



ILLUSTRATION BY JOHN S. DYKES/IMAGES.COM

THE

BY ESTELA MARA BENSIMON

diversity

SCORECARD

A Learning Approach to Institutional Change

The “Diversity Scorecard” is an ongoing initiative designed to foster institutional change in higher education by helping to close the achievement gap for historically underrepresented students. The idea for the Diversity Scorecard emerged in 2001 when it became evident that equity, while valued in principle at many institutions, is not regularly measured in relation to educational outcomes for specific groups of students.

Developed by the Center for Urban Education in the Rossier School of Education at the University of Southern California (USC) with grants underwritten by The James Irvine Foundation, the Diversity Scorecard’s core premise is that evidence about the state of equity in educational outcomes for underrepresented students presented in the form of graphically displayed quantitative data can have a powerful effect in mobilizing institutional attention and action.

This increased recognition of the existence and scope of inequities for students of color among faculty members, administrators, and counselors has been found to motivate them to take action in ways few other approaches can. Although confined in this instance to diversity, the same basic approach can be applied to almost any issue that an institution wants to tackle, so long as basic data are available. The Diversity Scorecard has been field-tested in 14 institutions in the Los Angeles metropolitan area since 2001 and it will continue to be refined through 2005.

Estela Mara Bensimon is professor of higher education and director of the Center for Urban Education at the University of Southern California’s Rossier School of Education. The author would like to thank all the dedicated team members at each of the 14 project institutions for their work toward the success of the Diversity Scorecard project. She retains the copyright for this article.

WHAT'S MISSING

An institution's success (or failure) in reducing educational inequities—conditions that severely restrict opportunity and upward mobility for students of color—is rarely used as an explicit measure of its effectiveness. Nor are institutions ranked or graded by the media or external authorities on the basis of equity in educational outcomes. Yet intra-institutional stratification based on race and ethnicity is a reality at most of the nation's colleges and universities. This is true whether the institutions are highly selective and predominantly white, are open-access with a heterogeneous student population, or are classified as Hispanic-serving. But the details of this intra-institutional stratification remain largely invisible to the campus community because equity in educational outcomes is not tracked continuously.

Many institutions obsessively notice even minor fluctuations in their average SAT scores for entering freshmen, but they rarely are aware of the proportion of underrepresented students who do or do not earn GPAs at a level that qualifies them for admission to selective PhD programs. Equity of outcomes also rarely shows up on the list of indicators used in state- or national-level higher education report cards. It also is frequently missing from state accountability requirements. And while the concept of equity is implicitly reflected in the standards of most accrediting organizations, none of them requires institutions to report statistics about students of color beyond numbers admitted or enrolled.

It is said that what gets measured gets noticed. While celebrating ethnic and racial diversity on our campuses is

laudable, it is not the same thing as achieving equity. We must deliberately and energetically remove the conditions that deny or impede equitable outcomes for all students. The Diversity Scorecard is a tool and a process to help campuses assess their effectiveness in providing historically underrepresented students with the credentials they will need to gain economic, social, and political power.

THE DIVERSITY SCORECARD AS AN APPROACH TO INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE

The Diversity Scorecard's Model of Institutional Change. In order to bring about change in an institution, individuals must see, on their own, and as clearly as possible, the magnitude of inequities (*awareness*). They then must analyze and integrate the meaning of these inequities (*interpretation*), so that they are moved to act upon them (*action*).

To get started we asked the presidents of the 14 participating institutions (see box) to appoint a group of people to work with us, and specified that one of them should be a staff member from the Office of Institutional Research. The 14 teams had different compositions, but included deans, vice presidents, counselors, and assistants to the president—as well as faculty members in disciplines such as English, philosophy, psychology, ethnic studies, and mathematics. We called them “evidence teams” because their basic role in the project was to hold a mirror up to an institution that reflected clearly and unambiguously the status of underrepresented students with respect to basic educational outcomes.

To develop and intensify awareness among evidence team members, we in-



involved them directly in creating equity measures and benchmarks. We started this task by developing a framework for institutional self-assessment that we called the “Diversity Scorecard,” based on Kaplan and Norton’s balanced scorecard for business, and the academic scorecard for higher education (see Harold F. O’Neil, Estela M. Bensimon, Michael A. Diamond and Michael R. Moore’s “Designing and Implementing an Academic Scorecard,” *Change*, November/December 1999). This template provides four concurrent perspectives on institutional performance with respect to equity in educational outcomes: access, retention, institutional receptivity, and excellence.

