ILLUSION OF INCLUSION: UNIVERSITY POLICIES THAT PERPETUATE EXCLUSION OF STUDENT OF COLOR

Emerald Templeton
University of San Francisco*

Bridget Love*

Beverly H. Davis*

Melvin Davis, Jr.*

Illusion of Inclusion: University Policies that Perpetuate Exclusion of Student of Color

Emerald Templeton
University of San Francisco*

Bridget Love*

Beverly H. Davis*

Melvin Davis, Jr.*

The purpose of this paper is to explore the policies, practices and procedures of inclusion across three universities in the San Francisco Bay Area: Stanford University, the University of San Francisco, and the University of California at Berkeley. Using a rubric which measures inclusion based on a three point set of criteria (equity, sustainability, and mission-alignment), the authors analyzed four common statements in which inclusion policies for traditionally marginalized students and students of color are contained: university mission statement, diversity program mission statement, diversity statement, and values/goals statements. The analysis revealed that although the values/goals statements align with the missions of the three institutions analyzed, there is often incongruence between the diversity program mission and diversity statements and the missions of the universities. This tension reflects the practice of institutions of higher education to draft policies that reflect inclusion language for diverse populations without making the necessary structural changes that impact values, attitudes, and practices.

Leonardo and Porter (2010) assert that college campuses are not safe places for students of color. Not comprising the critical mass of most colleges, students of color are thrust into environments that, at their core, are hostile, belittling, and undermining (Leonardo & Porter, 2010; McIntosh, 1988; Powell, 2012). Successful students are connected students. Involvement in the social scene in college has been repeatedly found to be related to increased persistence and achievement (Pascarella & Terengina,

1991). Without connection on college campuses the university's ability to retain students of color is greatly impacted.

Diversity and Inclusion Programs

A number of programs and initiatives to help further diversity and inclusion efforts throughout higher education have been implemented. These programs are instituted to fill a recruiting and retention gap of students of color and work to further student and university partnerships by recognizing and celebrating diversity. Included in this frame are recruiting and admissions policies and practice, student programs, and cultural centers (Stewart, 2011).

Generally, operating in tandem with admissions offices, diversity and inclusion programs work on a variety of levels throughout the academic year that focus on recruitment and yield efforts directed at high school students who identify with racial or ethnic groups that are most underrepresented in higher education; low-income students, and those who will be one of the first in their family to attend college. Inclusion implies that someone has been excluded at some point in time by others and prevented from full participation in a community that they desire to access (Ballard, 2013).

Although much of the current literature focusing on diversity and inclusion programs has its nexus in student retention, little focus is placed on the deteriorating campus climate resultant of policy infrastructures that maintain systems of White supremacy, power, and privilege. It is to be noted that the prevailing thought is that, along with student access to these institutions, students also require the resources and infrastructure to support their learning to maintain positive outcomes (Bensimon, 2005). Included in the overall strategy of diversity and inclusion are cultural centers, inclusion

policies, guiding principles and diversity statements, and programs that support and serve students of color campus wide. These programs refer to the variety of personal experiences, values, and worldviews that arise from differences of culture and circumstances and include race, ethnicity, gender, age, religion, language, abilities/disabilities, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, and geographic region.

Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to explore policies, practices, and procedures of inclusion across three universities in the San Francisco Bay Area: Stanford University, the University of San Francisco, and the University of California at Berkeley. These institutions were chosen due to their proximity to each other, noted prominence in higher education, and demographic similarities.

Morphew and Hartley (2006) posited that mission statements are organizational artifacts that imbue shared norms, meanings and values, and can be a factor in organizational decision-making. Drawing from a college or university's website as its source of publicly accessible rhetoric (mission and diversity statements) to evaluate its inclusion and equity intentionality is not far-fetched (Wilson, Meyer, & McNeal, 2012). College and university websites communicate a message consistent with private purposes of education – a commodity to be bought and sold, but inconsistent with those linked to public purposes – democratic equality, and social efficiency (Saichaie & Morphew, 2014).

As such, analyzing institutional commitments such as mission, diversity, and goal statements; strategic plans; and non-discrimination policies, the aim of this paper is to ascertain the inclusion policies of the institutions, how they are related to diversity, and

their impact (Guinier, 2003). Key criteria: equity, sustainability and mission alignment;
will be used alongside critical race theory to unpack existing data on student
engagement.

Theoretical Frame

Bonilla-Silva (2010) asserted that "race continues to be a significant factor in
determining inequality in the United States" (Bonilla-Silva, 2010, p. 48). These authors
laid the foundation for Critical Race Theory (CRT) in education using it as an analytic
tool for understanding school inequity. In 1998, D. Solorzano followed using CRT to
address racial microaggressions and campus racial climate. In 1999, Ladson-Billings
added to the body of knowledge by examining curriculum, instruction, assessment,
school funding and desegregation using CRT as a lens. Solorzano, Ceja, and Yosso
(2000) assert that CRT can be used to address racial microaggressions and campus
racial climate. In 2005, Solorzano, Villalpando, and Oseguera used CRT as a
framework to analyze the educational inequities and barriers for Latino (a) college
students while; in the same year, Teranishi (2002) used CRT to examine the racial
climate for Asian Pacific Americans. This study employs CRT to examine the tone that
diversity and inclusion policies set for the campus racial climate.

