efforts to increase minority student preparation for and access to college.² Second, five of the six institutions have joined in a consortial arrangement named Leadership South to undertake a series of collaborative efforts to increase minority student and faculty representation on their campuses. The sixth institution, Lynchburg College, has obtained support from the Fund to initiate an Office of Institutional Change specifically charged with creating campuswide opportunities for increased diversity within the student population, faculty ranks and curriculum.

In undertaking the present study, the Fund had several broad goals:

- to understand the strengths, weaknesses and likely benefits of the specific programmatic strategies; and
- to explore the ways in which the Fund might best use its resources to assist these institutions in achieving their goals of greater campus diversity and representation of African American students and faculty on their campuses.

The study provides an overview of the various programmatic strategies currently underway in these institutions to increase African American³ student access to and success in college. It considers two broad areas of intervention:

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

- Efforts to increase the *pool* of African American students prepared to enroll and succeed in college; and
- Efforts to increase the *representation* of African American students and faculty within their campuses by espousing greater campuswide diversity.

The study assesses efforts in these two areas by examining the adequacy of the models or framework that undergird the efforts; by exploring how effectively the models have been implemented; and finally, by considering the likely efficacy of the strategies in reaching the goals of increased African American student access and success in college.

Specifically, those efforts designed to increase the pool of African American students prepared for college are assessed by comparing their models and implementation to a set of criterion benchmarks developed by The Center for Assessment and Policy Development in a study of similar student-focused programs throughout the nation. **Like most student-focused programs throughout the nation**, the three summer programs reviewed in this study are not of sufficient size or maturity to permit or warrant a quantitative analysis of program benefits on student performance and achievement. The most appropriate strategy for assessing the programs is to consider the degree to which their programmatic models include elements that are consonant with best practices for increasing minority student access to college and the degree to which these models are adequately implemented. Thus, the study assesses whether or not the programs are likely to produce the desired outcomes.

This report draws upon the experiences of administrators, program staff, faculty and college students across all six institutions to examine a set of strategies to increase the pool of college-eligible African American students and to increase campus diversity within the institutions. The report does not include a separate evaluation or assessment of each institution's efforts or programs. Instead, it seeks to identify

common themes and experiences that can help inform policy and programmatic discussions on these issues with the six institutions as well as the broader policy community.

Data for this report were gathered over a series of in-person site visits between March and August 1992. Site visits included extended discussions with college presidents, deans, other administrative staff, faculty leaders and student leaders. In addition, each site visit included separate focused group discussions with African American and white students enrolled in the college concerning their experiences. Separate site visits were also conducted at four institutions during the summer to study programs directly funded by the Fund. Visits to the specific programs included direct observation of program activities (classes, presentations, special events), discussions with program staff (administrators, mentors and teachers) and discussions with participants.

ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAMS TO INCREASE THE POOL OF COLLEGE-READY AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS

Based on a study of student-focused initiatives designed to increase minority student preparation for and access to college, CAPD has identified six key operational issues to consider in designing such efforts. How these issues are addressed and implemented have significant implications for the initiatives' ability to increase minority student access to college. The six operational dimensions are:

- ***Selection of target population*** — *determining an appropriate level of selectivity in setting eligibility requirements.*
- ***Point of initial contact with youth*** — *the point in the educational process when students begin to participate in student-focused initiatives.*
- ***Nature of contact with youth*** — *the way in which program services are provided.*

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

- **Nature of academic focus** — *the level or nature of academic programming.*
- **Service delivery plan** — *the strategy for providing services and resources to participants over time.*
- **Relationship to the regular educational system** — *the connection between a student-focused program and the regular educational system in which participants are enrolled.*

The programs at Davidson (Love of Learning), University of the South (Sewanee Summer Scholars) and Washington and Lee University (FUTURES) have, in general, adopted models with many elements consonant with the preferred strategies identified by CAPD in its earlier work.

Each of the programs has chosen to work with a moderately selective target population and two of the three programs have set the point of initial contact at what is probably the most appropriate point in students' school careers. The nature of contact — the duration, frequency and consistency of program contact with students — though adequate at two colleges, could be strengthened in several areas. In the other program, the nature of contact is clearly less than adequate and needs much improvement. All of the programs have appropriately chosen to pursue a college preparatory academic focus. This aspect is among the strongest elements of the initiatives. Each program has also employed a cohort strategy buttressed by supplementary programming. However, we found that greater attention must be given to supplementary support in all programs. Finally, while each of the programs has some relationship to participants' regular schooling, the strength of those relationships varies widely.

Since staffs of these programs have made many of the decisions considered essential for likely success, it is probable that they will make some positive difference in the lives of students who participate. Many students report that their regular school work has improved substantially

since they have been participating in the programs.

EXPERIENCES OF AFRICAN AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Several recurring themes emerged in individual and roundtable interviews with African American students enrolled in the six institutions. Generally, these students are doing quite well academically. In some instances, their academic performance as a group exceeds that of traditional students at the campuses. Thus, dilemmas described by African American students are most often social in nature. While a few students across institutions indicate that they are comfortable both socially and academically on their respective campuses, this was not the prevailing African American student experience. Discussions with students revealed the following:

- Positive relations with faculty emerges as one of the most encouraging experiences of African American students on small, predominantly white campuses.
- Parental expectations and a feeling of responsibility not to disappoint other African American students account for the determination of some African American students to endure despite circumstances that they find troubling.

KEY FINDINGS CONCERNING THREE PROGRAMS DESIGNED TO INCREASE THE POOL OF COLLEGE-READY AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS

- Each program focuses on moderately performing students who *in the absence of the program* would be unlikely to attend college.
- Two programs begin serving students completing ninth grade when there is still adequate opportunity to influence academic preparation, course selection and motivation to attend college; the third program defers starting to work with students until the

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

summer after 10th grade which may limit opportunities to influence preparation for college.

- Two programs provide an episodic series of four-week summer programs, following participants' ninth, tenth and eleventh academic years. The third program offers a two-week summer program following the 10th and 11th grade and the opportunity to join another four-week campus program following the 12th grade. We believe that a four-week program over several successive summers prior to the 12th grade is the minimum needed.
- Efforts to supplement the summer program experiences during the following school years have had mixed results. The program at University of the South has developed an effective strategy for maintaining contact on a monthly basis. Davidson's efforts to monitor student school year performance and provide services has been stymied by a lack of program staff. Washington and Lee's program relies on the efforts of a district office of collaborative services to monitor student performance. Each of the programs needs to be strengthened in providing supplemental services to participants.
- All programs deliver a highly structured summer college preparatory (non-remedial) academic program that is closely tied to the curricular content of the students' subsequent school year. This close link with upcoming school work is likely a productive strategy for improving students' school year performance and academic self-confidence.
- Programs rely on a cohort-based approach for delivering similar services to all students.
- To date, the programs have not experienced problems of substantial attrition or uneven student performance that can undercut cohort-based approaches.
- Programs remain relatively detached from the day-to-day educational experiences of

participants during the school year. The academic focus of the summer initiative provides an initial link between the students' participation in the program and their school year. However, the benefits of program participation for students could be substantially improved if programs had the capacity to monitor students' progress.

Among the most common challenges facing African American students across the campuses were:

- Black students feel isolated because: there is often no African American community near the campus; few African Americans are on faculty or staff; and there is little campus social activity in which they can comfortably participate. They see themselves as both invisible and hypervisible members of the student body.
- Though the transition to these campuses is easier for some students than for others, even those students whose high school backgrounds were similar to their campus experience come to feel ill-at-ease.
- Being seen as a monolithic group is troublesome for African American students. They take exception to the notion that there is no heterogeneity within their group.
- The emphasis by these colleges on "tradition" and "heritage" translates into an emphasis on racism from African American students' perspective. While African American students are pleased to know that their college has identified diversity as an area of emphasis, many doubt that the present levels of commitment to diversity will be enough to result in real change.

The comments of African American students on these campuses mirror closely the findings of studies concerning the experiences of women in male-dominated workplaces. These women tend to be treated as representatives of their category or symbols rather than as individuals. Two conditions can heighten these effects: the

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

visibility of the minority group's social category (in the earlier research, women; in our study, race); and whether or not their social type is rare or new to the setting. On the campuses of the six colleges, both conditions apply.

The research on "token" women identified three perceptual phenomena associated with proportional rarity: visibility, polarization and assimilation. In addition, there are considerable pressures to succeed or over-achieve (feelings of over-observation, carrying the burden of representing their category by all of their actions, having to work twice as hard to prove their competence and fear of retaliation for out-performing members of the dominant group). Many of these phenomena closely match the comments of African American students on the six campuses. The current experiences and perceptions of African American students provide an important context for examining how efforts within the college communities have begun to address the goals of African American student retention and success.

EFFORTS TO INCREASE AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENT ENROLLMENT, RETENTION AND SUCCESS

Each of the institutions has adopted a variety of strategies, techniques and efforts to attract African American students to their campuses and sustain these students once they enroll. Many of these efforts began with recruitment and retention.

At present, the representation of African American students on most⁴ of these campuses lags substantially behind that of many other liberal arts institutions. Further, their locations — in states where there are substantial numbers of African American high school students and graduates—bring the gap in college-going rates into higher relief. One of the largest challenges facing these institutions is increasing the number of African American students interested in applying. In general, these institutions accept and enroll African American students at rates comparable to those of white applicants.

However, for a variety of reasons, applications from African American students are relatively rare. Institutions must consider ways to introduce themselves to the African American community and demonstrate that they are interesting in enrolling more African American students. In particular, institutions should re-examine decisions to focus recruitment of African American students from the same secondary schools from which white students are recruited, by expanding recruiting efforts within those schools among African American students with high achievement results. Further, colleges need to make a concerted effort to gain recognition and support of the broader African American communities from which current students are drawn. Such support can provide a vital link with potential students in the future.

Institutions have adopted a range of administrative and other efforts to provide support to students and improve the campus environment in which African American students exist. Each institution has created an administrative office to provide support and advocacy on behalf of African American students. In addition, considerable attention has been given to retaining African American students who do enroll. Several colleges have begun a process of reexamining curricula to ensure that materials and subject matter are inclusive and responsive to the interests and intellectual needs of all students. Efforts to increase African American representation within the faculty have yielded little progress to date and need to be reviewed. Finally, most colleges have made progress in placing African American students in student leadership positions. By and large, these efforts are relatively new and their full effects have not yet been demonstrated. However, in several institutions, such efforts have remained marginalized and focused on symptoms of issues and problems. In other institutions, there has been a movement toward creating the conditions necessary for a diverse campus.

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

KEY FINDINGS CONCERNING EFFORTS TO INCREASE DIVERSITY WITHIN COLLEGES

- Significant progress towards increasing diversity cannot occur until institutions recognize that increased diversity benefits all students and the institution itself. A common, shared vision for diversity is not held across the various constituencies within these campuses.
- An inclusive, comprehensive definition of diversity will require a substantial change in the policies, activities and campus climates of these institutions in virtually all areas of operation.
- Efforts to increase the number of African American students within these campuses have foundered in the face of the limited number of applications African American applicants are as likely to be offered admission and enroll as are other students.
- Standard efforts to identify potential applicants have met with only limited success. Institutions will need to use substantially different methods targeted at African American communities and at high school teachers of African American students to make additional progress.
- Many campuses have undertaken specific activities to change campus diversity and campus climate over the past several years. The effect of these efforts are just being felt.
- Administrative Offices for Minority Affairs are among the most visible symbols of a commitment to diversity. Staff in these offices are highly committed and have undertaken a broad range of activities to improve the educational and social setting for African American and white students.
- The creation of an Office for Minority Affairs has sometimes, however, become a terminal activity and may "marginalize" efforts to further diversify the campus.
- Introducing diversity with the college curriculum has occurred in a relatively piecemeal manner. A rigid definition of a liberal arts curriculum has sometimes been used to deflect requests for the inclusion of minority issues and scholarship. However, several departments and instructors at each institution have taken initial steps in this area. Davidson College has recently announced the creation of a concentration in minority and African American studies.
- Recruiting African American faculty and administrators remains a difficult challenge for these institutions.
- African American students have risen to prominent leadership positions in all institutions, serving in administrative, elected and other posts in all areas of campus life. However, entry into Greek Letter organizations remains problematic as some students wish to launch historically-Black Greek houses and others are discouraged in their efforts to join existing white houses.

SUMMARY AND POLICY CONCLUSIONS

The six institutions participating in this study have undertaken a variety of strategies to increase the number of African American students who are interested in college and to improve the chances that African American students in these institutions have a successful and rewarding collegiate experience.

Substantial institutional challenges face the colleges and the Jessie Ball duPont Fund as these efforts are examined and reviewed. Several challenges focus on efforts toward increasing diversity within these campuses. Other challenges evolve from the goals and purposes of the student-focused programs in several institutions.

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)**Efforts to Increase Diversity with Colleges**

We believe that many efforts of these institutions can be interpreted as attempts to increase diversity at the college level. Progress toward campus diversity in all of its manifestations — student population, faculty composition, curriculum, and school culture — has the potential to improve the quality of the entire educational enterprise including the experiences of African American students as well as white students.

We identify four broad areas in which steps must be taken within each institution to continue to advance an agenda of diversity:

- A need to broaden the rationale of current efforts from one of African American student retention to one of diversity;
- A need to devolve responsibility for diversity away from a single office or department to all areas of the college;
- A need to develop a systemic and sustained approach for providing all students with the skills and sensibilities needed to function and succeed in a multi-cultural, multi-racial collegiate setting; and
- A need for a consistent and sincere expression of institutional will that the achievement of a fully diversified campus is at the top of the college's agenda for the future.

Broadening Institutional Retention Goals to Campus Diversity

Our first policy conclusion is the need to refocus the mission and understanding of current efforts from an objective of African American student retention to one of campus diversity. Such a transformation of mission would require a "paradigm shift" on some of the campuses toward a recognition that a diverse educational experience is a benefit to the entire student population, not simply to African American

students. We believe that efforts whose primary purpose or rationale is increased African American student retention are destined to fail. They will fail because they address neither the causes that discourage potential applicants nor the factors that drive African American students to leave school — that African American students, their heritage and their experiences are not welcomed or reflected in the activities and priorities of the institution. Retention efforts are something an institution *does* to keep African American students around; being diverse is what the college *is* for all students.

Marginalization

Many colleges have taken concrete steps to improve retention of African American students or to begin the process of broadening campus diversity. Yet many of their efforts have been developed and implemented as marginalized solutions that address an immediate problem without having the strength or vision to change practices and policies across the college. This is due in part to the fact that these efforts have largely been assigned to a particular office for implementation, i.e., the Office of Minority Affairs.

While these offices take their responsibilities very seriously, their efforts often signal that this issue is being taken care of and need not concern others in the institution. As a consequence, these approaches are neither systemic nor institutionalized and thus have limited potential for being sustained over the longer term or having much impact on the broader college community.

Institutions must strive to devise systemwide strategies to achieve campus diversity. Various units must assess their current practices, policies and curricula and develop a three-year plan for advancing diversity in their area of responsibility. Such a plan should be monitored by a group representing all constituencies on campus — administration, faculty, students and board members.

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

Multi-cultural Remediation

The circumstances and issues of racism described in these six institutions are not unique or confined to these colleges. Virtually every college and university in the nation is grappling with exactly these issues. In a response to a recently released report about race relations at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, the Director of Institutional Change noted that what was needed and attempted at his campus was an educational process of "multi-cultural remediation." He estimated that each year at least one third of the student population (i.e., the entering freshman class) required an active program to address the deficiencies that many students had concerning multi-cultural issues and racial diversity among peers. In many ways, colleges and universities emerge as flashpoints for the lack of tolerance and appreciation for rights and contributions of all groups within American society.

The six institutions included in this study need to assess how best to overcome the racism that exists on their campuses. It is apparent that a *laissez-faire* approach is unlikely to produce the desired effects and probably risks severe division among students, staff and alumni if blatant racism emerges. The delivery of a program of multi-cultural awareness, appreciation and sensitivity cannot be completed within an orientation or through a series of informal fireside chats by the president. The issues involved are much more complex than can be handled **solely** by resident assistants or student leaders. A comprehensive plan integrated into the overall college experience — and not simply an "add-on" — must be developed.

Institutional Will

The final and perhaps most decisive area concerns the willingness and support for institutional change around the issue of diversity. Our observations lead us to conclude that institutional will for diversity is not consistently strong across the six colleges. Discussions with

members from all constituencies of the campus community at each institution indicated that there is considerable variation in the level of commitment or "institutional will" to articulate and advance an agenda for diversity. Several institutions have developed a plan with reasoned, concrete steps and have followed through on their plans. In other institutions, issues surrounding diversity are much more hazy and the examples offered as evidence of progress in these areas seemed unfocused or contrived. We recognize that achieving diversity is but one of many legitimate competing goals that face administrators on these (and all) campuses. Issues of financial stability, faculty support, alumni relations, capital campaigns, and others all demand attention and planning. Even given these competing pressures, several colleges have expanded their primary institutional agenda to include movement toward diversity. However, at other institutions, diversity is considered only as an afterthought.

For this reason, it may be appropriate for the Fund to consider how its resources can best be used to advance campus diversity. An option for the Fund would be to increase support only for those institutions where there is sufficient will to advance the Fund's broader diversity goals.