The first task for each evidence team was to examine available data on each of these dimensions of performance, disaggregated by race and ethnicity. Each team decided what types of data it would examine and, based on its review, chose to highlight a specific array of outcomes for particular groups of students. The next step in the process was to create the scorecard by selecting goals and measures in each of the four general areas. The last step was to present the completed scorecard to each institution’s president.

THE FRAMEWORK FOR THE DIVERSITY SCORECARD

Access Perspective. Access indicators enable institutional leaders to become more fully informed about the extent to which underrepresented students gain access to the institution’s programs and resources.

THE 14 DIVERSITY SCORECARD PROJECT INSTITUTIONS

- California State University—Los Angeles
- California State University—Dominguez Hills
- California State University—Fullerton
- Los Angeles City College
- Los Angeles Valley College
- Cerritos College
- Santa Monica College
- Riverside Community College
- Whittier College
- University of Redlands
- University of LaVerne
- Occidental College
- Loyola Marymount University
- Mount Saint Mary’s College

Indicators constructed from the access perspective address questions like: What programs and majors do underrepresented students enroll in? Do the programs and majors in which underrepresented students enroll lead to high-demand or high-paying career opportunities? Do underrepresented students have access to important academic or socialization programs like special internships or fellowships? What access do underrepresented students have to financial support? What access do underrepresented community college students have to four-year colleges through transfer? What access do underrepresented students at four-year colleges have to graduate and professional schools?

Retention Perspective. Indicators constructed from the retention perspective address such questions as: What are the comparative retention rates for underrepresented students by program? Do underrepresented students disproportionately withdraw from “hot” programs like engineering or computer sciences? How successful are underrepresented students in completing basic skills courses? How successful are underrepresented students in completing baccalaureate, associate, and credential/certificate programs?

Institutional Receptivity Perspective. The institutional receptivity perspective examines dimensions of institutional support that can help create a more accommodating and responsive campus environment for students drawn from underrepresented groups. Consequently, it raises questions like: Do new hires at the institution enhance the racial and ethnic diversity of faculty, administrators, and staff? Does the composition of the faculty correspond to the racial and ethnic composition of the student body?

Excellence Perspective. The excellence perspective has two components: access and achievement. When excellence is viewed through the lens of access, questions that come to mind include: Do particular majors or courses function as “gatekeepers” for some students and “gateways” for others? For example, is there a race bias in physics and mathematics? Is there a Western-culture bias in the humanities? Why are Hispanic students more concentrated in education, the social services, and business?

When excellence is viewed through the lens of achievement, typical questions that arise are: What are the comparative completion rates for underrepresented students in highly competitive


programs? What percentage of underrepresented students graduate with a GPA of 3.5 or higher? How big is the institution’s pool of high-achieving, underrepresented students in each academic discipline who are eligible for graduate study?

BUILDING THE DIVERSITY SCORECARD

Our 14 partner institutions include two- and four-year public colleges, as well as independent institutions. Eight of them enroll 25 percent or more Hispanic students, making them eligible for designation as Hispanic-Serving Institutions. We purposefully chose institutions that were not struggling to diversify their student body because we wanted to concentrate on *outcomes* for historically underrepresented students rather than on simply the achievement of a diverse student body. Among the 14 institutions, Hispanic enrollments range from a low of 13 percent to a high of 50 percent. Enrollments for African Americans range from a low of 3 percent to a high of 30 percent.

Early in the project, we also decided that the evidence teams would compile and analyze only *existing* data instead of collecting new data. Our rationale was

CHART I. THE DIVERSITY SCORECARD FRAMEWORK



Source: Diversity Scorecard Project, USC



that colleges and universities do not lack data, but they always seem to want to collect more. In fact, soon after the project started, some of the participating institutions immediately wanted to administer student surveys to assess their climates for diversity.

Just as there is a constant tendency at institutions to want to collect more and more data, there seems to be an equal drive to act immediately based on anecdotal information, or on assumptions about what the problem is and what the solution should be. To fight against these two ingrained institutional habits, we insisted that the first two years of our project be devoted to *really understanding* the problem of inequities in educational outcomes instead of looking for techniques, special programs, or best practices to solve them.

Ultimately, we were guided by John Dewey's dictum that, "To form relevant and effective ideals we must first be acquainted with and take notice of actual conditions. Otherwise our ideals become vacuous or else filled with a content drawn from Utopia."