Critical Race Theory "distinguishes the consciousness of racial minorities and
acknowledges the feelings and intangible modes of perception unique to those who
have historically been socially, structurally, and intellectually marginalized in the United
States" (Barnes, 1990, p. 1894). By using this frame, Whiteness, power and privilege
are annexed, and the marginalized are empowered to be a part of the discussion.
Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) applied CRT to education research in order to identify

how race influences behaviors, systems, and relationships within education structures. CRT allows there to be a lens through which to name educational atrocities. By naming them, CRT proponents have the opportunity to fight oppressive systems. Analysis of the intentionality of university statements through CRT on or around diversity and inclusion; ownership can be placed where it belongs instead of being projected onto already marginalized groups as their sole responsibility to create change.

More specifically, Critical Race theorists recognize that the experiential knowledge of people of color is essential in understanding how race influences education (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004). In fact, Delgado and Stefancic (2001) identify that--

> racism is endemic in U.S. society. It is deeply ingrained legally, culturally, and psychologically and reinforces traditional ways of thinking and being, which omit the experiences of people of color" and, as a result, advocate that "narrative research in education be utilized to prove comparable insights into the education system. (p. 235)

Often this type of narrative inquiry is omitted in diversity and inclusion policies except when the interest of the university converges with that of the marginalized group. CRT is a necessary framework to give voice to groups that have been repeatedly marginalized in educational settings. Stanford University, University of California at Berkeley, and University of San Francisco (all west coast universities, physically situated in a multicultural region) are thought to be more racially diverse, equitable and inclusive than their Ivy League counterparts (Harvard, Yale, Columbia and Rutgers). Therefore, it was incumbent upon the researchers to explore the diversity and inclusion policies of these institutions. Policies are biometrics that permit insight into the nature of schools who have historically demonstrated a commitment to diversity, social justice, and political grassroots movements.

Diversity Programs

According to Clark (2011), "Diversity in educational settings is generally understood as the body of services and programs offered to students, faculty, and staff that seek to ensure compliance with non-discrimination and related policy and law" (p. 57). Compliance may come in the form of a Diversity Office(r), new mission or inclusion statements, and/or the creation of diversity-related programs (i.e. cultural centers). A cultural center is an organization, building or complex that promotes culture and arts of or relating to a particular group of people and their habits, beliefs, tradition; these all-encompassing facilities cater to the needs of historically marginalized students. It is part of a diversity platform many universities are using to increase a global perspective and exchange of ideas on today's college campuses.

As a centrifuge for all that encompasses diversity, cultural centers embody the university's perspective on inclusion. The partitioning of a space dedicated to a particular culture, or grouping of cultures, has been a common response to the need for the representation and recognition of marginalized identities at the university. In contrast, "merging individual culture centers to bring underrepresented groups under one roof has the potential to undermine the rich history that each of these groups brings to the campus" (Patton, 2006, p. 642). However, the annexation of programs like cultural centers without structural and policy support can digress the mission of inclusion while leading to exclusion (Strange & Banning, 2001). Lacking are comprehensive reviews of university policies and procedures that may conflict with non-discrimination and inclusion clauses. With the emergence of diversity initiatives on university campuses, Clark (2011) contended that diversity is relegated to funding and

increasing racial/ethnic demographics, and further, the responsibility for managing issues of diversity has been unduly placed on cultural centers (Patton, 2010).

Patton (2006; 2010) argued that the creation of cultural centers can burgeon a sense of separation seemingly leading to exclusion; however, the community developed can be a launchpad for greater sense of belonging in the university as a whole. It is evidenced that first year students who are involved and integrated into the college community have greater outcomes than those who do not (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). Separate centers for minoritized and marginalized students on university campuses provide a space in which they can find support from others with shared experiences. Without motive towards exclusion, the purpose of cultural centers is to make room for students to feel a part of the university. In a mechanizing fashion, Lyke (2013) pointed out that "from a legal property regime perspective, diversity is as common because there are a number of members who have a legal shared right to its use," (p. 331). Interpreting diversity as property, university policy makers can misconstrue the establishment of cultural centers as a violation of other individuals' rights to accessing diversity, and thus establish campus procedures that negate the intention of inclusion for minoritized and marginalized students. As noted by Taylor (2000) "for multiculturalism to reassert its relevance, it must openly identify oppression and struggle against it more explicitly. How? By keeping race at the center of its agenda'' (p. 540).