Continuing Support of the Initiatives to Increase the Pool of Eligible and Interested African American Students

From the perspective of the Fund and the several institutions involved, a policy decision concerning the efficacy and contribution of Sewanee Summer Scholars, Love of Learning and FUTURES is potentially the most problematic. We have argued in this report that individually these programs brought together strong staff doing exciting things with African American students who normally would not receive such support. While we have raised some specific concerns about choices of programmatic elements and some aspects of implementation, we believe that each initiative has the capacity to make suggested

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

improvements in their models and implementation efforts.

We feel it is important to reiterate several points concerning the efforts we observed. First, there is no reason to believe that these efforts have **failed**. In fact, the programs are characterized by relatively strong models and good records of implementation.

Second, the staff involved in developing and implementing these initiatives should be applauded for a job well done. Their efforts demonstrate a strong, lasting commitment to the ideals and objectives of African American student access and success.

Third, the programs (and the Fund) have made a **de facto** commitment and obligation to the students who are already involved in these multi-year initiatives. We believe that it would be damaging to the opportunities and aspirations of participating African American students to arbitrarily close or alter programs without permitting the students either to complete them or be placed (and supported) in a similar initiative.

However, an important issue that has not been discussed is the scope and scale of the programs. The small number of students who may benefit from these efforts does not augur well in terms of meeting a larger goal of improving African American college enrollment rates. Between them, the programs serve fewer than 200 students drawn from literally thousands of similar youth in their geographic areas who might benefit from program participation. The difficulty from a policy perspective is that each of the initiatives has adequate to reasonable models and the potential for good implementation. For students who are served, the experience is probably valuable. However, recognizing the costs and effort required to organize, implement and sustain such efforts, one must consider how a broader impact, involving more students, might be achieved.

Two possible, but probably unrealistic, alternatives might be considered. Each seeks to

increase the scale and/or scope of the current initiatives. First, the programs might re-focus their efforts on broader systemic approaches to improve the conditions and circumstances in which children in the target communities are served. However, given the distances involved and the limited appropriate resources (i.e., a school of education) of the participating colleges, such an option is not realistic.

The second option is to expand the capacity of the current programs. As they currently operate, these programs are too small to increase substantially the pool of college-going African American students. In fairness, it must be noted that the scope and scale of these programs is similar to virtually all other student-focused programs throughout the nation. Nationally, the vast majority of programs serve relatively few students. While program expansion would provide more opportunities for African American students to participate, it also represents an onerous challenge for program staff and for sponsoring institutions.

If the Fund has an interest in increasing minority student access to college on a broader scale, it might consider re-focusing its support of "pool-expansion" programs on institutions with more direct and complete access to minority youth. Among the Fund's eligible institutions are a number of urban colleges and universities that probably have the capacity and interest in working with urban youth and urban school districts in efforts to increase minority access to college. From our perspective, the Fund should try to balance programming between efforts that serve minority youth directly — as do current programs — and initiatives that seek to transform more systemically the quality of education provided to minority youth in urban schools. Such a dual-pronged approach will yield immediate benefits to the youth served as well as longer-term, sustainable improvement in schools to the benefit of future students.

At the same time, the Fund could announce its intention of reducing and eventually eliminating support of student-focused efforts within the

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

three institutions, providing transitional funds to permit the programs to serve currently enrolled students to complete the full program or permitting the programs to attempt to find other sources of funding. Such a decision need not signal that the Fund is turning away from these institutions. In fact, resources currently used for pool programs could be appropriately redirected to address issues of campus diversity. However, such a decision may be difficult. The current pool initiatives are among the most visible, tangible indications that the institutions are concerned with issues of African American enrollment. Abandoning such efforts without a concomitant visible strategy for increasing campus diversity could potentially signify a desertion of the need to serve African American students in these institutions.

In 1988, 64 percent of 18-year-old African Americans graduated from high school, but only 29 percent were enrolled in college. . . . By contrast, whites registered a higher graduation rate (71 percent) and college enrollment rate (43 percent).

Deborah J. Carter and Reginald Wilson
*Minorities in Higher Education:
Tenth Annual Status Report*

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the most persistent and troubling challenges facing our nation is the continuing low levels of college enrollment among minority students in contrast to their majority peers. The American Council of Education's (1991) *Minorities in Education* report demonstrates that a cumulative process of minority student attrition from secondary school, poor academic preparation, concerns of costs and squelched educational expectations convincingly reduces the pool of minority students interested in, prepared for and encouraged to enroll in college.

At the same time, there is increasing evidence that large numbers of minority students who enter college leave before completion. There is

a substantial gap between the college completion rate of minority and majority students (see for example *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 1992). Again, the factors that limit the pool of minority college entrants — poor academic preparation, lack of encouragement, inadequate financial resources and hostile educational environments — continue to have pernicious and debilitating effects at the college level.

This report considers the efforts within six colleges to address both challenges described above: increasing the pool of minority — specifically, African American — students interested in and eligible for college; and increasing the number and success of African American students enrolled in these six institutions: Davidson College, Furman University, Lynchburg College, Rhodes College, University of the South and Washington and Lee University. The Jessie Ball duPont Fund has provided support for these activities in three ways. In four institutions (Davidson College, Washington and Lee University, Lynchburg College and the University of the South), it provides direct support for programs and initiatives designed to increase the pool of African American students interested in and prepared for (any) college. Second, the Fund has provided indirect support for activities addressing both minority student recruitment and minority student retention by a consortial group called Leadership South that includes Davidson, Washington and Lee, University of the South and two other institutions — Rhodes College and Furman University. In addition, the Fund has provided direct support to Lynchburg College to develop an institution-wide strategy for systemic change focused on increased diversity of the student population, faculty and administrative staff and curricular content, as well as support for partnerships with local public schools and academic pre-orientation sessions for incoming minority students.

THE INSTITUTIONS

Before turning to a discussion of the various initiatives and strategies underway at each of

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

these colleges, it is useful to briefly review some of the structural similarities and differences and common experiences across the institutions. The setting, history and circumstances of these colleges are important factors that determine both the need for and the possibilities and shape of efforts to increase minority student access and representation. Table I.1 presents a summary of characteristics across the six institutions.

Key Similarities

The six institutions share a range of common characteristics and features that make an examination of their efforts at increasing minority student college access and campus diversity particularly appropriate. All are small liberal arts colleges¹ located in the South. As private institutions, their tuition and fee costs are relatively high, though there is some variation across the institutions.

The common shared characteristic most germane for the current study is that the enrollment of minority students within each institution represents a small percentage (ranging between 1 and 5 percent) of the total

student population. The total number of African American students ranges from 26 to 117. Extremely limited representation of minority students has been the norm throughout the history of these institutions. In addition, minority representation among the faculty within these institutions is also limited. For example, no institution has more than three African American faculty members. Minority representation among administrators is also low; no school has more than three African American administrators (including admissions staff).

As in many established liberal arts colleges, tradition embodied within the practices, policies and symbols of the institution is a hallmark of each institution. Elements of tradition extend from opening ceremonies, to the designation and apparel of honors students, to scheduled public debates to social events. Most traditions are strongly protected and expected by administrators, faculty, students and alumni. Traditions help define the aura and experience of attending these institutions — as much as curricula, friendships and academic achievements.

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

**TABLE I.1
KEY CHARACTERISTICS OF SIX INSTITUTIONS**

	Davidson College	Furman University	Lynchburg College	Rhodes College	University of the South	Washington and Lee University
Founding Date	1837	1826	1903	1848	1857	1749
Location	Rural NC	Suburban SC	Suburban VA	Urban TN	Rural TN	Rural VA
Religious Affiliation	Presbyterian	Baptist	Disciples of Christ	Presbyterian	Episcopalian	None
Student Population	1,555	2,703	2,400	1,429	1,181	1,974
Undergraduate Population	1,555	2,496	1,905	1,370	1,109	1,600
Percent Female	45%	56%	60%	55%	48%	39%
Tuition & Fees	\$19,420	\$14,557	\$13,100	\$17,474	\$17,005	\$15,875
Percent African American	4.4%	4.5%	7.0%	5.0%	2.3%	3.8%
Percent of Eligible Students in Fraternities	55%	35%	10%	55%	69%	76%
Percent of Eligible Students in Sororities	65%	25%	10%	73%	72%	62%
Minority Faculty	3	2	2	2	0	2
Minority Administrators	3	1	1	1	1	2
Average SAT Verbal	600	525	447	585	557	603
Average SAT Math	640	585	472	630	594	655
Entrance Requirements	very difficult	very difficult	moderately difficult	very difficult	very difficult	very difficult
Member of Leadership South	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

Five of the institutions are located in either rural settings or very small towns. The host communities of the institutions generally have a very small minority population. The sixth school, Rhodes College, is located in Memphis, Tennessee, but like many urban colleges is located in an affluent residential enclave that shelters it from the bustle of an urban setting. The effect of the location of these institutions is that minority students and staff cannot anticipate finding social outlets with other minority students in the host community.

Across campuses, the social life and, to some extent, the entire "non-academic" college student experience is fundamentally shaped by student-led Greek letter organizations or similar institutions. Although only some campuses permit fraternities and sororities to be affiliated with national organizations, traditional Greek practices, processes and activities are pursued on each campus. Fraternities and sororities (or their equivalents) dominate the non-academic life on each campus.

There are several other characteristics shared by most, but not all, institutions. In particular, five of the institutions — those involved in Leadership South — have strong regional reputations of offering a very strong academic program premised on selective to highly selective admission policies. The institutions pride themselves on serving as important educators of the future leaders of their immediate regions and the South more broadly. Lynchburg College describes itself as having a moderately selective admission policy and seeks to draw students with somewhat lower levels of academic achievement and preparation.

Five of the institutions have some degree of religious affiliation. Although such affiliation does not determine fully day-to-day policy or directly impact campus life, it does provide a touchstone for broader issues of social action and collegiate policy.

Main Differences

It is also the case that there are differences across the institutions. Among the most salient differences are the ages of the institutions, the sizes of their student population, the composition of the student body and financial resources.

Institutional Age

There is considerable variation in founding date among the six institutions. The oldest institution, Washington and Lee University, began as an academy in 1749 more than a quarter of a century before the Declaration of Independence. Four other institutions were founded in the 20–year period between 1837 and the start of the Civil War. The youngest institution, Lynchburg College, traces its roots to 1903. The age of institution and the consequent experiences during its history figure prominently in the development and sanctity of the importance of tradition within these institutions.

Size of Student Body

Although these institutions are relatively small colleges, there is variation in the size of their student bodies. The largest institution is Furman University, which serves more than 2,700 students, including about 200 students in graduate/professional programs. In contrast, the University of the South serves only 1,200 students, including about 80 students enrolled in its graduate seminary program. The remaining institutions fall between these two extremes: Lynchburg (2,400 students, including, 1,900 undergraduates); Washington and Lee (2,000 students, including 1,600 undergraduates); Davidson College and Rhodes College, each serving between 1,400 and 1,600 undergraduate students.

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

Student Body Composition

Institutions also vary in respect to the composition of their student populations. In three institutions, a majority of students are female. In the other three, specifically those that became coeducational within the past 30 years, females are in the minority. Institutions also vary in terms of representation of students from the state in which the college is located. Furman University draws almost one half of its students from South Carolina. In contrast, Washington and Lee University and University of the South draw fewer than 20 percent of their students from the states in which they are located.

Experiences in Institutional Change

Before leaving our discussion of similarities and differences across these institutions, it is important to briefly review the common **experience** each has had in undergoing substantial institutional change. The focus of this report is on changing the access of minority students to college and representation of minority students on these campuses specifically. It is appropriate then to recognize that each of these institutions has faced important challenges and changes of equal or greater significance in their recent histories.

Four institutions have had recent experience in changing the composition of their student population. During the past three decades, three institutions have fundamentally changed the composition of their student bodies by admitting female students.²

- Davidson College became co-educational in 1972; females comprise 48 percent of its present student population.
- The University of the South began admitting women students in 1979; 48 percent of students were female in the 1991/92 academic year.
- Washington and Lee opened its doors to female students in 1984; 38 percent of its

student population was female during the 1991/92 academic year.

Rhodes College has experienced significant change in the characteristics of its student body as well. The student population grew by more than 60 percent during the period **and** the average combined SAT scores among entering freshmen rose by more than 100 points. Such a change was a culmination of a range of sweeping changes within Rhodes College. Although it began as a rural institution, in 1925 it moved to Memphis to attract and serve more students. Beginning in 1981, the institution adopted a new mission to become a leading national liberal arts institution. It implemented a broad strategy to upgrade institutional quality, including improving facilities, recruiting talented faculty and recruiting higher achieving students. In addition, during this process, the institution changed its name from Southwestern College at Memphis to Rhodes College in honor of a former president.

Furman University has also been the location of change. In the late 1960s, the entire institution moved from its original location to an entirely new campus setting. More recently, after more than a century of affiliation, the university formally severed its close relationship with the South Carolina Baptist Convention in 1992 in a dispute over the mission of the institution and the composition of its board of directors.

Lynchburg College has not had a prior watershed event comparable to those of the other institutions. However, during the past several years, it has engaged in a conscious process of self-examination and reflection that has led to a series of strategies and activities explicitly designed to foster sweeping changes throughout the institution. Led by its president and supported by the Fund, the college has sought to re-invent its particular "niche" in meeting the postsecondary needs of students. Using institutional, foundation and corporate support, Lynchburg College has re-focused its curriculum toward more technologically based³ and greater "hands-on" experiential instruction.

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

In addition, the college has sought to re-establish links with the local school district by revitalizing dormant adopt-a-school programs and redesigning teacher preparation and development programs. Finally, the college has used its Fund-supported Office of Institutional Change to shepherd a process of increasing the diversity of students, faculty and curriculum. This highly visible, deliberate strategy of diversifying the institution distinguishes Lynchburg College from the other colleges considered in this report. The goal of diversifying the student population, faculty and academic curriculum affects the entire mission of Lynchburg College in ways that are not as clearly evident in other institutions.

It is clear that these institutions are familiar with the benefits and costs of change. Although each institution is steeped in tradition, efforts toward fundamental change have been completed in every case. Of particular importance is that four of the institutions have had direct experience in changing the composition of their student bodies. Thus, the possibility of change involving minority access and student diversity is not without precedent. Below, we present the current statements of goals and objectives for increasing minority student college access and representation within these colleges.

A Set of Shared Goals and Objectives Concerning Minority Students

In addition to the obvious characteristics and features described above, each of these institutions is involved in a process aimed at increasing the representation of minority students among college students in general and within their particular institutions. The colleges share a common belief that two general strategies must be used to achieve these aims. First, each believes that efforts must be made to increase the **pool** of minority students who are prepared for college, interested in attending and encouraged to apply. Second, they believe that minority students, once enrolled, must find an environment that is conducive to their retention and success.

As noted above, five of the six institutions have formed a consortium named Leadership South. The consortium is described as "a comprehensive effort to further the education of minority students at all junctures of the educational process — from primary school through graduate study." Three objectives have been set:

- "To improve the academic performance by pre-college public school minority students and prepare them for higher education;
- "To strengthen the retention, achievement and professional aspirations of minority students at the college level; and
- "To promote the recruitment and retention of minority faculty."

Each of the participating institutions is expected to devise its own programming and strategies to advance these objectives. Further, working cooperatively, the institutions expect to share actively information and resources on common issues, problems and solutions as they emerge.

Among the major anticipated initiatives that would be pursued in each institution are:

- Working with public, primary and secondary schools to improve student preparation through tutoring, faculty support, etc.;
- Improving secondary schools and experiences of students through on-campus summer enrichment programs;
- Increasing efforts to increase minority student recruitment and enrollment;
- Improving retention of minority college students by offering direct support to students and creating a climate for diversity on each campus; and
- Devising new strategies to identify, recruit and retain minority professionals as members of faculty and administration.

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

Although Lynchburg College is not a member of Leadership South, it holds a similar vision and set of objectives articulated for the college by its president. In 1987, President Rainsford initiated a project called Lynchburg College's Program for Institutional Change. The program, housed with the Office of the President, has two major objectives:

- To broaden the pool of minority students attracted into and capable of succeeding in higher education in general and Lynchburg College in particular.
- To make Lynchburg College become and be perceived to have become a more hospitable institution to a culturally diverse student body, faculty and staff.

The particular programmatic elements developed by this office and other departments of Lynchburg College mirror many of those anticipated by institutions of Leadership South. They include:

- The vigorous renewal of partnerships with two area elementary schools involving students, faculty and administrators working daily with staff and students in the two schools;
- An active outreach program to identify and recruit more minority students to consider Lynchburg College;
- A campus-wide initiative to explore and implement various strategies to diversity in all areas of campus life — leadership, curriculum and social activities; and
- An extensive campaign to recruit minority faculty and staff using a combination of temporary and permanent appointments.

It is clear that despite the institutional differences between the Leadership South colleges and Lynchburg College, their individual objectives concerning minority student access and success are very similar. However, there is a difference across the two sets of goals and objectives in

the manner in which they delineate the objectives held for minority students once they are enrolled. The goals and objectives of Leadership South emphasize "retention, achievement and professional aspirations." Lynchburg College seeks to address broad issues of campus diversity in a manner that extends beyond issues of retention.

In fact, each institution began this process in response to concerns about retention of minority students. However, their experiences and study of the issues involved soon expanded the area of concern to the broader issue of diversity. Each of the colleges has grappled with the difficulties of changing campus climate and culture as a means for improved minority student retention. However, as discussions and recommendations began to encompass broader institution-wide issues, the colleges often met with resistance from those who wondered how an apparently narrow discussion of minority student retention had been transformed into a discussion of fundamental campus-wide change.