Members of the evidence team assumed the role of researchers in that they themselves became responsible for developing the needed equity indicators. This helped heighten their awareness of the issues involved because they had to actively choose and interpret indicators, not just look at them. At most institutions data are collected and compiled by the Office of Institutional Research. Few people on campus get to see the resulting reports, and even fewer actually discuss their implications.

We, the researchers from the Center for Urban Education, acted as facilitators of the process. This approach was a significant departure from normal habits—both for us as researchers accustomed to analyzing data ourselves and providing "answers," and for members of the campus teams, many of whom are faculty members or hold positions that do not bring them into contact with student data.

Our efforts in the Diversity Scorecard project have turned the act of data analysis into an intervention tool—a catalyst for change—that specifically seeks to alter individual perceptions and mindsets. Individuals change because they learn something that they do not know. For those in a position to directly affect student outcomes, the Diversity Scorecard tries to develop a deeper understanding of the inequities that are built into their institutions.

Faculty members and others may be generally aware that there are disparities in educational outcomes, but getting them to reflect on how their own practices might be contributing to the problem demands a different kind of learning experience. They need to discover vividly and directly the particular nature and features of the problem within their own institutions.

As already noted, our role at the center was to facilitate the work of the teams. On average, two members of our project staff met with each evidence team at least once a month for about two hours. All of the teams also came together three times a year to share their work.

To help campus teams identify potential equity indicators, we asked basic but rarely asked questions like, "What is the academic standing of the African American students who left after the first year?" or, "How do Hispanic students perform in remedial mathematics courses?" As the project evolved we created templates and tools to help the teams complete their scorecards.

Participating institutions did not receive special funding for this project and team members were not compensated. The fact that the project is now entering its third year without additional institutional funding constitutes a strong statement about institutional commitment. This kind of commitment increases the likelihood that the Diversity Scorecard will become sustained practice at participating institutions.

Step One: Disaggregating Basic Data by Race and Ethnicity. The first step in building the scorecard was for the member of the evidence team with access to student data—usually the director of institutional research—to bring a range of statistics to the group that were *disaggregated by race and ethnicity*. Some participating institutions were able to accomplish this task immediately. But most went about it much more slowly.

To help the teams get started in choosing appropriate data to look at, we created a "diversity vital signs profile." "Vital signs" are fundamental indicators of student performance that most institutions collect and report on a regular basis anyway. Examples include overall enrollments and enrollments in each academic major, term-to-term and year-to-year persistence rates, and GPA distributions. Regularly reported statistics like these were then disaggregated by race and ethnicity to identify and highlight any inequitable outcomes for historically underrepresented students.

Although most institutions regularly disaggregate enrollment data, they rarely disaggregate data on outcomes. When we asked our participants to do this, reactions we heard included: "We track financial aid, but we don't usually disaggregate it by ethnicity and types of awards," and "No one has ever asked us to disaggregate data by ethnicity and gender, by program and academic preparation; I [the chair of a humanities discipline] never asked [the institutional researcher] to disaggregate data for my department...I didn't have a reason."

Also, because most of the institutions in our project had already achieved what we call "Stage One Diversity"—a student body that is racially and ethnically diverse on a statistical basis—they failed to see the need for disaggregating their data further by race and ethnicity. A high-ranking dean greeted the idea of disaggregation sarcastically, letting us know: "We are 100 percent diverse. The Diversity Scorecard may be relevant for other institutions, like yours [meaning the University of Southern California], but we don't need to do that [disaggregate], we know what it will look like...for us there are no differences by ethnicity."

A team member from an independent institution, in contrast, welcomed the "vital signs" exercise because he could not have taken such an initiative on his

own. He said, “I could not generate this profile on my own. People might have asked why [I was doing this] or would have been suspicious of my data.”

Other participants were concerned that disaggregated data might backfire. At another independent institution that knew it had low graduation rates among African American students, a team member said: “I don’t think the board of trustees has ever seen these data—such as graduation rates by ethnicity. I don’t know if I want them to see it. Their solution might be, ‘Let’s stop admitting blacks.’”

Members of another team worried about similar pitfalls that might be associated with communicating disaggregated data. One said: “If we aren’t careful about presenting the data, they [the data] could unintentionally serve to promulgate existing ideas rather than change minds.”