Diversity and Inclusion Policies

Lyke (2013) asserts that diversity is situated in a "commons framework" where membership is shared and therefore difficult to assign to any one group without

controversy. As such, each institution defines and maintains their own ideology around diversity and inclusion within the "commons" frame. Each institution highlights their ideological frames as evidenced in their university mission, diversity program mission, diversity statement, and values and goals of each institution. For the purposes of this study, we evaluated the following guiding policies on diversity and inclusion as listed on the respective institutional websites:

- University of California at Berkeley (2016): University Mission Statement, Division of Equity and Inclusion Program Mission, Diversity Statement, and Principles of Community

- University of San Francisco (2016): University Mission Statement, Office of Diversity Engagement and Community Outreach Program Mission, USF Inclusion Statement, and Values and Goals Statement

- Stanford University (2016): University Mission Statement, Diversity and Access Office Program Mission, Title VI of Civil Rights Act of 1964, and Values and Goals Statement.

Evaluation Criteria

Equity

According to a report released by the Pell Institute for the Study in Higher Education (Cahalan & Perna, 2015), equal opportunity is a core commitment and the right of each citizen. The first official mission of the U.S. Department of Education was to ensure equal educational access to all aspirants. Kimberle Crenshaw (2010) explains that equality cannot be achieved for the historically marginalized (persons of color) until the starting point for all aspirants is made level and equitable.

Literature has acknowledged that more Black and Hispanic students are going on to higher education but not to selective institutions (Harris & Wood, 2013; Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014). Top-tier colleges/universities enroll mostly predominantly White students, while even well qualified Black and Hispanic students largely attend open-access institutions that see lower numbers of students graduate. To provide equitable inclusion in the admissions process, the federal government implemented a trio of programs to better prepare lower socioeconomic and minority students for higher education to include the Upward Bound program, Educational Talent Search, and Student Support Services. All of these programs sprang from the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 as a part of the plethora of programs which rose from civil rights legislation (Ward, 2006).

Sustainability

Evaluating campus climates can be extremely useful in understanding an institution's values and norms as reflected by the programs, policies, and practices supported. According to the Campus Climate Network Group (2002), university culture is a set of behaviors that affect the learning environment and influence whether an individual feels personally safe, listened to, valued, treated fairly or respected and impacts the institution's overall ability to retain students. Although many campus administrators believe that it is solely the role of staff in the multicultural student centers to address the issues and concerns of students of color, evidence to the contrary exists that this is not the only place that establishes a positive campus climate for all students (Patton, 2010).

What makes a campus climate sustainable as it relates to diversity and inclusion programs? Bensimon (2005), Willingham (2003), and MacMaster (2013) believe that characteristics that could cause groups or individuals to be systematically excluded from full participation in higher education, including age, disability, gender, race/ethnicity, religion/spiritual tradition, sexual orientation, job status or socioeconomic class, personal appearance, and political beliefs are not sustainable.

Berg and Huang (2004) define a model for Sustainable Student Retention using three criteria: Student Retention, Attrition, and Persistence. Student retention is continued student participation in a learning event to completion, which in higher education could be a course, program, institution, or system. Attrition is a decline in the number of students from the beginning to the end of the course, program, institution, or system under review. Persistence is the result of students' decisions to continue their participation in the learning event under analysis.

Nguyen, Bibo, and Engle (2012) outline successful strategies to encourage retention and graduation outcomes for minority students at those universities that drive towards high rates.   Graduation rates are used as the outcome based measurement tool. Two points are measured: (1) actual graduation rates for Black students; (2) gaps closed in graduation rates between white students and black students.

Mission Alignment

The mission statement of an institution of higher learning is a window to the true soul of the college. The online Business Dictionary (2015) defines a mission statement as a written declaration of an organization's core purpose and focus that remains unchanged over time and communicates a sense of intended direction to the internal

organization and external entities. Meacham and Barrett (2003) state that the mission statement is the enumeration of a campus' strategic priorities and values. The university mission statement not only guides the current functioning of the institution but guides planning for marketing and can be looked at to determine the realistic tone that can be expected from future students (Stober, 1997).

In this highly technical, digital and virtual era, college seekers use the internet to access a school prior to ever stepping foot on the campus: "Websites are, after all, a primary means by which students search for a college or university to attend" (Saichaie & Morphew, 2014, p. 523). As part of the college search process, the layout and content of college and university sites play an important role in communicating with prospective students and parents (Saichaie & Morphew, 2014). A quick way to determine the level of investment in students of color is to review the college website. A cursory look at the mission statement page of the website should reveal information and services in interest of underrepresented and minoritized students. With details about services to underrepresented students not easily accessible from the primary web pages, the number of "clicks" it takes to find the information is a clear indication of its importance. Another indicator of investment is to determine if the presentation of students of color on the website is proportionate to the number of students of color enrolled at an institution (Wilson, Meyer, & McNeal, 2012). All three criteria (equity, sustainability, and mission alignment) are found in programs that are deemed successful.