The tension between a focus on retention and a focus on diversity is not trivial. In essence, an effort simply focused on improving minority student retention will likely have effects that are limited to minority students. In contrast, an effort consciously focused on a vision of increased campus diversity has the potential of transforming the educational experience for all, including both majority and minority students.

This report reflects the tension between these two interpretations of the vision behind the activities and efforts of these institutions concerning minority students. The tension is found within each institution — among its administration, its faculty, its students and its alumni. Each college is finding that it is difficult to separate minority retention issues from broad diversity issues. However, for the most part, the colleges have devised strategies that speak to a broader vision of diversity. This report uses this broader conception in its presentation and analyses.

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

A REFLECTION ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INCREASING THE POOL AND INCREASING CAMPUS DIVERSITY

There is also a need to clarify the relationship between the objectives of increasing the pool of minority students interested in and prepared for college **in general**, and the goal of increasing the representation of minority students within these particular institutions. In theory, these two goals are highly and obviously complementary. On the face of it, increasing the preparation of students — who, without extra support, preparation and encouragement, would not attend college — can, in the longer term, increase the diversity of the student population within any particular college. Further, better pre-collegiate preparation will improve the chances of collegiate success. However, it does not logically follow that increases in the pool of such students would necessarily guarantee their representation within the student population of any (or any six) collegiate institutions.

In reality, several practical considerations may essentially diminish the relationship between these two goals and may determine the **exact** college option an individual student might attend. Simply stated, episodic summer programs cannot fully control the college decision-making process for students. At best, such programs can help students recognize that college is an option and provide some motivation for attending the host college. One of the advantages of our nation's expansive educational system is that most qualified high school graduates have a range of collegiate options from which to choose. Most targeted summer programs, in fact, explicitly seek to expose participants to the range and type of postsecondary institutions available.

Further, increased national interest in increasing the representation of minority students in college has resulted in amplified efforts to recruit and enroll minority students in institutions that typically would not have been considered by the student. Consequently, the apparent link

between the goal to increase the pool of minority students eligible and the goal to increase minority student representation on selected campuses is, at best, tenuous. From our perspective, it is best to uncouple the two goals and the specific efforts designed to achieve them, since the strategies implied within each are sufficiently distinct to warrant separate treatment.

In preparing this report, we struggled with selecting an appropriate and accurate term for describing the students whom colleges wish to recruit, enroll and retain. As noted above, the national trend has been to use the inclusive term *minority* to include African American, Hispanic, Asian and other students. In fact, the six colleges included in this study state in their documents that the focus of their effort is to improve the chance that *minority* students will attend and succeed in college. At the same time, the reality is that the meaning of *minority* within the context of these institutions is almost exclusively used to describe African Americans. This reality was confirmed in conversations with administrators and staff who readily noted that when they said "minority" they meant African American students. It is also the case that the term *minority* is used within the states in which these institutions are located to refer almost exclusively to African Americans. While Hispanic, Asian and Native American students reside in these states, their representation among the overall population is relatively low. To more accurately reflect the reality of these programs and the students they serve, we have decided to use the term *African American* throughout the remainder of the report to describe the target population of the efforts in these colleges except in those instances where the term *minority* is clearly more appropriate.

REPORT ORGANIZATION

This report draws upon the experiences of administrators, program staff, faculty and college students across all six institutions to examine a set of strategies to increase the pool of college-eligible African American students and to

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

increase campus diversity within the institutions. It is important to note that the report does not include a separate evaluation or assessment of each institution's efforts or programs. Instead, it seeks to identify common themes and experiences that can help inform policy and programmatic discussions on these issues within the six institutions as well as the broader policy community.

Efforts designed to increase the pool of African American students prepared for college are assessed by comparing their models and implementation to a set of criterion benchmarks developed by The Center for Assessment and Policy Development in a study of similar student-focused programs throughout the nation. **Like most student-focused programs throughout the nation**, the three summer programs reviewed in this study are not of sufficient size or maturity to permit or warrant a quantitative analysis of program benefits on student performance and achievement. The most appropriate strategy for assessing them is to consider the degree to which their programmatic models include elements that are consonant with best practices for increasing African American student access to college and the degree to which these models are adequately implemented. Thus, the study assesses whether or not the programs are likely to produce the desired outcomes.

The data from this report was gathered over a series of in-person site visits between March and August 1992. Site visits included extended discussions with college presidents, deans, other administrative staff, faculty leaders and student leaders. In addition, each site visit included separate focused group discussions with African American and white students enrolled in the college concerning their experiences. Separate site visits were also conducted at four institutions during the summer to student programs directly funded by the Fund. These programs were Davidson's Love of Learning, University of the South's Sewanee Scholars, Washington and Lee University's FUTURES Program and Lynchburg College's

Summer Transition Program. Visits to the specific programs included direct observation of program activities (classes, presentations, special events), discussions with program staff (administrators, mentors and teachers) and discussions with participants.

The remainder of the report is organized as follows:

- Chapter II presents an assessment of the efforts within three colleges to increase the pool of students prepared for and interested in attending college. The chapter assesses these efforts against a set of operational principles developed in a national study of the efficacy of college/school partnerships.
- Chapter III explores the experience of minority students at these six colleges as expressed in the words of African American, white and international students. Drawing upon conversations with individuals and groups of students in each of the six campuses, the chapter considers issues of recruitment and enrollment, the day-to-day experiences of campus life and perceptions of students of college efforts and activities to increase diversity and encourage African American students to feel comfortable in the college setting.
- Chapter IV examines the range of institutional responses that have been developed and implemented on these campuses to increase African American student recruitment, enrollment and retention. It begins with a general discussion of the rationale for increased diversity on campuses and posits a set of dimensions that form a framework for assessing progress toward diversity. The various institutional approaches and strategies are then assessed in terms of their likely efficacy in achieving the goals of diversity.
- Finally, Chapter V reflects on the challenges and opportunities facing these six schools as they grapple with their missions and goals for improving access for African American

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

students and increasing diversity within their own collegiate communities.

II. PROGRAMS FOCUSED ON INCREASING THE POOL

This section briefly describes and reviews a set of student-focused college/school partnership programs that have been implemented on three of the six campuses. These initiatives are important within the current report for two reasons. First, they represent the major tangible strategy pursued within the institutions for increasing the overall pool of African American students who are prepared for and interested in entry to college. Second, these programs have received the greatest emphasis and investment of staff time and monetary resources of all the efforts aimed at increasing diversity on these campuses. To date, the bulk of funds to support these initiatives has come from non-collegiate sources including national and regional foundations and other supporters.

Since these programs are so young and so small, it is neither appropriate nor possible to undertake a statistical impact analysis in which experiences and outcomes of students participating in the programs are compared with a scientifically selected control group of students who did not participate. However, it is reasonable to ask the question, "What is the likely impact of these programs?" In order to do so, we address: Are the models as designed adequate to affect the desired outcomes? Are the programs implemented as they were designed? Given the answers to these questions, and the scope and scale of the efforts, we can discern what the likely impact would be, short of executing an impact analysis.

We begin this section of the report by outlining a framework against which the adequacy of the program models is assessed. This is followed by a brief overview of program objectives and individual program descriptions. Next, we assess the three programs together against six key areas we have determined to be essential in design and implementation of such initiatives.

Within each of these six areas we assess the adequacy of the model and adequacy of its implementation.

Our assessment of the adequacy of the program models is based on a set of operational principles or organizational decisions that serve as standards for determining the potential of college/school partnerships to succeed. These standards were drawn from conclusions of a national study of partnerships between colleges and schools designed to increase the access of minority students to postsecondary education (McMullan, et al, 1992).

From our perspective, the key operational issues to consider in designing such efforts are:

- **Selection of target** population, which refers to determining an appropriate level of selectivity in setting eligibility requirements.
- **Point of initial contact** with youth, which refers to the point in the educational process when students begin to participate in student-focused initiatives.
- **Nature of contact** with youth, the way in which program services are provided.
- **Nature of academic focus**, which refers to the level or nature of academic programming.
- **Service delivery plan**, a strategy for providing services and resources to participants over time.
- **Relationship to the regular educational system**, which refers to the connection between a student-focused program and the regular educational system in which participants are enrolled.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

Davidson College, University of the South and Washington and Lee University each offer college preparatory residential summer programming for public school African American students. These initiatives are partnerships

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

between each of the colleges and secondary schools or school districts. Since all three are quite similar in terms of model design, they will be discussed as a group. A detailed description of each program is presented in Appendix I.

In an effort to attain the overall goal of expanding the pool of underrepresented minorities, these student-focused initiatives have as objectives: to strengthen students' achievement; to prepare them for college preparatory high school coursework; and to motivate them to consider college.

One point of divergence between programs is that the Davidson and University of the South initiatives are intended to increase the pool of African American students prepared to attend any college; the Washington and Lee initiative seeks to prepare and recruit potential students for enrollment there.

Since the Davidson program served as the prototype for those on the other campuses, basic program components are similar across sites. Each is a residential program that includes: academic classes with a sequential curriculum designed to prepare students for the subsequent school year; monitoring of high school grades and other academic year follow-up activity; and personal development and leadership training.

Below we briefly describe the characteristics of each of the summer programs. The profiles include the dates when the programs began, the names of partnering schools or districts, the points at which they begin providing services to students, the duration and time schedule of summer activity and a description of any monetary incentives provided. In addition, we note participant numbers and eligibility requirements, sources of teachers and counselor/mentors, program duration and supplementary school year activity.

Davidson College: Love of Learning

Davidson's Love of Learning program has operated since 1987. It was designed in cooperation with the Charlotte-Mecklenburg school system. Each year 30 new applicants who are "rising" to the next grade level (9–12) are invited to participate in the four-week summer program with an intensive schedule of classes from 7:45 am to 8:30 pm, five days per week. Participating students receive a \$200 stipend to offset foregone summer job income. Participants return to the program each year through the summer before their senior year.

According to the Love of Learning design, participants' grades are to be monitored during the school year and activities for parental education and support are scheduled and implemented by program staff.

As of summer 1992, there were 98 participants. Davidson is the only program to have "graduated" a group of students. Twenty-six (of the original 29) members of this group have enrolled in college, including four at Davidson.

Love of Learning targets students who are academically "middle range" but might, absent intervention, fall through the cracks in the educational system. To assure heterogeneity, 20 of its 30 annual selections are in the middle range of students; five are selected from the top of their class; and five are selected from the bottom.

Teachers in the program are carefully selected from neighboring school districts. Mentors are Davidson students and include both African Americans and whites.

University of the South: Sewanee Summer Scholars Program

The Sewanee Summer Scholars Program (SSSP) was implemented in 1991 in cooperation with the Chattanooga City and Franklin County school system. Participants begin taking part in the summer after their ninth grade year and can

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

return to participate through the summer after eleventh grade. During 1991, 35 students (30 from Chattanooga; 5 from Franklin County) participated in SSSP. Thirty-five students are added each year until the desired number (approximately 105) is reached. Participants follow a rigorous and intensive four-week schedule of academic, physical and personal development classes that run from 8:00 am to 11:30 pm, Monday through Friday. Additional activities (camping, hiking, trips to amusement parks and ball games, etc.) are planned for weekends.

During the academic year, Sewanee operates a follow-up program that includes monitoring of grades during reporting periods. Provision of tutors (for students in Franklin County), parenting, leadership, career and monthly educational enhancement workshops, and social events are implemented by program staff at the university.

Students receive stipends of \$200 for the first summer, \$400 for the second summer, and \$600 for the third summer of attendance. The funds are to defray foregone summer job earnings. As of summer 1992, approximately 60 students were in attendance.

SSSP participants are selected first by school counselors/teachers, then screened by program staff. The program targets students who are not at the top of their classes but who are considered to have the potential (with intervention) to attend college.

Most teachers in the program are selected from among those in the two school districts. Personal development classes are taught by Sewanee staff. Mentors are African American and white Sewanee students. During their final summer of participation, students are to be taught by college faculty.

Washington and Lee: FUTURES

The FUTURES program at Washington and Lee is in its second year of implementation.

Washington and Lee identifies its FUTURES participants through the Fairfax County public school system's college/school partnership program. The initiative is intended to prepare and recruit students for admission into the university.

During the regular school year, participants receive: assistance in course selection; presentations on SAT preparation and time management; tutoring services (when needed); and books with which to create a home library. The program also holds activities in which parents receive information on financial aid, college admission, and social and academic life. Academic progress is monitored through the Fairfax County Partnership Program.

Program participation begins during the summer following 10th grade. Ten potential participants are selected each year from two categories of students: those who have a cumulative GPA of 2.9 or below but show high academic potential, and those who have a GPA of 3.0 or above but are still considered to be academically at-risk. During their final summer, FUTURES students will be invited to participate in the university's racially integrated four-week Summer Scholars program. Washington and Lee offers a 50 percent reduction in tuition and room and board to any program participant meeting the institution's admission requirements.

Ten rising juniors and eight rising seniors participated in the two-week program during summer 1992. Activities included academic and personal development classes, field trips and recreational activities that took place between 8:00 am and 9:00 pm, daily. There are no monetary incentives for participation in this program.

Faculty for the summer program are secondary school teachers from the surrounding school districts and from Fairfax County. Two African American Washington and Lee students (one male, one female) serve as counselor/mentors.

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

ASSESSMENT OF ADEQUACY OF MODELS AND MODEL IMPLEMENTATION**Selection of Target Population**

Nationally, college/school partnership programs differ in their selectivity. These efforts can be divided into three broad categories: highly selective, moderately selective, or low selectivity. These designations are important because when programs of this type target high achieving students, their efforts are directed toward students who are likely to have attended college in the absence of the program. When low achievers are targeted, programming needs to begin earlier in students' schooling (usually in middle school); the impact of their efforts can take longer to be realized. In addition, this latter choice generally requires significantly higher levels of funding than the other options.

The programs at Davidson, University of the South and Washington and Lee can be described as moderately selective. They have focused largely on students of average academic performance who have exhibited through test scores or some other means that they have higher academic potential.

The target population on which the initiatives have chosen to direct their progress appears to be adequate and appropriate to meet the goals and objectives they have set. They did not focus on students who were likely to attend college in the absence of the program or those who were performing so poorly that their chances of ever attending college were extremely remote.

By and large, the programs have managed to implement this aspect of their models as designed. They have carefully selected and continue to select students of moderate achievement levels to participate in their initiatives. They consistently encourage schools to send "average" students and to refer highly performing students to other initiatives.

To their credit, each of the programs has established additional selection criteria to ensure that other types of students who might benefit are not overlooked. Program staffs consider whether or not applicants with slightly above or below average grades and test scores are from single-parent homes; if they would be the first in their families to attend college; and other factors that may put the student at-risk academically. The focus on this target group increases the probability that these initiatives will reach students who would otherwise be unlikely to attend or consider attending college.

Point of Initial Contact

There are three general points at which most programs across the nation begin to offer services: at the middle school level, at the start of high school, or toward the end of high school. Interventions that begin working with students who are already in eleventh or twelfth grade risk having minimal effect on the pool of minority students, because such strategies often select students who are likely to be college bound or miss those students who have dropped out or began failing academically before the point of intervention. Beginning intervention at the start of high school helps programs reach students who are potentially at-risk before any academic problems become severe and cause them to drop out of school. From an operational standpoint, it is easier for programs to provide services to a group of students beginning high school than to attempt to deliver services to middle school students who are likely to be dispersed into different high schools through complicated feeder patterns.

The programs at Davidson and University of the South initiate contact with students during the ninth grade. The Washington and Lee program begins during the summer following tenth grade. We conclude that the Davidson and University of the South models begin serving students at an appropriate point, but the delayed starting point of the Washington and Lee model is less optimal. The later the point of intervention, the less likely a discernable impact will occur.

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

Each of the programs begin serving students as planned in their models; Davidson and University of the South have consistently admitted groups of students beginning the summer following ninth grade and Washington and Lee has admitted rising eleventh graders, as planned. Obviously, the two programs that have planned and implemented earlier contact have a greater likelihood of effectively providing exposure to the experiences, and facilitating development of skills, necessary to improve academically in high school and to apply, enroll and succeed in college.

Nature of Contact with Youth

The frequency, duration and continuity of providing services to youth is an important element in achieving benefits for students.

The most common strategies employed nationally in this area include: continuous, year-round programming; repeated, episodic events or activities; or a once-only intervention. The strategy selected for providing services to participants has important implications for how intensive the services are; how the program will deal with attrition; how those services will be coordinated; how closely they need to be linked with participants' schools; the range and depth of programming; and costs. Programs that are year-round in orientation and provide continuous contact with youth are most likely to produce benefits. While episodic programs are superior to one-time interventions, both must devise strategies for sustaining support to students during the regular school year to increase the likelihood of college attendance among participating students.

Contact with students in these three programs is episodic in nature with supplemental support provided outside of schools. Continuous year-round programs are not a possibility when the host college has no structural place within the institution (i.e., a college of education from which the program can provide ongoing services) and when the college is located at a great distance from students who are to be served in the

programs. Based on experiences of other college and universities across the nation, episodic programs may be the only approach for programming to be sustained in instances where students are drawn from multiple districts or schools or when the school system is not proximate to the college.