At a third independent institution, members of the team suspected that female Hispanic students were over-represented in majors that tend to result in lower-paying jobs. But they decided not to pursue the matter because they thought the issue was “highly political.”

Disaggregating data for most of the teams turned out to be an eye-opener—even for the skeptics. For example, if evidence team members at one institution had been asked prior to participating in the project what percentage of their student population needed remedial mathematics, their ready answer would have been 41 percent. The institution regularly monitored this statistic.

But if asked what percentage of this remedial population was African American and Hispanic, they would not have been able to answer. This was not be-

cause the needed information was not available, but rather because no one had asked the question. Once they broke down the remedial education numbers by race and ethnicity, the picture that emerged was striking: 78 percent of African Americans and 52 percent of Hispanic students required remediation in mathematics, while the institution-wide percentage was 41 percent. One member of the evidence team reacted as follows: “This is the first time I’m aware that anyone is looking at this problem by ethnicity and to this detail... we tend to use global, crude measures... we can really raise the conversation around this.”

Through the “vital signs” exercise, the teams identified many kinds of potential inequities in educational outcomes, which in turn led them to seek more fine-grained measures. For example, one team

TABLE I. GATEWAY COURSE ACCESS, PASS RATES BY ETHNICITY

Gateway Courses	White	African American	Hispanic	Asian	Average Pass Rate
ACCT 1	67.7%	60.4%	58.5%	69.9%	65.2%
ACCT 2	76.4%	64.4%	66.0%	70.9%	70.0%
ACCT 3	78.2%	52.9%	60.7%	70.1%	67.8%
AN 260	81.6%	59.7%	63.5%	85.0%	71.4%
CS 283	70.2%	56.3%	67.1%	74.1%	71.5%
ECON 1	64.0%	47.1%	52.6%	65.3%	58.8%
ECON 2	65.9%	50.0%	54.8%	64.6%	61.0%
ECON 3	72.5%	53.5%	55.3%	67.5%	63.0%
ECON 4	76.8%	67.0%	56.1%	71.8%	68.4%
ECON 5	62.9%	56.4%	48.4%	70.0%	65.4%
FIN 1	74.2%	68.4%	67.6%	66.3%	67.7%
FIN 2	71.1%	44.1%	52.7%	67.5%	62.3%
GEOG 100	85.1%	53.8%	68.4%	83.6%	72.1%
HIST 2	76.8%	59.2%	70.1%	75.3%	71.1%
HIST 3	81.2%	58.6%	67.0%	74.9%	70.2%
MATH 081	72.1%	62.4%	74.5%	90.0%	73.4%
MATH 082	82.4%	59.2%	74.9%	87.3%	74.8%
MATH 083	73.3%	70.4%	71.0%	77.3%	71.3%
MATH 090	68.8%	38.5%	59.5%	71.8%	57.8%
MATH 091	55.2%	45.1%	53.8%	66.7%	54.9%
MATH 100	75.5%	61.4%	61.5%	74.9%	64.9%
MATH 102	62.0%	43.0%	49.7%	65.9%	55.1%
MATH 103	62.1%	43.0%	46.9%	66.7%	52.7%
MATH 206	63.6%	57.1%	47.1%	62.5%	55.3%
MATH 207	46.8%	41.5%	46.0%	54.6%	50.4%
MATH 242	48.6%	34.8%	44.9%	55.6%	50.5%
POL SCI 150	86.2%	65.8%	65.8%	75.5%	70.6%

Source: Diversity Scorecard Project, USC

chose to take a closer look at the top 100 courses enrolling the greatest numbers of students. Team members then isolated a subset of these high-enrollment courses in which average pass rates were below 75 percent. They labeled these courses “gateway courses.” The institutional researcher for this team constructed a display that used the colors blue and red to depict pass rates above and below the average, respectively (see Table 1).

African American and Hispanic students fell below the average pass rates in almost every course. A member of the team remembers the first time he saw the table: “It was presented in such a way that it was very overwhelming. I think everybody who saw the data said, ‘Wow, we have a real serious problem.’ All of a sudden, seeing the data provided in that way, everybody stepped back and gasped and said, ‘Boy, there’s something going on.’”

The color coding of the data made inequities in educational outcomes for minority students startlingly obvious: “The columns for Hispanics, African Americans, and Native Americans were almost all in red...they were below the average in all the remedial courses. They were below average in all of the college-level math courses. They were below the average in the business quantitative courses. And when you look at this you’re thinking, ‘These students aren’t going to be around.’”