Review of the Literature

The literature on diversity and inclusion in higher education is riddled with instances of reaction, rather than proaction, to issues that may arise within diverse environments. Universities have relied upon diversity offices and cultural centers to lead and manage the charge for increasing diversity and creating inclusive climates on campus. However, working within diversity and creating an inclusive environment involves all institutional actors and often requires a critical view of an organization's infrastructure. According to Clark (2011), chief diversity officers, often leading the diversity charge, have been relegated to "the very elementary, yet exceedingly complex, numbers game: demographics and dollars" (p. 57). Further, Clark (2011) implies that the lack of definition for diversity may be the culprit for the lack of inclusion:

> Diversity in educational settings is generally understood as the body of services and programs offered to students, faculty, and staff that seek to ensure compliance with non-discrimination and related policy and law, and to affirm social membership group differences (broadly considered) in curricular, co-curricular, and workplace contexts. (p. 57)

Inclusion policies which are reactionary tend to serve the needs of the institution rather than the students, for whom they were intended. Clark (2011) posited that institutions which only view diversity and inclusion as words in the mission statement, or as a dedicated office, tend to experience failure. Congruently, White, Louis, Persky, Howell, Griffin, Simmons-Yon, and Scolaro (2013) commented that "Some of the greatest challenges to achieving diversity and inclusion in higher education are lack of institutional leadership and diverse faculty and administration to model cultural differences and mentor students" (p. 2).

Fink and Hummel (2015) reported that "institutional practices, not student deficits, are responsible for the educational success of all students" (p. 30). With

diversity seen as a benefit and resource on college campuses, the concept of inclusion has been a matter of much discussion and great concern. The remnants of segregated college campuses continue to impact institutional climates in the area of racial/ethnic diversity. In depiction of this, Hurtado, Clayton-Pedersen, Allen and Milem (1998) reported, ''The best example is resistance to desegregation in communities and specific campus settings, the maintenance of old campus policies at [predominantly] White institutions that best serve a homogeneous population, and attitudes and behaviors that prevent interaction across race and ethnicity'' (p. 283). Patton (2010) contended that instituting new practices which demonstrate an appreciation for cultural diversity while promoting inclusion is necessary:

> It is important that as cultural practitioners, staff take seriously their role to educate and replicate cultural practices on college campuses. It is important not only to provide these opportunities, but to also ensure that they are authentic, deeply engaging, and institutionally impactful. Too often the institution relies on the outdated practice of depending on students to provide all cultural programs on campus. (p. 148)

There is a gap in research on inclusive policy structures. Built into the very fabric of our society are cultural values and habits which support the oppression of some persons and groups of people by other persons and groups. These systems take on many forms, but they all have essentially the same structure. If we are to effectively end the oppression, we have to understand the factors which maintain the systems themselves and address the things we do to support the maintenance of those systems. Most, if not all, of the current literature on diversity and inclusion in higher education focuses on pedagogical standards, student activities, and faculty-student relationship. Systems of oppression are not covered in the literature but are maintained by the dominate narrative often found in the form of policies.

Inclusion Policy Analysis

In defining inclusion, we drew from the economics sector to get a broader depiction of inclusion and its worth. Demographic diversity has served as an economic benefit and resource to institutions of higher education due to the prospect of innovation, cross-cultural understanding, and an expanded worldview (Clark, 2011; Lyke, 2013). As such, efforts have centered on recruitment and retention that bolster the inclusion of traditionally marginalized and minoritized populations.

Dev (2006) defined inclusion in terms of financial practices within banking institutions, reporting the large disparities between formalized organizations who can get credit and low-income rural organizations who are ineligible for credit but fall prey to high interest rates and indebtedness. Dev (2006) described that inclusion in economic terms means providing banking services to the disadvantaged at affordable rates. Although the lending of credit will not solve everything, it will provide access for the marginalized to systems in which they are typically excluded (Dev, 2006). Not only is inclusion a good business practice and a matter of social responsibility, it has proven important for the stability of financial institutions.

Like Dev (2006), many others see inclusion of the marginalized and disenfranchised as a socioeconomic resource (Clark, 2011; Lyke, 2013; Patton, 2010). Promoting diversity as a source of innovation, cultural understanding, and citizenship, institutions of higher education have incorporated diversity programming and inclusion language into various protocols. Demographic diversity numbers have become an important factor in determining if a college campus is diversity-friendly. Diversity

language in institutional statements, such as the mission, are additionally considered to represent the state of campus inclusion.

Inclusion Scoring Rubric

The Universities' inclusion and equity policies were blindly coded by 4 coders (see *Table 1*). All coders were instructed to award a (1) one to statements that provided wording consistent with the previously provided definitions of equity, sustainability and mission alignment. Contrarily, coders were instructed to award a (0) zero to statements that did not contain these elements.

Table 1.
Inclusion scoring rubric.

Criteria	Score	
	0	1
Equity: indicates a focus on fairness of outcomes **Sustainability**: indicates ongoing support and the ability to be replicated **Mission-aligned**: indicates parity with and fulfillment of stated purpose and goals of the institution	Little or no indication of criteria met.	Clear indication of criteria met.