Davidson and University of the South each designed four-week residential summer programs. The Washington and Lee on-campus program is set at two weeks (except during the final summer when participants will attend a four-week, integrated campus experience in a different program). The supplemental programming these initiatives chose to offer as part of their models includes: monitoring of academic performance; parent (and to a lesser degree, teacher) involvement; and "as needed" services such as tutoring. The Davidson model added the hiring of staff to coordinate these services; the University of the South model includes monthly meetings with participants and their parents for a variety of academic and social activities. The Davidson and University of the South models can be described as adequate, but both could be enhanced by regular mentoring programs or weekend campus visits incorporated within either of their models.

The Washington and Lee model is less desirable for two reasons. First, the two-week duration for the centerpiece of the model (the summer residential program) is too short to accomplish the programs' stated goals. The second reason is related to the provision of supplementary programming. The university's partner (the Fairfax County School District) coordinates supplementary services at some distance from the campus. While the program director makes periodic trips to Fairfax schools each semester, she cannot individually reach each student during these visits. Such limited contact risks participant attrition from the program.⁴ The institution's use of the program as a recruitment tool makes such an addition to the model even more appropriate. Enhancing links between the college and students during the school year

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

would strengthen all programs, including Washington and Lee's Future Initiative.

Despite sharing a similar episodic approach, implementation of the models is uneven across programs.

- At Davidson, program staff requested from the administration, but have not received, funds allocated to hire staff to coordinate their efforts within students' schools; thus this aspect of their models was never implemented as planned. Because the program has had to depend on school staff to coordinate this activity without compensation, data collection has been problematic and tutoring services have not always reached students in a timely manner. Despite these serious problems in implementing this component, implementation of the rest of the model has occurred as planned.
- At University of the South, implementation of the model has been excellent. The summer program took place as planned. A member of the university staff identifies and works closely with the schools on the collection of academic achievement data and the provision of tutors when needed. Staff travel to Chattanooga monthly for meetings and social activities with students and their parents. They transport students from Franklin County as well to these meetings. In addition, students in this program receive a stipend that becomes larger with each summer's participation.
- Implementation of the Washington and Lee model has also been executed as planned. Students have a residential summer experience for the planned period of time and supplementary programming for students is coordinated and overseen by staff of the Fairfax County School District. Since the district office handles all supplementary programming for students in such partnerships, it is possible that this aspect of programming is more efficiently provided for these students than for students in either of the other two programs.

On this dimension of the nature of contact with youth, University of the South did well on both adequacy of the model and its implementation. The other two programs fell short, either in model design (Washington and Lee) or in implementation (Davidson). If these two programs are to have the desired impact, they will need to be strengthened in these areas.

Nature of Academic Focus

Programs generally select one of two options when deciding the academic focus of college/school partnership programs: college preparatory or remedial. Sometimes planners choose to offer a combination of the two. Determining the nature of the academic focus of programming depends on the type of information planners believe that students need and can master. For programs with a long-range goal of increasing the pool of college-going minority students, it is fitting that the academic focus of the programs is college preparatory rather than remedial.

Each of these initiatives has selected a college preparatory curriculum. This choice of approaches suggests that program planners believe that these students' prior education experiences have failed to emphasize critical thinking and exposure to an academic approach that stresses college preparation. In such case, a remedial focus would be inappropriate and less likely to prepare and motivate students to consider college attendance.

To ensure that the summer program curricula motivate and prepare participants for college, each of the initiatives provides classes that are preparatory for what students will study in the coming year. Thus, students preparing for tenth grade have biology, algebra and English II classes, those entering eleventh grade have chemistry, algebra II and English III, etc. Observation of the classes in these summer programs suggests that on each of the campuses the coursework was college preparatory in nature. In addition, when interviewed, students indicated that the classes

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

give them a "leg up" on their studies during the regular school year. The summer coursework in each initiative is among their strongest components and programs ought to be congratulated for their efforts in this area.

Service Delivery Plan

There are two major categories of service delivery plans for programs of this type: those that use the cohort approach of selecting a group of participants to provide a relatively constant set of services each year, and those that provide differing levels and types of support to participants based on individual needs or interests.⁵

A programmatic decision to use a cohort strategy for providing services to students over time means that once a group of students is identified, they are all provided with a standard set of services based on the number of years or cycles they have been in the program (i.e., all first-year participants have the same summer classes). The decision to use a cohort approach rather than a strategy of coordinating different levels of support to students based on their individual needs or interests has implications for the range of services that can be provided. A broad approach including divergent programmatic options for participants is only possible when a large urban university is located near a group of students in need of support. Only under these circumstances can such programs pursue a broad spectrum of services to youth.

It is doubtful that any approach other than a cohort strategy could have been effectively coordinated or implemented by the staffs of these initiatives. None of the colleges has a school of education; and in addition, an initiative devised to meet multiple sets of student needs and interests through varied programming would require more time, human resources and funding than these colleges could reasonably provide.

To date, programs have not experienced the typical problems sometimes found in cohort-based programs — uneven progress across students making service delivery difficult and increasing student attrition from the program. By and large, students in the program do not fall behind their peers in the initiative. Thus, initiatives have not had to adjust programming to accommodate different groups of students based on progress.

The programs used a multitude of strategies to retain students from year to year: increasing incentives; involvement of parents; exposure to cultural and social events not normally available to young urban students; and a school-year component. In general, programs tended to retain students from year to year. Only two or three students have left each of the programs.

Relationship with the Regular Educational System

In programs across the nation, the degree of linkage with the regular educational systems of program participants generally falls into two extremes: no contact with the school beyond participant recruitment; and close relationships with the school(s) including the provision of supplementary programming to extend regular school services. For students participating in these types of programs, a connection between the regular educational system and the program can mean: better coordination and coherence of activities, strategies and requirements; a reduced sense students may have of differing goals between the two; and an increased likelihood of sustained contact with participants.

It is fortuitous that each of the programs is related, in many ways, to students' regular schooling. Such links are the only way to ensure that participants are progressing satisfactorily; that they are enrolled in a college-preparatory curriculum; and that summer coursework is designed to prepare them adequately for what they will study during the upcoming school year. As noted above in the assessment of the nature of contact with youth, depth of involvement with

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

participants' schools or school districts has varied by program and is one of the areas in which some difficulty has been experienced.

The costs and time associated with the provision of supplementary services away from the campus can be prohibitive. In addition, negotiating school and school district bureaucracies from outside the system can be a formidable challenge. To the extent possible, given time, distance, costs and other factors, these programs appear to have done well in their linking efforts with their participants' schools. Improvements can be made in terms of monitoring of students' grades and provision of tutoring services (as noted earlier); programs are aware that these are important aspects of the services they offer and are attempting to correct existing problems. Thus, we conclude that while linkage between programs and the participants' schools could be stronger, by emphasizing a curriculum approach based on the students' next semester and the other services and monitoring that is done, these programs have made relatively strong progress in becoming integrated with the overall education of participants.

SUMMARY

The design and implementation of these programs appear to be appropriate in several areas and weaker in others. These three programs are comprehensive initiatives, each incorporating a range of components considered necessary for meaningful intervention.

Each of the programs has chosen to work with a moderately selective target population and both Davidson's Love of Learning and University of the South's Sewanee Summer Scholars have set the point of initial contact at what is probably the most appropriate point in students' school careers. The nature of contact, while adequate at Davidson and University of the South, is good but could be strengthened and augmented; and at Washington and Lee it is clearly less than adequate. All of the programs have properly chosen to pursue a college preparatory

academic focus and each has employed a cohort strategy buttressed by supplementary programming. The supplementary programming, however, should be strengthened in all three programs if students are to benefit. Finally, while each of the programs has some relationship to participants' regular educational systems, the strength of those relationships is primarily due to curricular content and less due to on-going linkages during the school year.

Across programs, implementation has generally followed the programs' models. However, implementation fell short with respect to nature of contact with youth. If the programs are to be continued, the models need to be strengthened; components designed to extend support services throughout the year need to be more adequately implemented.

Because staffs of these programs have made many of the decisions considered essential for likely success — starting early in high school years, providing a strong academic program, offering a model that brings participants back year after year — it is probable that they will make some positive difference in the lives of students who participate. Many students report that their regular school work has improved substantially since they have been participating in the programs. We conclude that the design and implementation of these initiatives have very strong points as well as areas that can and should be strengthened. The three programs offer a coherent set of elements that are delivered, with few exceptions, in a professional and solid manner. Given these qualities, we conclude that the students served through these programs probably benefit from their participation and likely receive the types of support, motivation and incentives that will influence their college-going behavior in the future.

III. EXPERIENCES OF AFRICAN AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

This chapter highlights several recurring themes that emerged in individual and roundtable

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

interviews with African American students enrolled in the six institutions. Generally, these students are doing quite well academically. In some instances, their academic performance as a group exceeds that of more traditional students on the campuses. Thus, dilemmas described by African American students are most often social in nature. While a few students across institutions indicate that they are comfortable both socially and academically on their respective campuses, this was not the prevailing African American student experience.

Although the transition to these campuses is easier for some students than for others, even those students whose high school backgrounds were similar to their campus experience come to feel ill-at-ease.

Most of these African American students chose the college they currently attend for one of two reasons: the attractiveness of the financial aid package or the small size of the campus. Some were seeking the comfort of a college climate that mirrored, as closely as possible, the racial and social atmosphere of the high school they attended.

For some, there is an initial level of comfort. Many students reported that initially they saw their college experience as "just like" the experience they had in high school. However, for some, after being on the campus for a period of time, many students found that it was not the same after all. Perhaps the difference is that they no longer go home each day to their families.

"I was used to integrated schools and neighborhoods, so at first I adjusted easily. Sophomore year was more difficult. I don't know why. I just feel more isolated. I'm active in extracurricular activities but something isn't complete. No one can quite relate to how it feels. I don't want to dump on white students and make them feel bad. It isn't their problem." [Washington and Lee]

"People here are very nice and open up. It's good that the school is not too big. . . . I can go directly to administrators and they talk to me. I'm not just a social security number." [Washington and Lee]

"High school was much like [this college]. A melting pot. I thought the adjustment would be easy. It's very homogeneous. It's not diverse. I dive in and whatever is down there I try to deal with it. It still feels strange to be the only minority in most of my classes." [Washington and Lee]

Parental expectations and a feeling of responsibility not to disappoint other African American students account for the determination of some African American students to endure despite circumstances that they find troubling.

While a small number of African American students voluntarily leave the institutions prior to completion of their degrees, most have elected to remain and succeed. Many have accepted the view that they must sacrifice college social experiences usually taken for granted in order to take advantage of what they consider to be superior academic preparation. Others question whether they made the best college choice; however, most of these students choose not to transfer elsewhere.

Some African American students are motivated to persist by the pride and high expectations their parents have expressed. One student noted:

"My parents think I'm God because I'm here and graduating. It means a lot [first generation to attend college]. That thought makes me get up and go to class." [Lynchburg]

Others express a concern that leaving the institution will send a signal to majority students and college officials that minorities are unable to handle the rigor of the academic experience on that campus. These students believe that such a

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

signal would affect how other African American students are viewed.

"We're caught in the middle. Blacks wonder why you're here. Whites don't really accept you. You're in the middle. There's a lot of pressure. It affects academics. If you do badly, you've let everyone down. They see you as having been let in with low grades though it's not true." [Washington and Lee]

"It's a different issue for whites. We can't fail; they can get a 'c' and be fine. Some white girls come here for an MRS. degree. They know they'll have a job." [Furman]

Black students feel isolated because: there is often no African American community near the campuses; few African Americans are on faculty or staff; and there is little campus social activity in which they can comfortably participate. They see themselves as both invisible and hypervisible members of the student body.

The racial homogeneity of these campuses, along with the geographical locations of those where there is no African American population or cultural activity, leave African American students with a strong sense of aloneness. This problem is exacerbated by the paucity of African American faculty, staff or other role models employed on campuses.

On each campus, a few African American students hold campus positions in student government or as resident assistants in dormitories. However, most African American student voices are muted. This is due, in part, to the control that Greek letter and other social organizations of majority students exercise over the campus social sphere. Only a few African American students across all of the campuses hold membership in these organizations. Those who join tend most often to be those whom students are least likely to identify as typical African American students.

Due to the small numbers of African American students, it is not unusual for many majority students to have had no African American classmates. However, the novelty of their presence also makes them the object of curiosity and, in some instances, disdain.

Students' comments included:

"This was an intensive culture shock. I feel out of place. You can't relate to them [affluent white students] on any level. It's a very different lifestyle." [Furman]

"Some students aren't here to learn at all. Some just laugh at Black History Month." [Lynchburg]

"My mother had heard good things about this college and encouraged me to come. My father thought I wouldn't enjoy myself. He felt it would be an emotional struggle. He was right." [Furman]

"I think it's the university policy to push minority students together. That's okay in the short-term but it creates a sense of 'us' versus 'them'." [University of the South]

"The problem is not academic. It's a social problem. Things are closed to certain people. If you're not from a certain environment and background, there's nothing else." [Furman]

African American students seldom elect to participate in social activities sponsored by white campus organizations. Many have attended such activities but were put off by the focus on alcohol consumption or the feeling that they were not wanted. The problem of drinking as the basis for socializing was heard from students on five of the six campuses. On the sixth campus, stringent policies against alcohol use by students are rigorously enforced.

Students noted:

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

"When we say 'party' we mean dance, when they say 'party' they mean get drunk." [Davidson]

"If you're not used to the liquor at the parties, it's a shock. All they do is drink and watch TV — beer tossing. I don't want to feel that I've given up a part of myself to have fun and belong." [Washington and Lee]

"Thursday to Saturday drinking is the biggest social activity on this campus." [Lynchburg]

On campuses where most African American male students were recruited as athletes, African American females feel especially isolated. Black athletes are generally the most socially accepted group of African American students in these schools. Usually, no comparable strategy exists for integrating African American females into the campus community.

The assumption by some majority students that the presence of minorities on campus reflects a lowering of academic standards is offensive to African American students.

The assumption that their enrollment at a selective college is necessarily the result of Affirmative Action or that all African American students are academically underprepared elicits exasperation and anger from African American students. Even when they excel in their college studies, they are sometimes met with shows of disbelief on the part of majority students or faculty. They find the concept that by being academically able they are exceptions among people of color is particularly disconcerting.

"Having to defend Affirmative Action is defending yourself. It's the only thing your opinion is sought on." [Furman]

"When I got into the [very visible honors group] I was really pleased. That is until I got looks from faculty and white students who didn't seem to believe I

earned it. It makes me so angry." [University of the South]

"It's not like what I thought. To have to prove yourself over and over again. When they see us they think, 'you're here because of a quota.' When they see Asian students they think, 'you're here because you're smart.'" [Furman]

Being seen as a monolithic group is troublesome for African American students. They take exception to the notion that there is no heterogeneity within their group.

This concern is best illustrated by institutional responses to requests from African American students to establish chapters of historically black Greek letter organizations on the campuses. On almost every campus, there was an initial reluctance by administrators to consider such a move. However, once the histories and missions of the groups were investigated and found to be service-and academics-oriented, administrators conceded (though often reluctantly) to allow one such organization to exist on campus.

While African American students are pleased to have an opportunity to have a black fraternity, they note that each of the organizations differs in the type of students they normally attract.

Some African Americans, as in any other racial group, are more comfortable working with other students who share their interests and personality type. The assumption that one organization will be enough for all African Americans does not take into consideration the fact that they are not necessarily a homogeneous group. From their perspective, the preponderance of white fraternities and sororities suggests that either campus officials are biased against them or that they fail to comprehend the need of African American students to exercise the same social affiliation options as other students.

"Black students here are very diverse in ideas and goals." [Washington and Lee]

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

"Everyone doesn't want to be in the same fraternity. Small numbers [of blacks] mean forcing a fit. All of us don't have something in common." [Furman]

"They think we want to separate ourselves. The black fraternity issue is seen as forming another country; a separatist movement. Yet they expect that we come to them; that we make the effort." [Rhodes]

"I think the college believes that if we keep us together that solidarity will just occur naturally but everyone is very different." [University of the South]

However, the administrative decision to allow only one black Greek organization is also influenced by several other factors. First, the national chapters of these organizations require minimum numbers of interested students to qualify before permitting a chapter to be established — many of these campuses lack the critical mass required to support more than one organization. Second, and perhaps the most frequently heard argument against the presence of African American organizations, is that they will further isolate African American students. Third, majority students sometimes see campus acceptance of anything directed to African American students as examples of "political correctness." Further, alumni or other constituencies who may wish to see the institutions remain as they have been, may respond with greater resistance to change.

In addition, there is a problem at some of the campuses that had cut formal links with national fraternities and sororities years ago. On these campuses, all such groups are now local service organizations. To allow nationally affiliated black groups on the campus could cause considerable white student backlash. Administrators expressed concern and reluctance about reestablishing charters with national fraternities and sororities that had been severed in the past. However, they recognized that if they demurred, white students and alumni would be upset.

Positive relations with faculty emerges as one of the most encouraging experiences of African American students on small predominantly white campuses.

On each campus, interaction with faculty, and their encouragement and high expectations for African American students, was identified as the greatest or most beneficial aspect of the college experience.