If this table had been presented in black-and-white as is customary, it undoubtedly would not have had much of an impact. We ran into this phenomenon time after time: Statistics in themselves may or may not lead to discovery and action; it depends a lot on how they are displayed (see Chart 2).

Step Two: Identifying Goals. The next step in the process was to establish performance goals for each of the scorecard’s four perspectives. For example, one campus team found low pass rates for Hispanics and African American students in gateway mathematics courses. It consequently set a goal in the access perspective of its scorecard “to increase the percentage of African American and Hispanic students who complete and achieve a grade of C or better in ‘gateway’ courses.”

Another campus team discovered disproportionate numbers of students who required remediation in mathematics. In


CHART 2. INCOMING STUDENTS NEEDING MATH REMEDIATION, PERCENTAGE BY ETHNICITY

41% of All Incoming Students Fall 2000 Required Remediation in Math



Source: Diversity Scorecard Project, USC

CHART 3. FACULTY ETHNICITY COMPARED TO STUDENT ETHNICITY AT ONE UNIVERSITY



Source: Diversity Scorecard Project, USC

the retention perspective section of its scorecard, it established a goal “to increase the college persistence of students who enter the university in need of remediation.” Finally, at an institution where Hispanic students had the highest rate of BA completion the team found that there were still disparities when they examined the GPAs of graduating seniors. This team decided “to improve the grade point average of graduating Hispanic and African American students” as one of its excellence perspective goals.

The majority of teams had a difficult time identifying measures that would fit easily into the institutional receptivity perspective, so most decided to compare the racial and ethnic composition

of the faculty to that of the student body. Chart 3 reflects findings on this measure for most of the campuses participating in the project.

Step Three: Report to the Campus President. At the end of the second year of field-testing, each of the evidence teams prepared a report for the institution’s president on the current status of equity on campus. At this point, the biggest challenge for the Diversity Scorecard project arose: how to produce reports on campus equity that would not, like others before them, end up collecting dust on a bookshelf. Our Center for Urban Education staff provided the teams with a general outline to follow, and provided direct assistance in prepar-

ing the reports and creating effective graphic displays. But each team constructed its own report, using uniquely chosen measures and focusing on areas of importance that would speak to their own campus community.

Campus teams made formal presentations of their reports to their presidents. These meetings and presentation formats varied considerably. One president issued an invitation to the entire campus so the team could present the report in a town-meeting format. The president at another institution made the Diversity Scorecard the focus of an annual faculty retreat.

In many cases, the team first presented the report to the president and his or her immediate cabinet. Teams have also made presentations to campuswide administrative and governance bodies like planning councils and academic senates, as well as to faculty in individual departments. At one college, the mathematics faculty members were so struck by the data that they organized their own retreat to discuss the findings.

With only one exception, presidents have been both impressed and moved by the report. Their reactions included ideas about how the Diversity Scorecard could be linked to other campuswide programs and initiatives, who else should be involved with the project, and where the permanent “home” for the Diversity Scorecard should be located.

For example, when asked whether her institution would continue in the project, one president stated, “This report is really starting to get new information to us. The color-coding [of the success rates by ethnicity]... well, it just really hits you in the face.... I’d like to talk about the recommendations and what to do next.”

She went on to recommend that the team include members of the English and mathematics faculties in the next phase of the project. She also had ideas about how the Diversity Scorecard could be linked to ongoing faculty development activities at the campus. Another president observed, “This is the most interesting cabinet meeting we’ve had in a *long* time.”

What matters most, of course, is whether the presidents take specific actions to address the inequities identified by the scorecard. While it is too early to know this fully, some developments make us optimistic. The fact that the presidents of 11 institutions have decided to continue participating in the project

is one good sign. And we are aware of other more concrete indications of presidential action to address identified inequities. At one institution, for example, the president has asked all academic units to develop their own equity scorecards. At another, the president requested the original Diversity Scorecard team to develop a formal plan of action based on the data.

For the most part, the findings documented in these reports highlighted striking inequities in educational outcomes that, if not addressed aggressively, point to a very gloomy future for California’s African American and Hispanic populations. But not all the news was bad. One positive finding that spanned many participating institutions was that Hispanic students had high—and sometimes the highest—rates of persistence and graduation. This good news on graduation rates was partially tempered by the discovery that Hispanic students tend to graduate with lower grade-point averages than students in other groups. This hinders their chances of pursuing graduate education, and diminishes their likelihood of being selected for interviews by corporations that conduct on-campus recruitment sessions.

