

January 20, 1970  
February 20, 1970

see also  
no. 1970  
manually  
p. 329  
Vol. 36

Equality of Educational Opportunity and the University of Colorado:

A Report to the Faculty Council\* By the Faculty Council Committee on  
Minority Programs. Richard Jessor, Chairman, Delmos Jones, Julius  
London, Salvador Ramirez

During the past several years, a bleak fact about higher education in American society has become more and more widely recognized. That fact is that access to colleges and universities has been open only in a token sense to youth who belong to America's main minority groups--Black youth, Mexican-American youth and Indian youth. A recent survey of the 80 predominantly white state universities and land-grant colleges in this country showed that less than 2% of their students, undergraduate or graduate, were Black; yet Black Americans constitute somewhat over 11% of the population of the United States. (That survey goes on to remind us that in 1968 there were more foreign students than American Negroes in our colleges and universities.) The situation has been much the same for Mexican-Americans and Indians of whom there has never been more than a handful on American campuses.

Efforts to expand opportunity for higher education for minority students have quickened across the country in the last year or two, and many institutions have devised special programs to recruit, admit, and support minority students some of whom, in relation to conventional criteria, were considered to be "high risk." At the University of Colorado, the first program began in the summer of 1968 with the admission, with financial support, of 78 students. The summer of 1969 saw approximately 250 Mexican-Americans, 150 Blacks, and 50 Indians in summer Educational Opportunity (EOP) programs. During the present academic year, approximately 640 undergraduate minority students are receiving some degree of financial support through the EOP programs on the Boulder campus. Minority student groups of 160 and 40, respectively, are attending the Denver and Colorado Springs Centers under similar program auspices.

As is evident from the brief time span involved, the minority student programs at C.U. have had to be developed rapidly and in response to urgent concerns and pressures. Responsibility for their development has rested largely with the University administration and the minority student groups-themselves. Despite faculty participation in such programs as that at the Law School, or in certain innovative summer programs as those in physics and biology for minority high school students, faculty involvement in any systematic way has been minimal, and faculty understanding of the implications of these minority program developments has been limited.

It was awareness of this latter state of affairs that led to the establishment of this committee. Our charge was to examine the various aspects of the University's involvement in minority student education and to make policy recommendations to the Faculty Council as to the role the University should play in this area in the future. Since our appointment near the end of Spring semester, we have met frequently to talk with University administrators, with minority program staff, and with minority students. And we have met frequently to talk among ourselves in trying to arrive at policy recommendations that could serve to replace the current, short-term, University response with a longer-range perspective.

\*A brief summary of the major proposals made in this report appears in an Addendum at the end (see p. 17)

This report will focus primarily upon a series of recommendations which we feel to be essential to achieving the appropriate University position with regard to minority students. A preliminary draft of the report was circulated to some members of the faculty, the student body, and the administration; the present version has benefitted a great deal from the comments, criticisms, and suggestions received. In the discussion of our recommendations we will have the opportunity to describe the present state-of-affairs and to comment on problems which currently exist. While our attention will mainly be on the Boulder campus, we want to state emphatically that our concern is with the University as a whole, and our recommendations are meant to apply also to the Denver and Colorado Springs Centers. As a matter of fact, some of our recommendations may be more appropriately implemented at the Denver Center, given its location in a large urban setting with a large minority population, than at the Boulder campus. Before turning to the series of recommendations, several general comments should be made by way of preamble.

First, it should be clear that the issues involved in minority student education ramify throughout every facet of University activity; the simplest of proposals in this area is already complex. To talk simply of admitting more minority students, for example, is to have, at the same time, to deal with the complexities of recruitment procedures, admission criteria, counseling services, locating additional minority faculty and staff, housing, racial or ethnic studies, revenue sources, budgetary priorities and the like.

Second, the concern with minority education involves, and cannot avoid, the very definition of the nature and the purpose of a state university. The questions of "who shall be educated?" and "what are the responsibilities of a state university to the citizens of that state?" have been newly reopened by the demands of minority youth, and no amount of recourse to tradition or past practice can, in itself, provide an adequate answer.

Third, the entire discussion in this report is predicated on the maintenance of the standards of educational excellence traditionally associated with the University of Colorado. Concern does exist in the academic community that increased enrollment of minority students, especially "high risk" students, will inevitably mean a lowering of standards or the development of "second class" degrees. No one we have talked with has supported such a development, and it is clearly to the disadvantage of minority students themselves to obtain degrees the currency of which has been debased. The aim of minority student programs must be to provide youth who previously have been excluded from higher education with the benefits of that education. Concern with standards must be maintained; but such concern must focus on what the University does for its students and their benefits from it, rather than merely on the credentials the students present at the outset. Protection of the educational quality of a C.U. degree can be achieved by the sedulous monitoring of exit or graduation standards, irrespective of the length of time taken or the academic path which has been followed to that point. The committee wants to make clear its view that this is the only appropriate position for the University to assume; the recommendations in this report are meant to reflect that view.

Fourth, none of the recommendations to be made should in any way be taken to support separatism or segregation on the campus whether in the dormitories or in the classrooms. Although demands have been made for racially separate classes or housing accommodations at various universities in the past few years, such arrangements are not consonant with the objectives of higher education. Special classes may be necessary at particular times for particular groups of students or may be designed to be of primary interest to

particular students, but the general policy of the University should be to institutionalize an open and integrated educational experience.