"Faculty have a pretty good attitude. Students have bad attitudes. I don't feel like part of the student body. I don't feel welcome." [Furman]

"Professors go out of the way. They encourage you. It's not degrading attention. They see potential and it helps with self-esteem. Students are cordial but you can't tell whether they're sincere." [Davidson]

"Some black students are from public schools and doubt whether they're as smart as those who are from private prep schools. Those who are successful have formed close ties with faculty. Faculty want to broaden the curriculum but there's a [white] Student outcry not to." [Washington and Lee]

"I've always had great experiences with faculty: they all teach well; they give you their home numbers; and they're willing to work with you after class." [Lynchburg]

"Professors take note of the fact that you are black and intelligent. It's in the way you respect yourself and in how they address you." [Lynchburg]

However, despite the well-intentioned efforts of most faculty, some have been slow to adjust to teaching an increasingly multi-cultural student body. In these classes African American students are offended that coursework is presented from a totally Eurocentric perspective or that they are expected to be willing and able to speak for all minorities (or even all African Americans).

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

"Faculty have good intentions but they're not prepared for the repercussions of change. They don't want to let up on that white male perspective in the classroom. It's one of the most upsetting things. Sitting in a classroom listening to misperceptions and bullshit. One student who spoke up about it is now gone." [University of the South]

"One faculty member described a year in the life of black students at [this college] for minority weekend. It wasn't real." [Furman]

The emphasis by these colleges on "tradition" and "heritage" translates into an emphasis on racism from African American students' perspective.

Each of the colleges places a great value on its Southern heritage and traditions. Unfortunately for African American students, this often implicitly (and sometimes quite explicitly) excludes African Americans while the institutions celebrate eras, events and heroes that are antithetical to these students' heritage. The symbols and images that serve to remind are integral parts of the institutional environment: the Rebel flag, photographs and statues of Confederate soldiers in administrative offices and on the grounds, a campus-wide dress ball with an antebellum theme, etc.

"When I found out that the ball had a Confederate theme, I thought, 'what am I supposed to wear, a scarf and an apron?'" [Washington and Lee]

"You can't get away from the school's history and traditions. I think that few white students may be quick to pick up minority causes." [University of the South]

"Robert E. Lee is the patron saint here. The Confederate flag is the emblem of a fraternity started by Lee. I have friends in the group but you have to doubt their sincerity." [Washington and Lee]

"The [white fraternity]'s Confederate flag is seen as insensitive but they're displaying part of their heritage. It's racist. They make it convenient for them and they don't care how we feel." [Furman]

"I got a good impression of [this college] when I came to visit. I'm not sure if it was the **right** impression. I didn't know what daily life would be like. I still like the classes and professors, but the good ole' boys, Confederate flags, conservatism. . . . I didn't know. Bush and Reagan are gods on this campus." [Washington and Lee]

Understandably, these students find it difficult to believe that the new focus on racial diversity is a true priority on their campus. This perception is strengthened by resistance to inclusion of the works of blacks or black history into the curriculum. One campus official explained:

"The curriculum is very traditional. We look for good quality writing. So much of the good writing is by white males that it would mean bumping some of them." [Rhodes]

Other administrative explanations included a lack of teachers qualified to teach anything from a black perspective and the need to keep to the "Canon."

While African American students are pleased to know that their college has identified diversity as an area of emphasis, many doubt that the present levels of commitment to diversity will be enough to result in real change.

African American students cite several examples of what they see as a lack of commitment to true diversity on their campuses. Among these is the expectation that they must totally assimilate and cease to socialize among themselves to be successful on campus.

African American students also note that there is an expectation that it is they who must make all

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

of the effort to become fully accepted members of the student body. This is troublesome in that they have no control over the existing social climate.

"You have to relate to them [white students]. They don't want to relate to us. I tried to relate but was rejected."
[Furman]

". . . some blacks fully assimilate. They disassociate themselves from other blacks." [Washington and Lee]

"If you try to relate and become an integral part [of the student body], you're rejected unless it's on their terms. Assimilate or nothing." [Furman]

"We've been trying to get a black fraternity started but it's taken a long time. Some people say it will separate black students from white students but they still don't want us in their fraternity."
[Lynchburg]

"They reward you for assimilating."
[Furman]

In fact, even on campuses where students in white organizations have tables assigned and sit together in dining halls, African American students who sit together are seen as separatists.

Nonetheless, some African American students continue to be very tolerant of majority students who have been insensitive or intolerant. They want to fit in but find it stressful to have to educate other students on African American issues while at the same time bearing the blame for not being accepted.

"They're not to blame, that's what they were taught. You have to be tolerant."
[Lynchburg]

"A few people have never seen a black person. You have to be strong and realize that some people just don't know. You have to inform them."
[Rhodes]

What African American students may not have considered is that majority students also have a need to fit in with their group. If conservatism is the norm, then they, too, become conservative. Some African American students observed:

"White students are carbon copies. They're like replaceable members of a set." [Rhodes]

"It's like white students who come here go through a big cloning machine."
[Washington and Lee]

"It's an insincere, superficial kind of friendly. Tolerance on a superficial level. I'm not sure the powers that be want change." [Washington and Lee]

It appears that these students see whites as a homogeneous group in much the same way as they feel they are seen. It is interesting to note that a white campus official made a similar observation about the homogeneity of white students on his campus.

Hesitancy to discuss issues of race and ethnicity in an open forum is also seen as a lack of commitment to diversity:

"Everyone knows how bad it is, but no one wants to talk. Administration pays lip service but it doesn't follow through."
[Furman]

"This school is apolitical. Just like there was no coverage of the L.A. riots in the student newspaper, if you bring it (i.e., something to do with your ethnicity) up, they don't want to hear it and you're marked for life." [Washington and Lee]

"When they have racism/sexism forums, only sexism is discussed." [Furman]

Another administrator noted:

"Civility and politeness [on the part of white students] masks their true feelings, but that's not to say that racism isn't under it. The veneer is very thin in some cases." [University of the South]

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)**SUMMARY**

As we reflected on the comments of African American students on these campuses, we were struck by the similarities between their observations and those of women reported in the seminal research of Rosabeth Moss Kanter on "token" women in a male-dominated workplace.

Kanter's discussion focuses on the importance of proportion (relative size) in understanding interactions in groups composed of people of different cultural categories or statuses. A clearer understanding of these issues could serve as an important step in effectively addressing them.

According to Kanter, the numerically dominant group controls the group and its culture. Under these circumstances, the smaller groups are most often treated as representatives of their category or symbols rather than as individuals. Two conditions can heighten these effects: the visibility of the minority group's social category (in Kanter's research, women; in our study, race); and whether or not their social type is rare or new to the setting. On the campuses of the six colleges, both conditions apply.

Kanter identifies three perceptual phenomena associated with proportional rarity: visibility, polarization and assimilation. She describes performance pressures including feelings of over-observation, carrying the burden of representing their category by all of their actions, having to work twice as hard to prove their competence and fear of retaliation for out-performing members of the dominant group. Many of these phenomena closely match the comments of African American students on the six campuses. For example, the perception of being hypervisible described by some African American students and performance pressures referred to by others parallels Kanter's description of women's perceptions in predominantly male work settings.

Without question, more effective strategies must be employed by institutions taking the

diversification of their campuses seriously. The one area in which these institutions have successfully given comfort to African American students is in faculty interaction. In that faculty and administration set the tone for how seriously any campus initiative will be taken, it would seem that this is the strength on which improvement might most effectively be built.

One of the more successful strategies being implemented nationally is faculty incentives to infuse multi-cultural works, issues and history into the curriculum. On these campuses, foundation funds were obtained to support grants to faculty submitting workable proposals on how this might best be done in their particular discipline.

Another strategy might be to de-emphasize the potential benefits to African Americans and emphasize the importance of all students graduating from elite institutions to be well-rounded in their knowledge base — including having a strengthened understanding of populations soon to constitute one third of the American population. Early in their college careers, all students on these campuses should take part in structured sessions that help them understand their part in living in a multi-cultural society. Marginalized or ghettoized solutions will add to the sense of isolation felt by African American students and heighten the view by majority students that they are outsiders.

The issue of heritage and tradition is likely to remain "sticky" since it would be unrealistic to expect these institutions will disavow the history out of which they grew. However, it may become necessary to accept that celebration of this heritage must be balanced by celebration of other cultures and traditions and by effectively communicating how and why some practices may be offensive to African American and other minority students. Failure to do so may result in declining African American enrollments and continued discomfort for those who enroll and attempt to persist.

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)**IV. EFFORTS TO INCREASE DIVERSITY ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES**

In the last chapter, the voices of students eloquently portrayed the challenges faced by African American students enrolled in these six institutions. This chapter examines the efforts on and across these campuses to address some of the concerns and issues that these students have raised. In essence, this is a chapter about efforts to increase racial and ethnic diversity on these campuses.

The chapter begins by reviewing some reasons and rationales advanced within these institutions for pursuing greater diversity. It subsequently advances a series of propositions that begin to clarify the meaning of achievement of diversity. These propositions about diversity are not limited to their potential effect on African American students but have substantial implications for the entire college. The chapter examines the institutional responses and strategies to affect diversity in these institutions and assesses how the strategies have advanced the goal of diversity on the campuses.

THE RATIONALE FOR DIVERSITY

One of the major goals of the six institutions and of the Jessie Ball duPont Fund is to increase the diversity of student and faculty of these institutions. The interest in diversity among these institutions stems from several pragmatic factors:

- First, the six institutions have accepted a responsibility for broadening the opportunities for African American and other underrepresented groups to benefit from the academic program available at these schools. In some institutions the concern over African American representation is premised on ethical and moral expectations that their institutions must serve effectively all students. In other institutions, limited student diversity has become a source of embarrassment or criticism by potential funders, current and prospective students and alumni.

- Second, the colleges recognize that their unique position as the educators of the leaders of the South will be diminished as more and more African Americans assume leadership positions as elected and appointed officials and private sector managers without passing through the academic, cultural and training provided in these schools. Thus, if these schools seek to retain their role in educating leaders they must become more inclusive to ensure that emergent leadership from all segments of the South enroll.
- Third, as part of their self-selected mandate for educating leaders, several institutions are beginning to recognize that they have a complementary responsibility to prepare their non-minority students for leadership and citizenship in multi-racial, multi-cultural political and economic settings. That is, some schools recognize that an integral part of their training and preparing of all leaders assumes that their education reflects the diversity of the world in which their graduates will exist after graduation. Hence, increased diversity is not simply a goodwill gesture to correct for past exclusion and discrimination but rather is in the best interest of the overall educational mission of the institutions.

In response to these objectives and challenges, the six institutions have devised and implemented a series of strategies for addressing the concerns for diversity in their schools. Their responses can be appropriately categorized into two types — efforts to increase African American applications and enrollments; and a broader set of efforts to retain African American students through direct support and improved campus climate.

ON THE MEANING OF DIVERSITY

It would be convenient to assume that a call for diversity has a shared frame of reference among everyone on these campuses. However, such an assumption is unrealistic. There is strong evidence that various constituencies and individuals on campuses have different

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

expectations and have set distinct parameters of the scope and scale of a movement toward diversity.

What do we mean by increased diversity on campus? This question is a major issue both for the schools included in this study as well as for this report. The dimensions of diversity range broadly. In our conversations with campus officials and students, the assumed discussion of diversity centered around the inclusion of more African American students and issues in campus life. However, it is equally clear that on many campuses the meaning of student population homogeneity extended far beyond race. For example, when pressed on the issue of current diversity, many administrators felt compelled to tell us that their college had made inroads in recent years in attracting students from non-Southern states, from public schools, with various religious affiliations, from lower-middle class families, and even with different political party affiliations or affinities.

African American students as well as faculty and administrators noted that white students as a group were more alike than not. Most shared a common set of experiences and life outlooks that went far behind being white. One group of African American students contended that there was more apparent diversity among the small contingent of black students on campus than there was among their white peers.

We also recognize that unlike many other concepts or objectives, a movement toward diversity, especially focused around the dimension of race and ethnicity, is not universally regarded as a necessary, or even preferred, ideal. For example, efforts toward multi-culturalism have been assailed in many quarters of the nation on the grounds that it would reduce academic standards or was simply pandering to misplaced emphasis on so-called "political correctness." Such objections were repeated directly and indirectly in our visits to these campuses.

It is important to recognize that even pragmatic reasons for increasing diversity still are based, in

great part, on a moral assumption that any student — minority or non-minority, male or female, religious or not — should have the opportunity for and access to an educational experience of choice and that this opportunity includes providing the student with the means and support to be personally and psychologically comfortable and successful.

Based on our interpretation of the goals and objectives of Leadership South institutions and Lynchburg College, our conversations with administrators, faculty and students in each institution and our own understanding of these issues, institutions begin to make progress toward diversity when students of any background:

- can identify others who share similar life experiences and outlooks;
- are not powerless simply because they are a member of a such a small group at the institution;
- are not singled out as a token or an example based on their inclusion in a particular group;
- are not expected to serve as a spokesperson or act as model for all issues, questions and concerns of their group;
- can interact and intermingle with members of other groups without actively or passively denying their membership in their own group;
- can feel comfortable in educational and social settings of the campus without regard for their race or ethnicity;
- find among the leaders at their institutions — administrators, faculty and other students — individuals who are members of their group and others who share their interests and ideals; and
- find materials and discussions in their formal and informal education at the college that are inclusive and accurate reflections of the experiences, history, philosophy and literature

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

of their group and their contributions to the advancement and discourse of the discipline.

It is within this framework that we consider the issue of diversity in the colleges included in this study. Recognizing that it is unlikely that each of these dimensions have been achieved, we consider the accomplishments to date and the strategies set in place to make additional progress. These dimensions are not *absolutes* but serve as guideposts to help us mark the changes that have occurred and the challenges that lie ahead.

CAMPUS-BASED STRATEGIES TO INCREASE DIVERSITY

The remainder of this chapter examines a variety of initiatives, strategies and factors across the six campuses that affect the achievement of diversity on these campuses. In reviewing these efforts, one must recognize that no single, simple effort can increase the number of enrolled African American students or improve African American student retention in college. Rather, a sustained, multi-pronged strategy will be needed.

The chapter reviews efforts in two key areas:

- Recruitment and admission of African American students; and
- Retention activities and other administrative steps to address the needs and concerns of African American students.

Within each area, we discuss the particular strategy and then assess its likelihood of improving campus diversity. We then examine some key issues of implementation and offer recommendations for possible refinements in the strategies.

Efforts to Increase Numerical Diversity

The six institutions all have low enrollments of African American students. Although each

college has experienced some increases in African American student enrollment, enrollment gains have been relatively modest. Several factors and expectations condition efforts to increase the number of African American students on these campuses.

First, without exception, when considering increasing the diversity of the student population the majority of administrators on each campus explicitly acknowledge that their efforts are aimed at attracting more African American students. Citing the large percentage of African American children in their states, administrators say that their first objective in increasing minority student representation in the student body must be concerned with African Americans. While they do not exclude efforts that also attract Asian, Hispanic and international students, their primary objective is to secure higher African American enrollments.

Second, staff at each of these colleges acknowledge that the focus on bringing more African American students to their campuses **is not new**. Each college had some experience in the 1960s and subsequent decades in seeking to attract African American students. However, within each institution, these efforts are regarded as inadequate and possibly damaging. Specifically, administrators note the higher attrition of African American students and the continued bitterness of the few graduates who persisted. The overall sense is that prior efforts were more concerned with counting African American students rather than serving them effectively. Administrators rue the outcome of these early efforts noting that their legacy includes two perceptual barriers that are difficult to overcome. For some faculty, administrators, students and alumni, the earlier experiences suggest that African American students **could not succeed** at these institutions. For them, the early experiments proved that the academic programs at these schools exceeded the abilities and aspirations of African American students who enrolled. The second damaging legacy — held by African American students and families, alumni, secondary school counselors,

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

and some faculty and administrators — is that these institutions are not sufficiently responsive and interested in permitting African American students to succeed.

As a consequence of these earlier experiences and perceptions, each of the schools has taken great pains to ensure that in attracting African American students, admissions standards are not modified nor is it perceived that they have been. Thus, the third factor that conditions efforts to increase African American enrollment at these institutions is that only students whose secondary school performance and achievement tests closely mirror those of their majority peers are likely recruitment targets.

In fact, in several schools, a strong effort is placed on recruiting African American students whose educational **experiences** are similar to those of white students (i.e., attending a private prep school or well-supported suburban school), or African American students who attended primarily white schools. Such a strategy may possibly be efficient in terms of "yield" of potential college applicants per recruiting visit. However, in reality, the consequence is that recruiters from these schools find themselves in direct competition with other schools over the same students while ignoring the pool of potential African American applicants who attend urban or less prestigious secondary schools.

At the same time, each of the colleges makes a substantial effort to bolster the chances that targeted African American students apply, are accepted and ultimately enroll in the school. However, concerns about traditional (white) student, parental and alumni perceptions of partiality mean that many of these efforts are relatively low-key and not public.

Across the six schools, a similar set of strategies have been pursued to increase the number of enrolling African American students. The admissions offices within the schools have used a typical array of tools to identify, recruit and convince African American students to consider applying and, ultimately, enroll:

- Pre-identification of likely African American students gleaned from standardized test results;
- Development of brochures and recruitment materials specially prepared to attract African American students;
- Targeted mailing to likely student applicants;
- Participation in college fairs especially in areas with high concentrations of African American students;
- Use of the college's African American administrators and students as recruiters in selected communities and schools;
- Invitations to introductory weekend events designed to permit prospective students to meet faculty and other students. In several instances, the cost of travel to these events is borne by the institutions;
- Careful consideration of financial aid packages to maximize the award offered while minimizing expected direct family contribution or loan requirements; and
- Continuing contact with prospective students by current African American students and admissions staff even after students have indicated their intention to attend the school.