Next Steps. Developing indicators, presenting baseline data, and determining goals are only the initial steps in creating a Diversity Scorecard. The project’s long-term purpose is to establish a regular institutional process to monitor whether outcomes for underrepresented students are improving or lagging behind. But monitoring cannot happen without specific benchmarks that show desired end results. In the next phase of the project the evidence teams at each campus will start developing such benchmarks.

To facilitate this process we have developed a new measure, the Student Outcomes Equity Index (available on our project Web site at www.usc.edu/dept/education/CUE/index.htm.) Over the next two years, campus teams will institutionalize the scorecard and make it part of their routine reporting. They will also compile an inventory of all of the areas where inequities were detected including individual academic programs and academic services such as mathematics peer tutoring or the writing laboratory.

The purpose here is to monitor the initiatives that are already in place and



to determine whether they are working well. Using the completed inventory, each campus team will choose one area in which inequities were identified for more in-depth examination and subsequent action.

INFORMATION, SITUATED LEARNING, AND INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE

Some of the participants had initial doubts about the project. But after two years of participation, the majority now feel that their participation has been fruitful. In the words of one: “At first I was very skeptical about this project. However, I have found the approaches to data very useful. This push to look at data is spilling over to other areas, such as curricular issues. [While] doing this project I’ve found many ways of thinking about data.”

By simply breaking down existing data on basic indicators of student outcomes by race and ethnicity, our partner institutions have been able to locate the most critical gaps in academic performance for their African American and Hispanic students. Many of our partners had always suspected that there were problems, but relied heavily on anecdotes to describe them (and in some cases, to justify why it would be almost fruitless to address them). Most lacked a disciplined and evidence-based approach to understanding educational outcomes and the dimensions of the equity gap that the scorecard so strikingly revealed.

The issue—as in most institutions—was not that the needed data were unavailable. It was instead that members of the institutional community were not accustomed to engaging in the kind of sus-

tained conversations needed to transform data into actionable knowledge. On this point, one committee member observed, "On this campus, when we talk about issues and problems, we often talk about mythologies. Evidence-based practices state where we are and where we need to improve. Making sense of evidence is part of the critical thinking process. The project is training me to think critically. I now look at some of the mythologies and ask about supportive data."

Through the process of developing the Diversity Scorecard, we expected that campus team members would become experts about the condition of equity on their campuses. By involving them directly in the process of gathering information and disaggregating it by race and ethnicity, they would feel more confident in assuming the role of "change agents."

While it is too early to say that this approach has made a difference in actual student outcomes, we have reason to be optimistic that many of the 60 people who have worked with us over the last three years will agree with what one participant told us: "As a result of this project, you kind of become a bit more interested in wanting to become change

agents. Not just merely people who facilitate the flow of work and the implementation of procedures and policies, but that we kind of take a conscious interest in trying to bring about change. I always try to be a change agent but I also remind myself that given where I am, I know that I become complacent and I know that there are certain things that I start taking for granted."

Colleges and universities have frequently been found to make little use of assessment and accountability data. One might therefore wonder what makes us think an approach centered on data collection and benchmarking will fare any better. The answer is that instead of just collecting data, we regard the act of *developing* equity indicators and *creating* the Diversity Scorecard as *the intervention*. The aim is for team members to gain deep understanding of inequities in educational outcomes by actively creating the tools that lead to their own recognition of the problem and their subsequent commitment to address it.

Classic "data-gathering" exercises, in contrast, are typically understood to precede an intervention. Those who are sup-

posed to do the intervening have little or no role in collecting or manipulating the data. Our process, in contrast, is clearly designed around the tenets of situated learning. Campus groups are engaged in a process of active, collaborative inquiry about the state of equity on their campuses. They are not the passive recipients of a report prepared by someone else that is simply disseminated.

The best hope for institutional change lies in the possibility that individual members of a campus community will transfer their learning to other contexts within the institution. By doing so, they will enable their colleagues to learn and to change as well. This approach creates the conditions that cognitive research tells us are associated with effective transformational learning—bringing about significant changes in the beliefs, values, and actions of learners. The words of project participants that we have provided throughout this article reflect the kinds of mental transformations that they are experiencing as a result of their active attempt to make meaning out of otherwise disembodied statistics. It is a lesson that we believe can be applied to many other arenas where institutions must change. ☐