For columns 1, 2, 3, 5, and 12 in the Coding Output Table the agreement is 100%, which represents perfect inter-rater reliability (see *Table 2*). In viewing the diversity statements through a CRT lens, the data indicates that Whiteness, power and privilege have not been annexed. Persons of color at these schools are continuing to be marginalized by policies that are not equitable, sustainable or mission aligned.

Coders	Equity - indicates a focus on fairness of outcomes				Sustainable - indicates ongoing support and the ability to be replicated				Mission-Aligned - indicates parity with and fulfillment of stated purpose and goals of the institution			
	University Mission 1	Diversity Program Mission 2	Diversity Statement 3	Values /Goals 4	University Mission 5	Diversity Program Mission 6	Diversity Statement 7	Value Goals 8	University Mission 9	Diversity Program Mission 10	Diversity Statement 11	Values /Goals 12
1	UCB: 0 USF: 0 S: 0	UCB:1 USF:1 S:1	UCB:1 USF:1 S:1	UCB:1 USF:1 S:1	UCB:1 USF:1 S: 0	UCB:1 USF: 0 S: 0	UCB:1 USF:1 S: 0	UCB: 0 USF:1 S: 0		UCB: 0 USF: 0 S: 0	UCB: 0 USF:1 S: 0	UCB:1 USF:1 S:1
2	UCB: 0 USF: 0 S: 0	UCB:1 USF:1 S:1	UCB:1 USF:1 S:1	UCB:1 USF:1 S: 0	UCB:1 USF:1 S: 0	UCB:1 USF:1 S: 0	UCB:1 USF: 0 S:1	UCB:1 USF:1 S: 0		UCB: 0 USF1: S: 0	UCB:1 USF:1 S: 0	UCB:1 USF:1 S:1
3	UCB: 0 USF: 0 S: 0	UCB: 1 USF: 1 S: 1	UCB: 1 USF: 1 S: 1	UCB:1 USF:1 S: 0	UCB:1 USF:1 S: 0	UCB:1 USF:1 S:1	UCB:1 USF: 0 S: 0	UCB:1 USF:1 S: 0		UCB: 0 USF:1 S: 0	UCB:1 USF:1 S:1	UCB:1 USF:1 S:1
4	UCB: 0 USF: 0 S: 0	UCB: 1 USF: 1 S: 1	UCB: 1 USF:1 S: 1	UCB:1 USF:1 S: 0	UCB:1 USF:1 S: 0	UCB:1 USF:1 S: 1	UCB:1 USF: 1 S: 1	UCB:1 USF:1 S: 0		UCB:1 USF:1 S: 1	UCB:1 USF: 1 S: 1	UCB:1 USF:1 S: 1

Table 2.
Coding Output Table

The codes in the remaining columns 4, 6, 7, 8, 9 (grayed out), 10 and 11, were entered into an online utility that computes inter-coder/inter-rater reliability coefficients for nominal data coded by three or more coders: Reliability Calculator for 3 or more coders (ReCal3). The data from this study met the requirements and assumptions of the ReCal3 test: the data was nominal, each file represented multiple coders working on a single variable, each column represented a single coder's work on one variable, each row represented a single unit of analysis, and all codes were represented numerically. The input file was formatted properly and all columns contained the same number of units of analysis with no missing data.

The results indicated a high percentage of agreement among raters based on the total number of potential agreements. There was an agreement of 83.33% across

codes for Equity illustrated in the Values/Goals statements for each of the three institutions (see *Figure 1*). Similarly, reliable is the percentage of agreement (75%) across the codes for Sustainability illustrated in the Diversity Program Missions (see *Figure 7*) and Values/Goals (see *Figure 4*) statements, and the codes for Mission Alignment illustrated in the Diversity Statements (see *Figure 6*). The consistency of agreement was not as reliable in the areas of Sustainability for Diversity Statements (coders agreed only 66.67% of the time; see *Figure 3*) and Mission Alignment for Diversity Program Missions (coders agreed only 50% of the time; see *Figure 7*) which may be influenced by the number of cases rated as well as the varying definitions of Mission Statements.

The coders determined that the criterion, Equity, was not met for three sets of University Mission statements because there was no indication of fairness of outcomes (see *Table 3*). Comparatively, each university structured their institutional mission statement differently, and in some cases it was difficult to locate a statement clearly defined as the Mission. Often, institutions use mission statements as the defining guide for policies and practices; however, without clarity of what is included in this type of statement or even how to access it, there is little expectation for a demonstration of equity. Interestingly, although the criterion Equity was not determined for the University Missions statements, there was a high indication of Equity illustrated in the Diversity Program Missions, Diversity Statements, and Values/Goals at each institution. The lack of parity between the University Mission statement and the other statements may be indicative of a lack of institutional cohesion and alignment.

The codes from the Sustainability scale indicate some variation between University of California at Berkeley, the University of San Francisco, and Stanford University. Both Mission Statements from University of California at Berkeley and the University of San Francisco included clear indications of ongoing support for their program; however, there was no indication of ongoing support or the ability for replication in Stanford University's Mission Statement. The Diversity Program Missions, Diversity Statements, and the Values/Goals were frequently rated as sustainable with some variance for the University of San Francisco and Stanford. In many cases, Stanford University statements did not meet the criteria for the Sustainability scale.