Each of these efforts has been refined and improved over the past several years. Those judged to be most effective — pre-identifying likely candidates, targeted recruitment materials, recruitment weekends and use of current African American students — have been expanded. Several including participation in college fairs and visits to schools have been reduced because admissions staff believe that the results are not sufficiently promising.

Discussions with admissions staff reveal a range of frustrations with the current process and its outcomes. Staff in each institution reported that recognition or awareness of their school among African American families, teachers, students

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

and communities was not very high. Several schools had data about name recognition at the national and regional level. These data revealed that a strong regional reputation did not translate into equivalent recognition among African Americans. These findings were confirmed anecdotally among many current African American students who told us that they had not heard of their college before being directly approached by the school as a result of strong scores on standardized tests or through a recruiter who badgered them into taking recruitment materials at a college fair.

The second frustration among many admission staff was the realization that key gate-keepers in some schools serving potential African American students were dissuading them from applying. Admissions staff and students agreed that many high school counselors had placed barriers before African American students interested in applying. From the perspective of admissions staff and students, some counselors simply had no information about these institutions; others, citing the low percentages of African American students enrolled, sought to convince these students that these institutions were unreceptive to African American students. Finally, some counselors actively discouraged students from applying because they believed that the students could not compete academically at the college level. Students at each school told us that it was the efforts and encouragement of a family member or a particular teacher that ultimately ensured that they enrolled in one of these institutions. There was near universal agreement that high school counselors were unhelpful at best or actual barriers to enrollment. The consistency of responses about the role of counselors in the circumstances of African American students points to a significant challenge facing these schools as they seek to attract more African American students.

A third source of frustration, not unique to these six schools, is the sense that each is competing with numerous other similar institutions for exactly the same African American students. As one admissions officer put it, "Sometimes we

win; sometimes we don't." Admissions officers acknowledge that competition should be expected but complain that several circumstances place them at a disadvantage. Given the schools' relatively high selection criteria and norms for admission, many schools find themselves in direct competition with Ivy League schools, other well-endowed private liberal arts colleges, selective historically black institutions and some state universities with national stature. Further, virtually each admissions officer could cite a particular instance where an African American student who had accepted admission had been lured away at the last moment to another institution by the promise of a better financial aid offer. Several institutions additionally cited the recent award by the Duke Endowment to Duke University earmarked for African American student recruitment. From the perspective of these admissions office staff, Duke University had been given an almost overwhelming advantage in recruiting African American students in the southeast and elsewhere.

Admissions office staff cited considerable pressure from the administration to produce more African American students but bemoaned the dilemmas they faced. They note that the "yield" of actually enrolling students from among all students accepted was the same or higher for African American students. That is, African American students who had been accepted were more or as likely to enroll in the school as white students. In addition, admissions staff noted that their application review process resulted in offers of admission to African American students at the same or better rates as those to white students. Thus, they argued, African American applicants were as likely to be admitted as were white students.

From the perspective of admissions staff, the fundamental impediment to increased African American student enrollment was the submission of applications. Most admissions staff conceded that they had been stymied in the efforts to increase substantially the number of applications received from African American

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

students. Citing the reasons described above — low name recognition, interference by or lack of support from key secondary school gatekeepers and an overall apparent disinterest among African American students in considering their schools—many admissions staff were discouraged by their lack of progress in this area and at a loss to conceptualize other strategies.

Recruitment and admissions of African American students is central to the ability of these institutions to begin to address diversity issues. Administrators, faculty and students alike spoke of the need for sufficient numbers of African American students to "feel comfortable." While administrators were hesitant to offer a specific goal for their campus, most expressed their desire for a level that ensured that when an African American student enrolled in a class that he or she could reasonably expect (and find) two or three other African American students enrolled in the same class. African American students offered a similar hope that they could expect in most of their classes to find another African American student enrolled.

It is interesting to work out the arithmetic of such a goal and understand its implications for recruitment. For example, consider a campus of 1,500 students in which the normal course load of five courses per semester and average class size of 25 students. In order to ensure that an African American student met at least two other African American students in four of his or her five classes, there would need to be at least 180 to 200 African American students enrolled in the school. In order for the African American student to be enrolled with three other African American students, the minimum African American enrollment would need to be 300, or 20 percent of the total student body.

Certainly, no institution has met its explicit or implied goal for recruitment of African American students. As noted above, the institutions' admissions office have used an array of strategies for identifying, recruiting and attracting African American students. Neither the process of college acceptance nor enrollment among

those admitted appear to be the root of the problem. Acceptance rates and enrollment yield rates among African American students are comparable to those of white students. While it might be possible to increase the acceptance rates and enrollment yield, it does not appear that such efforts will result in appreciable improvements in the total enrollment of African American students. Without question, the root of the problem is found within the low level of applications submitted by African American students. The challenge, as any admissions staff member would report, is to generate interest and action among potential African American applicants.

Three areas of the recruitment process must be re-examined:

- The reliance on traditional sources of white students — private schools, residential prep schools, strong suburban public schools — as a source **also** of African American students restricts the recruitment effort substantially in two ways. First, African American students in such settings are a focus of major competition by many institutions, many of which are in a more advantaged position for recruiting African American students. Second, the number of African American students served in these specific secondary schools is simply too low to expect an increased number (yield) of students to enroll in any these institutions.

While concern about recruiting and attracting students who are prepared educationally and socially for a collegiate experience in a predominantly white setting is an important issue, we must caution that such a concern must not be used as a reason to limit the "hands-on" search for qualified African American students.

One possible strategy might be to identify the postsecondary institutions that are producing more than a handful of African American students named on the College Board/ETS generated lists of high scoring students. Instead of simply targeting the students on the list, the recruiting effort might be focused as well on the

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

school itself as a potential source of future applicants.

- The lack of a strong and positive institutional presence within the African American community presents a difficult challenge to these institutions. Colleges should seek ways to use the experiences of current African American students to establish a positive reputation within the students' home communities. For example, the achievements and experiences of African American students enrolled in each college should be broadly communicated to the African American communities — local African American organizations, churches, neighborhoods and media — of these students. Emphasis should be on the accomplishments of the students and the role that the collegiate institution played in helping the student realize his or her dreams. Similarly, letters detailing a particular student's achievements should be sent to the student's high school. Such letters should not simply be sent to the counseling office but to the student's teachers and principal. Students consistently told us that individual teachers and staff were instrumental in convincing them or encouraging them to attend these institutions. The six colleges should capitalize on this resource.
- The varying role of gatekeepers who advise African American students on college-going is also a problem. The role of high school college guidance is a major dilemma for colleges in general and these six colleges, in particular. A detailed discussion of college guidance is outside the scope of this report. However, reports by students and admissions staff alike confirm that the state of college counseling is generally poor and likely counterproductive, especially as it pertains to African American or minority students. Although there are exceptions in which college counselors play an instrumental role in encouraging African American students to attend college, the prevailing sense among students and admission staff is that counselors are not effectively assisting African

American students to enter college. Students and admission staff identified four distinct trends that combine to reduce the likelihood that African American students would attend these six institutions:

- First, many high school counselors are either so overwhelmed by workloads or fundamentally ignorant about the differences and benefits of more than a few institutions that they cannot offer effective guidance and support.
- Second, some high school counselors simply believe that African American students are neither qualified for college nor deserve to attend, and encourage even highly achieving students to enter the labor force or "try out" college on a part-time basis at a local community college.
- Third, some high school counselors actively seek to protect African American students from failure and dissuade students from applying to schools with difficult admissions standards and performance expectations.
- Finally, some strong counselors, when confronted with the current enrollment levels of African American students on these six campuses, legitimately ask whether they should encourage their students to apply or attend.

Issues concerning college guidance are especially troublesome. Admissions staff report that a strong and supportive guidance counselor can be invaluable in identifying and recruiting potential applicants. However, such allies are rare in institutions serving large numbers of African American students. In those institutions in which guidance counselors are overwhelmed or act in ways that are adverse to the interest of students, efforts must be made to broaden contacts to include teachers of college preparatory courses. In institutions in which counselors are dissuading African American

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

students from applying to these schools, recruiters must work to dispel or counter their concerns with examples showing real experiences of students who have been successful.

Efforts to Change Campus Diversity

Increasing admissions and enrollment of African American students is the first step in ensuring and promoting diversity on the college campus. The next step is to transform the educational and social setting in which minority, specifically African American, students spend their college careers. Faced with the realities of high attrition and negative incidents experienced by the first wave of African American students enrolled in these colleges in the 1960s and 1970s, college leaders have developed or experimented with a series of institutional, structural responses to meet challenges facing enrolled African American students. Some of these efforts involved creating institutional structures or systems for directly aiding African American students; others involve efforts to improve the climate or responsiveness of the campus to African American concerns.

Institutional Structures and Systems

Colleges have undertaken a range of institutional responses to increase African American student retention and broader diversity on campus. Their efforts can be roughly grouped into four major areas:

- Creating administrative units with responsibility for minority affairs;
- Developing discrete African American student retention efforts;
- Encouraging movements toward greater diversity within the curriculum; and
- Increasing African American student representation in leadership positions.

Below, we review the efforts of colleges in each of these areas and assess them in terms of the potential for the approach to address the dimensions of diversity described above. We should expect to find that these efforts advance the capacity of African American students to feel accepted and supported on campus. We consider the strengths and weaknesses of the approaches and offer, when appropriate, some opinions on ways in which the strategies might be improved.

Administrative Offices for Minority Affairs Issues

Each of the six colleges has created offices specifically charged with addressing minority student needs and concerns. In three of the colleges — University of the South, Furman and Rhodes — concerns of non-white students are the responsibility of the Office of Minority or Multicultural Affairs. At Lynchburg College, the Office of Institutional Change has maintained primary responsibility in this area. At Washington and Lee University and Davidson College, responsibility for minority student issues has been specifically assigned to an assistant or associate dean within the Office of the Dean of Students. In most institutions, the creation of offices or administrative positions to oversee minority affairs coincided with initial increases in African American student enrollment or an emphasis on African American student recruitment.

Administrators in each institution acknowledge that for successful experiences of African American students to occur on predominantly white campuses, some administrative department must be charged with responsibility for supporting minority students. In most of the colleges, the appointment of an individual specifically charged with minority affairs has only occurred within the last three years. In one institution, the University of the South, an Office of Minority Affairs has existed since 1981; at Davidson College, an assistant chaplain served this function until an assistant dean was

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

appointed with responsibilities for minority affairs as part of his assignment.

Across all campuses, the six offices assigned responsibility for minority student affairs and concerns have become a point of advocacy and support for African American students. Each of the offices is headed by an African American administrator expressly recruited to the position. Often, this individual is seen as the primary spokesperson for minority, especially African American, concerns and issues. In addition, most of these administrators report that they serve as an official or unofficial academic and social counselor for most African American students on their campuses.

Besides providing simply a place for African American students to talk, incumbents in these positions have launched a variety of activities to meet the needs of African American students and to improve the campus climate among other students and among faculty. Among the typical activities or tasks sponsored by these offices are:

- Organizing periodic sessions for African American students to discuss common concerns and issues;
- Holding some responsibility for welcoming and acclimatizing entering students during orientation (or pre-orientation) sessions;
- Monitoring individual student academic progress and offering support, encouragement or access to tutoring services when needed;
- Organizing sessions for African American (and other) students about strategies for being an effective student — time management, study habits, research techniques, test-taking anxiety reduction, etc.;
- Organizing and sponsoring campus-wide events (Black History and Awareness Month; special speakers and/or concerts) designed to introduce some elements of African American culture into campus life;

- Overseeing the activities and efforts of Multi-cultural Affairs Centers or Houses where they existed;
- Providing guidance and support to African American student organizations or interest groups — Black Student Union, Multi-cultural Committee, groups seeking to establish black Greek organizations on campus, etc.; and
- Recruiting new African American students.

Without exception, the individuals involved in these offices are highly committed to helping African American students succeed at their institutions. They know each African American student personally and it is clear that they monitor their academic performance, their social lives and even their day-to-day attitudes regularly. Even students who are not the "regulars" in the office remain a concern for the staff in these offices.

From the perspective of African American students, the existence (or creation) of these offices is one of the few tangible indicators that the administration of their colleges are concerned about them as a group. They jealously guard any infringement on what they perceive as "their" point of contact with administrative policies.

Our discussions with staff and students on these campuses concerning the role and advantages of these campuses raised several interesting dilemmas for the future. Without question, these offices represent one of the few solid points of communication between African American students and the broader community. The adult presence embodied in the directors of this office provides a sympathetic ear to issues of injustice and injury raised by students on a daily basis and often offers a tempered response to the concerns. Directors of these offices, in essence, have little institutionally given support, but they derive considerable campus-wide authority from their ability to speak on behalf of African American and minority concerns.

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

However, it is important to note that there is an inherent risk to the progress of campus-wide diversity when such offices are effective. Our observations and discussions on each campus revealed that many administrators, faculty and non-minority students felt that the existence of such offices, in many ways, reduced the urgency or the need for increased emphasis on diversity. For some, the existence of the office itself meant that enough was already being done. The Office of Minority Affairs was seen by these students and staff as an adequate and sufficient vehicle for lobbying about concerns of African American students. For others, any issues related to African American students or African American issues were solely the responsibility of the Office of Minority Affairs. If issues arose, they should be referred to this office; if no action was taken, it would be assumed that the issue was of little consequence. Both perspectives reflect a ghettoizing of African American student issues and concerns.

We are left then in a quandary. The creation and staffing of these offices represent a strong statement of institutional concern about the needs and issues of African American students. Their absence would mean that the voice of most African American students would be substantially excluded from college policy issues that directly affect them. At the same time, we fear that on some campuses, though not all, the creation of an Office of Minority Affairs has become a terminal achievement instead of a starting point for diversity. It becomes convenient on these campuses to assert that the issues of African American students are being dealt with simply because such an office exists. Further, when issues with significant implications for the entire campus community arise — overt racism, reductions in financial aid, the chartering of a black Greek organization where national Greek organizations have been excluded — and are assigned to the Office of Minority Affairs, they risk becoming marginalized since they can be characterized as a "black" or a "minority" issue.

We found a few instances where initial steps had been taken to partially address this dilemma. At Davidson, part of the role of advocate and counselor to African American and other minority students had been devolved, to some extent, from the Office of the Assistant Dean, to faculty involved in the Second Family initiative. This effort, which pairs individual African American students with individual faculty and their families, has two functions. First, it permits students to develop another link or network within the broader college community beyond the assistant dean, the normal counseling/advising system and their faculty or teachers. Second, it provides the volunteer faculty with the insight and knowledge they need to become advocates for black student issues when and if the need arises.

At Lynchburg College, the Office of Institutional Change and the college president's strong commitment to diversity have provided an environment supportive of taking on minority issues as a legitimate and sustained topic of campus discussions. Student leaders, minority and white, as well as faculty have spearheaded efforts to bring questions of minority status and race into the consciousness of faculty and students. These efforts permeate many college discussions and decisions.

Perhaps, in ideal circumstances, the compelling need for administrative offices to deal specifically with minority students concerns might disappear. However, the existence of such offices at present is not merely a **symbol** that African American student needs and interests require special attention; their existence is demonstrably witnessed in the words of African American and white students, faculty and administrators. Although we have noted that their creation has been the occasion on some campuses to conclude falsely that the issues and concerns have been addressed, it would be foolhardy to conclude that the existence of the office is "the problem."

Five campuses have acted to create such offices only within the past three years; it is

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

inappropriate and premature to begin discussions about how the campuses might handle African American student affairs in their absence. It is important, however, to determine how the functions and mission of this office can be inculcated across all administrative and functional departments of the campus community. The concerns and interests of African American students (and of all students) cannot be relegated as the responsibility of a single office.

Each college must review its past reports and white papers concerning the status of African American students on campus and examine whether the milestone of creating an Office of Minority Affairs has sidetracked the overall responsibilities of all sectors of the campus community to address the needs and concerns of African American students. Such a review should be concluded with a revitalized statement of objectives within the mission currently vested within the Office of Minority Affairs for incorporation into all aspects of the college during the next three to five years. While the current Office of Minority Affairs should be a resource and advocate of this process, it cannot be the sole catalyst or agent of the steps necessary to achieve diversity.

Developing Targeted Retention Efforts

A second set of strategies designed to sustain diversity on campus include typical African American student retention efforts. As noted above, these initiatives are organized and coordinated by the institution's Office of Minority Affairs (or its equivalent). Such initiatives take several forms and range from very extensive freshmen orientation/preparation programs to modest tutoring initiatives.

One of the most extensive retention programs is the Summer Transition program at Lynchburg College offered to all African American students who have accepted admission to the college. The program seeks to familiarize the participants with the campus while reinforcing their preparation for college-level academic

coursework. During the program, students are introduced in informal settings to administrative and academic staff of the college. Thirty-nine students, representing the vast majority of all entering African American students, were enrolled during the summer of 1992.

The four-week summer initiative is sponsored by the Office of Institutional Change. A combination of high school and college teachers serve as faculty for the program. African American and white Lynchburg college students serve as resident assistants (counselor/mentors). The program includes four credit-bearing academic courses; seminars in time and stress management, and test taking strategies; and social activities. The program day is very full, beginning at 8:00 a.m. and concluding at 9:00 p.m.

In the other institutions, less extensive retention programs are the norm. For example, three of the institutions offer two- or three-day "pre-orientation" programs explicitly designed for minority students. Entering minority students⁶ are invited to arrive on the campus several days before the official college freshmen orientation program begins. Such programs typically include an opportunity for students to meet their peers as well as upperclass students, to familiarize themselves with the campus, and to prepare for some of the challenges that they may encounter during the first semester. Some portion of the pre-orientation program is spent considering issues of race or "differentness" as college students. The response to such programs is not universally positive by either African American or white students. In some institutions, pre-orientation programs are seen as confirming that African American students cannot persevere on their own; other students see such programs as setting the stage for condoning separatist/segregationist approaches among white and African American students. At one college, in fact, the pre-orientation program has been canceled in response to the objections of white students. However, among the students with whom we spoke, most African American students and white students saw a benefit for

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

such pre-orientation sessions and thought they should be continued.

Offices of Minority Affairs also typically play some role in monitoring African American student performance as well as keeping track of personal or social issues that might affect the student's college experience. Each school has programs that offered academic tutoring when needed. Within each institution, the Office of Minority Affairs organizes discussion groups of African American students to talk about common issues, provide peer support and serve as a social outlet.

These efforts are all standard approaches that symbolize administrative concern about the interests of African American students and that, in themselves, provide actual support to students. They constitute a set of necessary, but not sufficient, efforts to make the experience of being a minority at a predominantly white institution palatable.

Curricular Diversity

One of the most significant but also most difficult areas in which movement toward diversity might occur is in the curricula. Especially within colleges with strong liberal arts traditions, the content of the curricula may be **the** defining feature and manifestation of the mission of the institution. Consequently, the scope and content of curricula are likely to be the most critical points of contention in efforts to increase diversity. Increased curricular diversity is important for several reasons. First, it moves toward the mission of an inclusive liberal arts education that expands understanding and appreciation of all human knowledge and experience among all students. Second, for African American students it demonstrates that their college values them and their heritage as contributors to human development.

In reality, most institutions we visited have not really begun to explore in a systematic way the ways in which the movement toward diversity might affect curricula. However, there is

evidence that on an individual, course by course, department by department basis, steps toward greater curricular diversity are being taken or experimented with.

Overall, the response to increasing curricular diversity within the colleges is guarded. Typical skeptical responses raise concerns about "watering down" the established academic standards and the lack of preparation of current faculty to effectively present materials drawn from diverse sources.

In discussions with academic deans in several colleges, we were told that efforts to increase diversity would be difficult to achieve since, from their and their faculty's perspective, the inclusion of greater diversity in scholarship, literature and research would necessarily require the de-emphasis or deletion of current work studied in the curricula. Recognizing that the current curricula was often based on time-honored and widely known classics — albeit, predominantly the work of white males — it was difficult to conceive, they argued, how such classics could be supplanted by works whose contribution did not have such status.

The second concern raised by academic deans and other administrators is that current faculty are not prepared to incorporate the needed diversity within their curricula. Citing the lack of familiarity with Eastern philosophical and religious thought, lack of knowledge about African literature and Third World perspectives on history, some deans reported that their faculty had decided to concentrate on what they knew best and could present effectively. Some also acknowledged, however, that initial steps toward increased curricular diversity would not be premised on arguably esoteric topics of distant cultures and religions but would address the experiences and contributions of African Americans, Hispanics and women that were much more accessible.

Davidson College, University of the South and Lynchburg College have taken steps to encourage current faculty to incorporate some aspects of multi-cultural research and literature

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

within existing courses or to provide support to faculty seeking to develop a new course specifically designed to address topics that have been excluded from existing curricula or to address multicultural issues more broadly. Such approaches are in nascent stages on almost all campuses. Administrators, deans and students at many schools reported examples of courses or sections of courses that had been designed to address such issues. However, they noted that while courses specifically focused on minority topics began to address some of their interests in curricular diversity, the enrollment in these courses was predominantly African American; longer-term objectives of curricular diversity are not yet being achieved.

Finally, one of the newest developments in this struggle for greater diversity within the curricula has been the creation, with the support of the Jessie Ball duPont Fund, of a concentration in minority studies at Davidson College. Within this structure of a concentration, students majoring in one of the traditional disciplines (history, humanities, sociology, political science, etc.) could choose to focus partially their course of discipline study on issues related to the African American experience. The designation of concentration provides a framework for departments and students to determine the courses and seminars that most appropriately fit within a focused course of study. In essence, a concentration approach allows students to specialize in their particular major. At the broader college level, the creation of a concentration provides coherence to a set of courses drawn from multiple disciplines and departments that are related through their shared consideration of African American issues. In essence, a concentration can be used to expand diversity within the curriculum without separating it as an activity of a single department.

The issue of increased curricular diversity is one the major topics of discussion in institutions across the nation. The six colleges included in this study are experiencing the same types and degrees of turmoil, questioning and concern

found in many schools. In some ways, these six schools enter the debate relatively late; low African American student enrollments in the past buffered them from the issues. However, as African American students establish a presence on each campus and the national tide of change concerning curricular diversity continues unabated, each school will need to develop a reasoned response.

Institutions should seek to learn from the experiences of other colleges that have or are considering curricular diversity. The national experience suggests that a single, simple approach does not suffice. Hence, the creation of a Department of African American Studies may or may not be an effective strategy; it alone does not meet the challenge of curricular diversity. Similarly, developing individual courses across departments to address diversity is an approach that may meet the needs of the limited number of students who enroll, but cannot be expected to satisfy the broader need to diversify the educational experience of all students.

It is apparent, based on the experiences of other colleges and of these particular institutions, that a broad movement toward increased curricular diversity cannot be expected to occur by chance. Strong educational leadership backed by decisive action and direct policy support will be needed. Academic deans and departmental chairs must be charged with the responsibility for actively encouraging and monitoring movement toward increased curricular diversity among the courses offered by the college. As part of the normal academic review of curricula and teaching, college curricula committees must be instructed to assess diversity of the educational experience as an indicator of the quality of the overall program. Additional resources in the form of stipends and curricular material clearinghouses must be made available to faculty and staff to help them in these efforts.

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

Recruiting and Retaining African American Faculty and Administrators

The presence of African American faculty is a strong indicator of emergent diversity on predominantly white college campuses. In addition to bringing a multi-cultural perspective needed to diversify the curricula and teaching, these individuals can also: serve as concrete role models/mentors/advocates for African American students; provide majority students with a more well-rounded educational experience by exposing them to scholars from outside their own racial-ethnic groups; and, by enlarging the African American professional community, increase the probability that other African American faculty candidates will consider working within these institutions.

Currently, each of the six campuses has fewer than three African American faculty or administrators: Davidson currently has the greatest number of African American faculty and administrative staff with three each; Furman, Lynchburg and Rhodes each have two African American faculty and one African American administrator; Washington and Lee has two of each; and University of the South has one African American administrator and no African American faculty. Administration at these institutions are well aware of the need to increase these numbers, and can list several reasons for this disparity and a number of strategies they have employed in order to ameliorate the problem.

Across the campuses, several reasons were offered for having so few African American professionals:

- The pool of African American Ph.D.s is so small that there is national and regional competition for the same people;
- Of the African Americans in the pool of Ph.D.s, most hold education degrees, but the institution is seeking to hire in a specific academic area;

- The area in which the college is located does not include an African American community;
- Among the few candidates brought to the campus, very few exhibited the potential to earn tenure given current expectations and requirements at these institutions;
- The area in which the college is located offers no employment options for the spouses of candidates;
- Some candidates are simply not interested in working in the South; and
- For whatever reasons, individual African American faculty who have been hired have subsequently elected to leave.

To address the problem, several different strategies have been tried. However, as the numbers indicate, these approaches have been to little or no avail. Major strategies include:

- Participation in the efforts of a national consortium of liberal arts colleges (usually referred to as "the Swarthmore Group") to bring African American Ph.D. candidates who are of dissertation status to teach for one year while they complete their degree;
- Securing foundation funds to secure "wild card" hires (African American applicants who are qualified to teach in an area where there may or may not currently be an opening);
- Bringing visiting fellows (through foundation funding) to teach on the campus for one year; and
- Initiating a limited teacher exchange program with an historically black college; this effort is being undertaken at one of the six institutions.

In addition, some campus officials report that they are attempting to "grow their own" by using African American graduates of their campuses as "teacher/scholars." Another plan is to attract southern-born Ph.Ds who have gotten their degrees in northern institutions and "may be homesick."

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

It may also be that there are additional reasons for continued failure to attract African American faculty. For example, one campus reported running "a very quiet Affirmative Action type search." From the perspective of a prospective African American faculty member, the stigma attached to becoming an Affirmative Action hire on a small predominantly white campus in the South may make an offer of employment unworthy of consideration.

A related problem is that of seeing and speaking of African American Ph.D.s as "role models." While it might be hoped or even intended that new African American faculty assume this role, being hired for this purpose may not appear to be much of a professional opportunity for an individual who has worked to be seen as a serious professional and scholar.

Officials on most of these campuses state that when they refer to minority recruitment, they are speaking specifically of African Americans. However, when counting minority faculty, they sometimes include faculty who did not grow up in the United States but enrolled in college or graduate school after completing their elementary and secondary training in Africa, Great Britain or the West Indies. While these faculty share the same racial designation as the African American students these schools are attempting to attract, they often do not share history or culture. Such differences may reduce the chances of a strong relationship between such faculty and students.

Of the strategies listed above, one that may be easiest and most cost-efficient is faculty exchange arrangements with small, private historically black colleges. There are several good reasons to consider such an approach:

- Several of the black colleges most comparable to the colleges in this study are located in the same geographical areas
- This strategy would be cost-effective in that individuals involved in exchange activity could continue to be paid through their home institution; and

- This approach could serve as an entree to networks that may yield both African American students and faculty.

Another workable approach may be to refine the idea of "growing their own" to include incentives for their graduates to want to return following graduate school. They may also wish to try such a strategy by exchanging alumni across Leadership South institutions.

The issue of limited African American faculty is reaching a crisis at the national level. Even historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs) report difficulties in recruiting and retaining African American faculty. The presidents and deans of HBCUs cite many of the same constraints named by faculty in these institutions. It is likely that the situation will continue to deteriorate until the pipeline between high school and graduate work is repaired or replaced. Until then, competition for African American faculty will continue to be keen. The six institutions involved in this study will likely be at a decided disadvantage. They will need to fashion creative strategies that permit them to "share" African American faculty with other similar institutions and with HBCUs while waiting for the yield from the African American scholar pipeline to improve.

Student Leadership Opportunities

An important indicator of increasing diversity among students is the extent to which African American students emerge as visible and accepted leaders within the broader college community. The opportunity for African American students to hold positions of authority and distinction within the campus can diminish concerns over powerlessness and can serve as an important example of the potential and competence of African American students. The emergence of African American leaders in the six schools involved in this study is a function of administrative action, popular support among the student body in general and the talent and ability of the African American students themselves.

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)**Administrative Appointments.**

Administrators in each school have taken steps to cultivate and provide leadership opportunities for African American students on their campuses. The most obvious indications of these actions are the appointments of African American students as resident hall advisers, as peer counselors and as members of various campus-wide committees and councils. We note with satisfaction that African American students on each campus served in these quasi-administrative leadership capacities. Their assignment is a signal that the administration believes that African American students can meet the responsibilities, and also provides the students themselves with direct leadership experience.

Elected Student Leadership. The second area in which increasing diversity in campus life is reflected is the advancement of African American students into positions of leadership within the student population. Again, at Davidson College, Lynchburg College, Furman University and Rhodes College, African American students have risen to elected leadership positions. Black students serve within the student government, as dormitory leaders, and on campus judiciary bodies. Black students have been or are student body presidents at two institutions within the past four years. The rise of African American students is a function both of the willingness of white students to support black candidates and of the personality and abilities of the black candidates themselves. It is interesting to note that on none of the campuses had the decision been made to have designated minority seats on the student council or government boards. Although there remains some "novelty" on campuses of having an African American as a student leader, this sense of uniqueness stems primarily from the recognition that African American students constitute such a small proportion of the entire student body. In no instance, however, did we discern any indication that the African American student was selected or elected simply because he or she was a minority and not for his or her qualifications.

Athletes. Across campuses the role of student athletes as campus leaders varies. At small liberal arts colleges, athletic programs do not carry the prestige and clout as they might at state universities, for example. Further, the strong liberal arts tradition in each of the schools ensures that academic pursuits and success are more highly valued than athletic prowess and achievements. Nevertheless, student athletics are an important part of campus and student life. The relative smallness of the campus and student population also ensures that the athletes are easily identified and often seen by most students each day. They are visible members of the college.

Several schools offer athletic scholarships as a recruitment tool. Many African American male students on these campuses, in fact, receive athletic scholarships. As has been noted by others, sports can be an important vehicle for integration among peers. The experiences at these institutions are no exception. Black student athletes receive a variety of supports and inducements that allow them to become active in all areas of student life involving white students. They tend to report having more white friends, attending more social events and joining more social organizations than do their non-athlete black peers.

The assumption that the majority of African American males are athletes was raised as a concern by students, faculty and administrators in several campuses. They noted that in some instances that black male students were referred to commonly as "athletes" and black female students as "scholars." Such a division reflected both perception and reality. Black students of both sexes noted that they had difficulty relating to each other because of their different reasons for attending college. Black athletes resented the stereotype that they were admitted to the school simply to play sports. In several cases, black athletes had dropped off teams to avoid being pigeonholed in this manner. Females complained that they became further isolated because they were African American and did not

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

have the ready-made vehicles for entry into the broader campus social scene.

In general, each of the campuses has made substantial progress in providing or creating leadership opportunities for African American students. In fact, that produce large numbers of white student applicants (prep schools, private schools, suburban schools) runs the risk of limiting the potential pool of African American applicants.

SUMMARY

Each of the institutions has adopted a variety of strategies, techniques and efforts in an attempt to attract to their campuses and sustain these African American students once they enroll. Many of these efforts began as efforts aimed at recruitment and retention. In several institutions, such efforts have remained marginalized and focused on symptoms of issues and problems. In other institutions, there has been a movement toward creating the conditions of a diverse campus. These efforts remain nascent and tenuous.

V. REFLECTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- This report has described and assessed the efforts within six southern liberal arts colleges to address two related, but distinct, challenges:
- to increase the pool of minority (African American) students who are interested in and prepared for entry into college; and
- to increase the actual representation of African American students within their student population, sustain these students through graduation and produce increased diversity on campus.

The need for action in both of these areas is irrefutable. Despite some gains in the entry rates of African American students in recent decades,

there remains a considerable gap between African American and white students in college-going and college persistence rates. Further, each of the six institutions has very low representation of African American students in its student population and prior efforts to increase the number of African American students have met with only limited success.

In this final chapter, we seek to examine a series of policy questions and options related to the efficacy of the current efforts of these institutions and the range of possible next steps for the institutions and for the Jessie Ball duPont Fund. Earlier sections of this report have concluded with a series of recommendations about specific issues or approaches. This chapter seeks to place the findings of this study in a broader policy framework. It reviews some of the larger policy questions and issues that are addressed by the initiatives underway within these six institutions. Our discussion will use the experiences and findings from activities of the six colleges to begin to address implications for social and educational policy within these institutions and for the Fund.

ISSUES OF DIVERSITY

We have argued that many efforts of these institutions can be interpreted as attempts to increase diversity at the college level. Progress toward campus diversity in all of its manifestations — student population, faculty composition, curricula, and school culture — has the potential to improve the quality of the entire educational enterprise, including the experiences of African American students as well as white students.

We identify four broad areas in which steps must be taken within each institution in order to continue to advance an agenda of diversity:

- A need to broaden the rationale of current efforts from one of minority student retention to one of diversity;

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

- A need to devolve responsibility for diversity away from a single office or department to all areas of the college;
- A need to develop a systemic and sustained approach for providing all students with the skills and sensibilities needed to function and succeed in a multi-cultural, multi-racial collegiate setting; and
- A need for a consistent and sincere expression of institutional will that affirms the achievement of a fully diversified campus is at the top of the college's agenda for the future.

Broadening Institutional Retention Goals to Campus Diversity

Our first policy conclusion concerning the activities of these campuses to address the needs of African American students is the need to refocus the mission and understanding of current efforts from an objective of minority student retention to one of campus diversity. Such a transformation of mission would require a "paradigm shift" on some of campuses toward a recognition that a diverse educational experience is a benefit to the entire student population, not simply minority students. We believe that efforts whose primary purpose or rationale is increased African American student retention are destined to fail. They fail because they address neither the causes that discourage potential applicants from applying nor the factors that drive African American students to leave school — that African American students, their heritage and their experiences are not welcomed or reflected in the activities and priorities of the institution. Retention efforts are something an institution "does" to keep African American students around; diversity is what the college should provide for all students.

Marginalization

Many colleges have taken concrete steps to improve retention of African American students or to begin the process of broadening campus

diversity. Yet many of their efforts have been developed and implemented as marginalized solutions that address an immediate problem without having the strength or vision to change practices and policies across the college. This is due in part to the fact that these efforts have largely been assigned to a particular office for implementation, i.e., the Office of Minority Affairs.