Table 3.
University Mission Statements

University of California, Berkeley (2016)	University of San Francisco (2016)	Stanford University (2016)
The distinctive mission of the University is to serve society as a center of higher learning, providing long-term societal benefits through transmitting advanced knowledge, discovering new knowledge, and functioning as an active working repository of organized knowledge. That obligation, more specifically, includes undergraduate education, graduate and professional education, research, and other kinds of public service, which are shaped and bounded by the central pervasive mission of discovering and advancing knowledge. The University's fundamental missions are teaching, research and public service.	The core mission of the university is to promote learning in the Jesuit Catholic tradition. The university offers undergraduate, graduate, and professional students the knowledge and skills needed to succeed as persons and professionals, and the values and sensitivity necessary to be men and women for others. The university will distinguish itself as a diverse, socially responsible learning community of high quality scholarship and academic rigor sustained by a faith that does justice. The university will draw from the cultural, intellectual, and economic resources of the San Francisco Bay Area and its location on the Pacific Rim to enrich and strengthen its educational programs.	And its purposes, to promote the public welfare by exercising an influence in behalf of humanity and civilization, teaching the blessings of liberty regulated by law, and inculcating love and reverence for the great principles of government as derived from the inalienable rights of man to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The most variance in codes was present in the Mission Alignment scale for

Diversity Program Mission statements across the three universities. Most coders

indicated a lack of parity between the Diversity Program Mission and the University

Mission statements for University of California, Berkeley and Stanford University, while

indicating parity between the Diversity Program Mission and the University Mission

statements at the University of San Francisco. There was complete agreement that the

Values/Goals of each institution indicated parity with the University Mission statements.

In summation, the coding process revealed three main areas of consideration for

the conversation about inclusivity. The Values/Goals of each institution are aligned with

the Universities' Mission Statements although the Mission Statements aren't indicative

of Equity. The Mission and Diversity Program Mission statements were often in

contention, not demonstrating alignment. Additionally, there was a consistent intimation

of sustainability, alluding to ongoing support of university programs, policies, and

practices for which the various statements represent.

ReCal 0.1 Alpha for 3+ Coders
results for file "ET_E_VG.csv"

	File size:	27 bytes
	N coders:	4
	N cases:	3
	N decisions:	12

Average Pairwise Percent Agreement

Average pairwise percent agr.	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 1 & 4	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 1 & 3	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 1 & 2	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 2 & 4	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 2 & 3	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 3 & 4
83.333%	66.667%	66.667%	66.667%	100%	100%	100%

Figure 1. Values/Goals- Equity

ReCal 0.1 Alpha for 3+ Coders
results for file "ET_E_VG.csv"

	File size:	27 bytes
	N coders:	4
	N cases:	3
	N decisions:	12

Average Pairwise Percent Agreement

Average pairwise percent agr.	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 1 & 4	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 1 & 3	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 1 & 2	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 2 & 4	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 2 & 3	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 3 & 4
83.333%	66.667%	66.667%	66.667%	100%	100%	100%

Figure 2. Diversity Program Mission- Sustainability

ReCal 0.1 Alpha for 3+ Coders
results for file "Results 6.csv"

	File size:	18 bytes
	N coders:	4
	N cases:	2
	N decisions:	8

Average Pairwise Percent Agreement

Average pairwise percent agr.	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 1 & 4	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 1 & 3	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 1 & 2	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 2 & 4	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 2 & 3	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 3 & 4
75%	50%	50%	50%	100%	100%	100%

Figure 3. Diversity Statement- Sustainability

ReCal 0.1 Alpha for 3+ Coders
results for file "Results 7.csv"

File size:	18 bytes
N coders:	4
N cases:	2
N decisions:	8

Average Pairwise Percent Agreement

Average pairwise percent agr.	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 1 & 4	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 1 & 3	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 1 & 2	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 2 & 4	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 2 & 3	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 3 & 4
66.667%	100%	50%	50%	50%	100%	50%

Figure 4. Values/Goals - Sustainability

ReCal 0.1 Alpha for 3+ Coders
results for file "Results 8.csv"

File size:	18 bytes
N coders:	4
N cases:	2
N decisions:	8

Average Pairwise Percent Agreement

Average pairwise percent agr.	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 1 & 4	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 1 & 3	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 1 & 2	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 2 & 4	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 2 & 3	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 3 & 4
75%	50%	50%	50%	100%	100%	100%

Figure 5. Diversity Program Mission - Mission Alignment

ReCal 0.1 Alpha for 3+ Coders
results for file "Results 10.csv"

File size:	18 bytes					
N coders:	4					
N cases:	2					
N decisions:	8					

Average Pairwise Percent Agreement

Average pairwise percent agr.	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 1 & 4	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 1 & 3	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 1 & 2	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 2 & 4	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 2 & 3	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 3 & 4
50%	0%	50%	50%	50%	100%	50%