While these offices took their responsibilities very seriously, their activities signalled that this issue was being taken care of and need not concern others in the institution. As a consequence, these approaches are neither systemic nor institutionalized and thus have limited potential for being sustained over the longer term or having much of an impact on the broader college community.

Institutions must strive to devise systemwide strategies to achieve campus diversity. Various units must assess their current practices, policies or curricula and develop a three-year plan for advancing diversity in their area of responsibility. Such a plan should be monitored by a group representing all constituencies on campus — administration, faculty, students and board members. Some institutions that have already engaged in a review of minority student affairs need to return to their findings and recommendations to assess the progress that has been made and develop an action plan for moving forward.

Multi-cultural Remediation

The circumstances and issues of racism described in these six institutions are not unique or confined to these colleges. Virtually every college and university in the nation is grappling with exactly these issues. In a response to a recently released report about race relations at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, an administrator noted that what was needed and attempted at his campus was an educational process of "multi-cultural remediation." He estimated that each year at least one third of the student population (i.e., the entering freshman

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

class) required an active program to address the deficiencies that many students had concerning multi-cultural issues and racial diversity among peers. In many ways, colleges and universities emerge as flashpoints for the lack of tolerance and appreciation for rights and contributions of all groups within American society.

The six institutions included in this study need to assess how best to overcome the racism that exists on their campuses. It is apparent that a *laissez-faire* approach is unlikely to produce the desired effects and probably risks severe division among students, staff and alumni if blatant racism emerges. The delivery of a program of multi-cultural awareness, appreciation and sensitivity cannot be completed within a two-day entering student orientation or through a series of informal fireside chats by the president. Further, the issues involved are much more complex than can be handled **solely** by resident assistants or student leaders. A comprehensive plan integrated into the overall college experience — and not simply an "add-on" — must be developed.

Institutional Will

The final, and perhaps, most decisive area concerns the willingness and support for institutional change around the issue of diversity. Our observations lead us to conclude that institutional will for diversity is not consistently strong across the six colleges. Discussions with members from all constituencies of the campus community at each institution indicated that there is considerable variation in the level of commitment or "institutional will" to articulate and advance an agenda for diversity. Several institutions have developed a plan with reasoned, concrete steps and have followed through on their plans. In other institutions, issues surrounding diversity are much more hazy and the examples offered as evidence of in these areas seemed unfocused or contrived. We recognize that achieving diversity is but one of many legitimate competing goals that face administrators on these (and all) campuses. Issues of financial stability, faculty support,

alumni relations, capital campaigns, etc., each demand attention and planning. Even given these competing pressures, Lynchburg College, Davidson College and the University of the South have expanded their primary institutional agenda to include movement toward diversity. However, at other institutions, diversity has been considered only as an afterthought.

For this reason, it may be appropriate for the Fund to consider how its resources can best be used to advance campus diversity. An option for the Fund would be to increase support only for those institutions where there is sufficient will to advance the Fund's broader diversity goals.

CONTINUING SUPPORT OF THE INITIATIVES TO INCREASE THE POOL OF ELIGIBLE AND INTERESTED AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS

From the perspective of the Fund and the several institutions involved, a policy decision concerning the efficacy and contribution of Sewanee Summer Scholars, Love of Learning and FUTURES is potentially the most problematic. We have argued in this report that individually these programs brought together strong staff doing exciting things with African American students who normally would not receive such support. While we have raised some specific concerns about choices of programmatic elements and some aspects of implementation, we believe that each initiative has the capacity to make suggested improvements in their models and implementation efforts.

We feel it is important to reiterate several points concerning the efforts we observed. First, there is no reason to believe that these efforts have **failed**. In fact, the programs are characterized by relatively strong models and good records of implementation.

Second, the staff involved in developing and implementing these initiatives should be applauded for a job well done. Their efforts demonstrate a strong, lasting commitment to the

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

ideals and objectives of African American student access and success.

Third, the programs (and the Fund) have made a **de facto** commitment and obligation to the students who are already involved in these multi-year initiatives. We believe that it would be damaging to the opportunities and aspirations of participating African American students to arbitrarily close or alter programs without permitting the students to either complete them or be placed (and supported) in a similar initiative.

However, an important issue that has not been discussed is the scope and scale of the programs. The small number of students who may benefit from these efforts does not augur well in terms of meeting a larger goal of improving African American college enrollment rates. Between them, the programs serve fewer than 200 students drawn from literally thousands of similar youth in their geographic areas who might benefit from program participation. The difficulty from a policy perspective is that each of the initiatives have adequate to reasonable models and the potential for good implementation. For students who **are** served, the experience is probably valuable. However, recognizing the costs and effort required to organize, implement and sustain such efforts, one must consider how a broader impact, involving more students, might be achieved.

Two possible, but probably unrealistic, alternatives might be considered. Each seeks to increase the scale and/or scope of the current initiatives. First, the programs might re-focus their efforts on broader systemic approaches to improve the conditions and circumstances in which children in the target communities are served. However, given the distances involved and the limited appropriate resources (i.e., a school of education) of the participating colleges, such an option is not realistic.

The second option is to expand the capacity of the current programs. As they currently operate, these programs are too small to increase substantially the pool of college-going African

American students. In fairness, it must be noted that the scope and scale of these programs is similar to virtually all other student-focused programs throughout the nation. Nationally, the vast majority of programs serve relatively few students.

While program expansion would provide more opportunities for African American students to participate, it also represents an onerous challenge for program staff and for sponsoring institutions. Each of the campuses depend, to some degree, on external funding to defray the costs of the services they provide. The institutions that have approached other funders have had some small successes. However, they have also encountered the reality that foundations interested in supporting educational interventions are currently moving more toward funding programs directly at the K–12 level. In addition, they sometimes find that historical racial homogeneity of their campuses in the past raises questions about the strength of their commitment to racial diversity in the present.

Where institutional funds have been used, questions have already begun to arise about the return on investment. As these are not (with the exception of Washington and Lee) student recruitment programs, and because any true test of outcomes must await program and school completion by the cohorts enrolled, return on investment is difficult to demonstrate. Thus, the initiatives are sometimes seen as altruistic notions that take away from other institutional priorities. Further, not all campus constituencies (faculty, administration, students, trustees, alumni, etc.) are in agreement over the need for diversity programming. Under these circumstances, and during difficult economic times, garnering additional institutional funds for program expansion may be especially troublesome.

If the Fund has an interest in increasing minority student access to college on a broader scale, the Fund might consider re-focusing its support of "pool-expansion" programs on institutions with more direct and complete access to minority

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

youth. Among the Fund's eligible institutions are a number of urban colleges and universities that probably have the capacity and interest in working with urban youth and urban school districts in efforts to increase minority access to college. From our perspective, the Fund should try to balance programming between efforts that serve minority youth directly as do the current programs and initiatives that seek to transform more systemically the quality of education provided to minority youth in urban schools. Such a dual-pronged approach will yield immediate benefits to the youth served as well as longer-term, sustainable improvement in schools to the benefit of future students.

At the same time, the Fund could announce its intention of reducing and eventually eliminating support of student-focused efforts within the three institutions, providing transitional funds to permit the programs serving currently enrolled students to complete the full program, or permitting the programs to attempt to find other sources of funding. Such a decision need not signal that the Fund is turning away from these institutions. In fact, resources currently used for pool programs could be appropriately redirected to address the issues of campus diversity. However, such a decision may be politically difficult. The current pool initiatives are among the most visible, tangible indications that the institutions are concerned with issues of African American enrollment. Abandoning such efforts without a concomitant visible strategy for increasing campus diversity could potentially signify a desertion of the need to serve African American students in these institutions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Carter, D.J. and Wilson, R. *Tenth Annual Status Report on Minorities in Higher Education*. Washington: American Education Council, 1992.

Cave, George and Quint, Janet. *Career Beginnings Impact Evaluation: Findings from a Program for Disadvantaged High School Students*. New York, NY: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, 1990.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. "Some effects of proportions in group life: skewed sex ratios and responses to token women." *American Journal of Sociology*. 82: 965–990, 1977.

McMullan, Bernard J. *Connecticut College Minority Students Summer Advancement Program: A Report on the Pilot Experience*. Bala Cynwyd, PA: Center for Assessment and Policy Development, 1989.

McMullan, Bernard J., Sidler, Jennifer L., Wolf, Wendy C. *College-School Partnerships to Improve Minority Access to College: Initiatives Addressing Teacher Renewal, Curricular Revision and School Reform*. Bala Cynwyd, PA: Center for Assessment and Policy Development, 1991.

McMullan, Bernard J., Garrett, Cheryl Smith, Sidler, Jennifer, Watts, Marian, Wolf, Wendy C. *A Shared Responsibility: College/School Partnerships Serving Minority Youth*. Bala Cynwyd, PA: Center for Assessment and Policy Development, 1992

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Higher Education Programs, Division of Student Services. *Special Programs for Students from Disadvantaged Backgrounds*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, 1990.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Evaluation and Program Management. *Executive Summary: Evaluation Study of the Upward Bound Program: A Second Follow-up*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, 1980.

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

**APPENDIX I
SUMMER PROGRAM PROFILES**

FUTURES (Washington and Lee University)

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY: Washington and Lee University Lexington, Virginia

PROGRAM NAME: FUTURES: A Pre-College Program for Minority Students

YEAR IMPLEMENTED: 1991

PURPOSE: To prepare a significant number of minority youth for higher education by raising their educational aspirations; improving their educational preparation; and helping their parents become better resources in educational process.

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS: 20 each year

SELECTION CRITERIA:

Students considered by the Fairfax County Public School System (FCPS) to be academically at risk **and** having high academic potential. Two categories of students are considered: those with a cumulative GPA of 2.9 or below and those with GPA of 3.0 or above but still considered at risk. Those considered most at risk are selected over those who seem less at risk.

SELECTION PROCESS:

- 1) Students going from eighth to ninth grade apply to the FPCS Office of Minority Achievement's College Prep Program.
- 2) Twenty of the applications are forwarded to Washington and Lee.
- 3) Washington and Lee considers teacher ratings and recommendations, writing ability, enthusiasm, GPA and extracurricular activities.

PROGRAM ELEMENTS:

Counseling, two-week residential experiences each summer during high school⁷; provision of resource materials; activities to help parents become better resources throughout the educational process; and a 50 percent reduction in tuition, room and board at Washington and Lee for 10 successful completers of the program. Program participation begins with an overnight orientation visit at the university for parents and students (information on financial aid, admission, social and academic life, and athletics).

During school year, student progress monitored by FCPS through advocates hired to work with 10 to 60 students. They assist in course selection, arrange activities and presentations (SAT prep, time management, tutors [when necessary] and make participation in Laser Disk Learning Programs (math and science) available to parents.

Throughout program, participants receive books to create a home library (English usage, writing skills, financial management, recreational reading, SAT preparation, etc.).

The residential summer program begins after tenth grade.

Transportation is provided.

During the morning: classes in English composition, math and science. In the afternoon: field trips, workshops, recreation. Teachers are with students all day and part of evening.

Parents attend a closing session/luncheon.

THE TUITION GUARANTEE:

The 10 students (per year) selected must:

- a. satisfy participation requirements in educational and counseling activities
- b. successfully complete a college prep curriculum with a GPA of 3.0 or higher

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

- c. Score on the SAT (and three additional achievement tests) in a range that falls within the scores required for admission to Washington and Lee (for the middle 50 percent of those admitted, 1172 to 1344).

Financial aid beyond the 50 percent tuition and room and board reduction is considered on a case-by-case basis.

Sewanee Summer Scholars (University of the South)

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY: University of the South Sewanee, Tennessee

PROGRAM NAME: Sewanee Summer Scholars Program

YEAR IMPLEMENTED: 1991

PURPOSE: To encourage African American high school students from the Chattanooga and Franklin County Public School systems to continue their secondary educations and eventually pursue some form of higher education.

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS: Thirty-five each year⁸ (after ninth grade) until there is a total of approximately 105 participating students.

SELECTION CRITERIA:

"Students who will profit most" are identified by the Chattanooga and Franklin County school systems (some through standardized test scores and some through teacher recommendations). Those sought are students "with the potential to attend college but who probably would not do so without special encouragement and support."

Final screening is done by a committee of members of the program staff and appropriate representatives from participating secondary schools.

PROGRAM ELEMENTS:

During the four-week summer program participants attend academic classes that

change by grade level and include English, math, science, physical education, leadership, test-taking, wellness and spiritual development. They receive free admission to cultural and entertainment events; books and supplies; and a stipend to offset loss of summer earnings (\$200 for "rising" tenth graders, \$400 for "rising" eleventh graders, and \$600 for "rising" seniors.

School year follow-up includes:

- a. regular communication from staff and counselor/mentors
- b. workshops (career, parenting, leadership, education enhancement)
- c. special events (cultural, rap sessions, gatherings with staff and mentors)
- d. formal monitoring through monthly contact of program administration with school counselors, parents and summer program staff.

Staff for the summer program come from both school systems and the university (seven faculty for each cohort). In addition, seven college-aged counselor/mentors are hired and live in the dormitories during the program.

Love of Learning (Davidson College)

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY: Davidson College Davidson, North Carolina

PROGRAM NAME: Love of Learning

YEAR IMPLEMENTED: 1987

PURPOSE: To help black students: raise their sights about their academic goals and aspirations; improve their scores on the SAT; and compete successfully for admission to, and as students in, selective colleges and universities.

The program is also intended to "inspire some of those able students to choose careers in

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

teaching, especially in the fields of mathematics, the natural sciences and the humanities."

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS: Thirty students "rising" to each grade level (9–12). Up to a total of 120 students.

SELECTION CRITERIA:

Students in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg school system. Twenty of the 30 students selected annually are academically middle-range; five are selected from the top of the class and five are selected from the bottom.

SELECTION PROCESS:

Students apply within the school district.

Program staff select students from among applicants with assistance from the school system.⁹

PROGRAM ELEMENTS:

Love of Learning consists of four components: student, parent, professional development and community resources.

The **student component** has three aspects: intellectual (math, English, science, test-taking strategies, PS AT and SAT prep); spiritual (leadership, self-discovery, responsibility, citizenship, persistence, service); and physical (individualized fitness program, a wellness module, skill development in life-sports).

The **parent component** includes parent participation in parenting skills and accessing the public school system; interviews for prospective students; programs on responsibilities for college-bound seniors, financial aid, etc.; serving as parent liaisons.

The **professional development component** consists of work to foster cooperation between college faculty and staff and secondary teachers, principals and counselors.

The **community resource component** includes work with churches as satellite stations for

parent education and the involvement of representatives of such agencies as the Urban League and Parks and Recreation.

To the extent possible, minorities are hired as faculty, counselor/mentors (college students), spiritual development leaders, etc. (as role models).

NOTES

Executive Summary

- 1 Davidson College, Lynchburg College, University of the South and Washington and Lee University.
- 2 In particular, the Fund directly supports summer programs for African American high school students at three campuses — Davidson College, University of the South and Washington and Lee University.
- 3 In preparing this report, we struggled with selecting an appropriate and accurate term for describing the students whom colleges wish to recruit, enroll and retain. The national trend has been to use the inclusive term *minority* to include African American, Hispanic, Asian and other students and, in fact, the six colleges included in this study use this term in their documents to describe the focus of their efforts. At the same time, the reality is that by *minority* these institutions almost exclusively mean African American. To more accurately reflect the reality of these programs and the students they serve, we have decided to use the term *African American* throughout the report to describe the target population of the efforts in these colleges except in those instances where the term *minority* is clearly more appropriate.
- 4 Minority student representation among the student population of Lynchburg College has steadily increased and now is 7 percent.

Opening Closed Doors, Closing Opening Doors (cont)

Chapters I-V

- 1 Several have additional graduate or professional programs but the undergraduate program dominates the mission of all institutions.
- 2 It is interesting to note that the three other institutions have majority female populations, including Lynchburg College, where 60 percent of current students are female.
- 3 Each student is required to purchase a personal computer built on a 386–chip processing platform.
- 4 To date, however, program attrition has been low across the two years of the program. Only one student did not return.
- 5 Without question, the most common programmatic method for delivering services is through a cohort approach. One of the most widely known examples of a cohort-based initiative is Upward Bound, which provides three consecutive summers of sequential basic skills classes to participants. Programs that attempt to tailor services to students over time are much rarer. Examples of this more complicated approach include a multi-program initiative in St. Louis called the Partnership for Progress Bridge Program in which students are assigned to six different program elements depending on their particular needs or interests. Another example is the Prime initiative in Phoenix in which an students are directed to an assortment of services and programs between seventh and twelfth grades based on their particular talents or particular academic support needs.
- 6 In several institutions, students invited to attend pre-orientation may not be limited to minority students but may include students from rural areas, international students, first-generation college students and students recruited from geographic areas far from campus.

Appendix

- 7 Initially, the summer program was to be two weeks long. School system officials convinced W & L that this was too long (students unsophisticated; parents hesitant to send children for that long to formally all-white campus). This proved untrue during one-week stay during summer 1991. Will become two-week program in future for all grades but twelfth. Seniors will participate in a four week program.
- 8 Of the 35 students selected each year, 30 are from the Chattanooga City School System and five are from Franklin County.
- 9 Those not selected go onto a waiting list and become the control group for research on the program. In the event of a vacancy, members of this group move into the program. The school's Office of Institutional Research is to begin tracking student progress.