Figure 6. Diversity Statement - Mission Alignment

ReCal 0.1 Alpha for 3+ Coders
results for file "Results 11.csv"

File size:	18 bytes					
N coders:	4					
N cases:	2					
N decisions:	8					

Average Pairwise Percent Agreement

Average pairwise percent agr.	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 1 & 4	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 1 & 3	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 1 & 2	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 2 & 4	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 2 & 3	Pairwise pct. agr. cols 3 & 4
75%	50%	50%	50%	100%	100%	100%

Figure 7. Diversity Program Mission - Mission Alignment

Implications

An evaluation of common institutional statements such as the University Mission, Diversity Program Mission, Diversity Statement, and Values/Goals has implications for inclusion policies and practices on university campuses. In review of these guiding policies, there was a lack of focus on fairness of outcomes in the University Mission Statements across the three institutions analyzed. With the alignment between these institutions' Values/Goals and their Mission Statements, there is an indication that

equitable policies and practices are not a focus of the institutional charge. Further, the high inference of sustainability across the various statements implicates ongoing support and the ability for replication of the programs in their current state. This means that institutions may be continuing to provide financial support for policies and practices which are inequitable. The incongruence between the University Missions and Diversity Program Mission statements is an additional indicator of misalignment which may have implications for funding and the retention of programs that support equitable and inclusive policies and practices.

An analysis of statements of inclusion also has implications for institutional change and campus climate. In an effort to mediate issues of inequity and exclusion, some institutions may be coerced into changing institutional statements to reflect more inclusive language without changing the practices, thoughts, and attitudes of institutional actors. Others may mimic the implementation of inclusion statements to avoid issues while still failing to dismantle practices that perpetuate inequities. These actions impact how change is perceived and have serious implications for the recruitment and retention of minoritized students and students of color. A return to the conversation about demographics and dollars, equity and inclusion must go beyond simply writing institutional statements to shifting priorities, values, and goals.

Considerations and Recommendations

Bensimon (2005) stressed the importance of individual participation in creating more inclusive environments on college campuses for students of color: "Institutional actors are more likely to view diversity as a generalized characteristic of institutions and be blind to the particular circumstances of the racial and ethnic groups that constitute

diversity" (p. 100). It may be useful to explore the perceptions of diversity and inclusion held by institutional actors (i.e. students, staff, faculty, administrators) to understand their values and, thus, the impact on campus climate. Further research must be conducted about diversity issues which may arise related to the implementation of inclusion policies and practices, or the lack thereof. The analysis conducted for the purposes of this paper covered a relatively small area of policy review related to issues of inclusion. Admittedly, the small sample size in our analysis may pose difficulty in generalizing the findings; however, this presents an opportunity to explore inclusion policies on a larger scale. There is much more ground to cover related to campus climate, practices of racism and bias, and other issues of equity.

Although this study focused on three Bay Area universities (UC Berkeley, University of San Francisco, and Stanford University) and only a subdivision of their policies, other institutions would benefit from conducting similar studies. Further, an exploration of specific policy decisions such as the passing of the California Affirmative Action Proposition 209 will open the door for conversations about the impact of state sanctioned policies on issues of inclusion and equity in higher education institutions. With the rise of incidents of intolerance captured in the media around issues of race and racism in educational settings, studies like this are a starting point to assess language that may promote or condone inequity. In so doing, universities gain the opportunity to decenter Whiteness, truly giving voice to a changing demographic which is no longer content to remain in the margins or be excluded from conversations and decisions that affect the lives of people of color.

References

Barnes, R. D., (1990). Race consciousness: The thematic content of racial distinctiveness in critical race scholarship. *Harvard Law Review*, 103, 1864-1871.

Bensimon, E. M. (2005). Closing the achievement gap in higher education: An organizational Learning perspective. *New Directions For Higher Education*, (131), 99-111.

Berge, Z. L., & Huang, Y. (2004). A Model for Sustainable Student Retention: A Holistic Perspective on the Student Dropout Problem with Special Attention to e-Learning. *DEOSNEWS* , *13*(5), 1-26.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2010). *Racism without Racist: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Campus Climate Network Group. (2002). *What is campus climate*. University of Wisconsin.

Cahalan, M., & Perna, L. W. (2015). Indicators of Higher Education Equity in the United States. Washington, DC: The Pell Institute and Penn AHEAD.

Center for Community College Student Engagement. (2014) *Aspirations to achievement: Men of color and community colleges (A special report from the Center for Community College Student Engagement).* Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Program in Higher Education Leadership.

Clark, C. (2011). Diversity Initiatives in Higher Education: Just How Important "Is" Diversity in Higher Education? *Multicultural Education*, *19*(3), 57-59.

Crenshaw, K. (2010). *Unequal Opportunity Race.* [Video]. Retrieved December 9, 2015, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eBb5TgOXgNY

DeCuir, J. T., & Dixson, A. D. (2004). "So when it comes out, they aren't that surprised that it is there": Using critical race theory as a tool of analysis of race and racism in education. *Educational Researchers*, 33(5), 26-37.

Delgado, R., & Stefanic, J. (2001). *Critical race theory: An introduction*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Dev, S. M. (2006). Financial inclusion: Issues and challenges. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 41(41), 4310-4313.

Fink, J. E., & Hummel, M. L. (2015). With educational benefits for all: Campus inclusion through learning communities designed for underserved student populations. *New Directions For Student Services*, 2015(149), 29-40.

Guinier, L. (2003). Admissions rituals as political acts: Guardians at the gates of our democratic ideals. *Harvard Law Review*, 117(113).

Harris, F. III, & Wood, J. L. (2013). Student success for men of color in community colleges: A review of published literature and research, 1998-2012. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 6*(3), 174-185.

Hurtado, S., Clayton-Pedersen, A. R., Allen, W. R., & Milem, J. F. (1998). Enhancing Campus Climates for racial/ethnic diversity: Educational policy and practice. *The Review of Higher Education*, 21, 279–302.

Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record*, 97(1), 47-68.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1999). Just what is critical race theory, and what's it doing in a nice field like education? In L. Parker D. Deyhle, & S. Villenas (Eds.), *Race is... race isn't: Critical race theory and qualitative studies in education* (pp. 7-30). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Leonardo, Z., & Porter, R. K. (2010). Pedagogy of fear: toward a Fanonian theory of "safety" in race dialogue. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *13*(2), 139–157.

Lyke, S. (2013). Diversity as Commons. *Tulane Law Review*, 88(2), 317-367.

McIntosh, P. (1988). "White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack." *Independent School, 49*(2), 31-36.

Meacham, J., & Barrett, C. (2003). Commitment to diversity in institutional mission statements. *Diversity Digest, 7*(1,2), 6–9.

Morphew, C. C., & Hartley, M. (2006). Mission Statements: A Thematic Analysis of Rhetoric Across Institutional Type. *Journal of Higher Education, 77*(3), 456-471.

Nguyen, M., Bibo, E. W., & Engle, J. (2012). *Advancing to completion: Increasing degree attainment by improving graduation rates and closing gaps for African-American students.* The Education Trust. Retrieved from: http://edtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/Advancing_AfAm.pdf

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Patton, L. D. (2010). *Culture Centers in Higher Education: Perspectives on Identity, Theory, and Practice*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Patton, L. D. (2006). The Voice of Reason: A Qualitative Examination of Black Student Perceptions of Black Culture Centers. *Journal of College Student Development*, 47(6), 628-646.

Powell, J. (2012). *Interrogating Privilege: Transforming Whiteness in racing to justice: Transforming our Conceptions of Self and Other to Build An Inclusive Society*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Saichaie, K., & Morphew, C. C. (2014). What college and university websites reveal about the purposes of higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, *85*(4), 499-530.

Solorzano, D. G. (1998). Critical race theory, racial and gender microaggressions, and the experiences of Chicana and Chicano scholars." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11(1), 121-136,

Solorzano, D. G., Ceja, M., & Yosso, T. (2000). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate: The experiences of African American college students. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 69(1/2), 60-73.

Solorzano, D. G., Villalpando, O., & Oseguera, L. (2005). Educational inequities and Latina/o undergraduate students in the United States: A critical race analysis of their educational progress. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 4*(3), 272-294.

Stanford University. (2016). *Diversity and Access Office.* Retrieved from: https://diversityandaccess.stanford.edu/

Stewart, D. L. (2011). *Multicultural Student Services on Campus: Building Bridges, Re-visioning Community*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Stober, S.S. (1997). A content analysis of college and university mission statements. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, (UMI No. 9813554).

Strange, C. C., & Banning, J. H. (2001). *Educating by design: Creating campus learning environments that work*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Taylor, E. (2000). Critical race theory and interest convergence in the backlash against affirmative action: Washington State and Initiative 200. *Teachers College Record, 102,* 529-560.

Teranishi, R. T. (2002). Asian Pacific Americans and critical race theory: An examination of school racial climate. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 35(2), 144-54.

University of California at Berkeley. (2016). *Division of equity & inclusion*. Retrieved from: http://diversity.berkeley.edu/principles-community

University of San Francisco. (2016). *Diversity engagement and community outreach: Diversity is at the heart of who we are.* Retrieved from: https://www.usfca.edu/diversity

Ward, N. L. (2006). Improving equity and access for low income and minority youth into institutions of higher education. *Urban Education,* 41(1), 50-70.

White, C., Louis, B., Persky, A., Howell, D., Griffin, L., Simmons-Yon, A., & Scolaro, K. (2013). Institutional strategies to achieve diversity and inclusion in pharmacy education. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 77(5), 1-8.

Willingham, D.T. (2003). How we learn: Ask the cognitive scientist. Students remember...what they think about. *American Educator, 27*(2), 37-41.

Wilson, J., Meyer, K., & McNeal, L. (2012). Mission and diversity statements: What they do and do not say. *Innovative Higher Education, 37*(2), 125-139.