Fifth, while the report discusses minority students in general, it must be kept in mind that the two main groups involved, the Blacks and the Mexican-Americans, are distinct groups with their own distinctive needs, aims and problems. Thus, recommendations made in general about minority students may need to be tailored in quite distinctive ways when implemented for the two groups.

Finally, none of the recommendations to follow should be taken to imply criticism of past University actions or present arrangements with respect to minority programs. On the contrary, the University's effort thus far has been remarkable in many ways: the rapid recruitment and admission of a significant number of minority students, the innovation of support services, the gathering of financial resources, and the avoidance of fracture and confrontation in the academic community. Credit for these accomplishments belongs to the administration and to the minority student groups themselves. Our recommendations reflect only the view that it is time for explicit institutional policy to be formulated and that, in its formulation, it is time for the faculty's voice to be heard.

I. Our primary and fundamental recommendation is that the University should commit itself immediately and explicitly to a substantial increase in minority student enrollment at all levels and all campuses of the University. This commitment should include a definite timetable and a definite numerical goal. The commitment we recommend is that, by the 1974-75 academic year, the proportion of minority students among the in-state students enrolled at the University of Colorado should reflect the proportion of each minority group in the population of the state.

Several aspects of this recommendation need elaboration. The importance of an explicit commitment to a long-range enrollment objective cannot be overemphasized. No such commitment exists at present, and its absence is, in our view, responsible for a certain amount of distrust, suspicion, and hostility among minority students presently on campus. Despite the evident progress achieved thus far, there is uncertainty among the students about the University's capability and intention to sustain it, and about whether continued progress will require continued application of student pressure. The avowed commitment of the University to an explicit goal is perhaps the most stabilizing action the University can take at this point; it can serve to eliminate the uncertainty that breeds distrust, it can weaken the premises for confrontation, and it can elicit return commitments from the minority student groups to cooperate in the pursuit of a shared objective.

The five-year time period seems to be a reasonable one. A shorter period would probably be unrealistic: new programs will need to be devised, resources will need to be gathered, mistaken ventures will need to be undone--all of these will require time. A longer time period would begin to attenuate the significance of the objective.

The objective of enrolling minority students proportional to their numbers in the state's population is not an arbitrary one. Of all the numerical goals we considered, this one is the only one that seems to follow logically from the traditional purposes of a state university--to provide educational opportunity to all the citizens of the state rather than to an intellectual or economic elite. Other goals would obviously be less costly and demand less in the way of reorienting the University; thus they could be seen as more "realistic." Such "realism," however, would continue the long-term

injustice whereby minority youth have been denied access to the one sure channel to full participation in American society--higher education.

It can be argued that access to higher education for minority students can be provided by other institutions in the state, particularly the community or junior colleges. Obviously, community colleges constitute a major resource for what the Colorado Commission on Higher Education refers to as students from low-income and educationally disadvantaged backgrounds. But it is increasingly evident that full sharing in the benefits of American society, and return contribution to it, demands a college degree. Among the degree-granting institutions in Colorado, leadership belongs to C.U., and it cannot slough off its responsibilities to the state's minority youth on its sister institutions. This is not to say that efforts to develop state-wide, cooperative programs should not be pursued. Joint programs with other institutions can facilitate minority teacher training, the sharing of minority faculty, centralized student financial aid, recruiting of students, and the like. But such joint programs cannot substitute for the commitment we are recommending for C.U.; they should be seen, rather, as supporting it.

Translation of the proportional objective into rough figures will make clear that the commitment being recommended is a large one. The Black population component in the state is 4%, while the figure is about 11% for Mexican-Americans (the percentage of high school graduates contributed from these groups is, however, probably less). Assuming, for example, that the Boulder campus reaches a total enrollment of 25,000 by 1974-75, the in-state enrollment (approximately 60%) would be about 15,000 students. Of these, the minority enrollment by then should be approximately 2,300. Of the 2,300 in-state minority students, about 600 would be Black, about 1,700 would be Mexican-American, and there would be a suitable number of Indians. Since current minority enrollment on the Boulder campus is less than 800, what we are recommending is a three-fold increase in in-state minority enrollment on the Boulder campus over the next five years. Specific figures for the Denver and Colorado Springs Centers would need to be calculated on the same basis and the amount of increase involved determined in the same way.

We also recommend that approximately 15% of the out-of-state enrollment on the Boulder campus be constituted of members of minority groups to assure that equal opportunity is open to those students also and that appropriate diversity of out-of-state enrollment is attained. To achieve these objectives in a way which is successful requires that they become a primary organizing focus for the University as a whole; what this means will become more apparent as the subsequent recommendations are discussed.

II. One of the knottiest problems which universities have had to face in increasing minority enrollments lies in the area of recruitment and admission standards. Part of the very meaning of minority status in America is poor educational preparation. Any serious effort to increase minority college enrollment must resolve the problem of continued reliance upon conventional admission criteria--high school rank or grades and/or achievement test scores. At the extrema, one resolution does away with all entry criteria and provides the opportunity for higher education to all who want it; this position has been termed "open admissions" and, as one example, is the policy that has recently been adopted by the City University of New York. A special University Commission on Admissions at C.U.N.Y. had earlier concluded that within the context of strong support programs: "The best way of determining whether a potential student is capable of college work is to admit him to college and evaluate his performance there."

Such a position does not, of course, mean that college performance is not well predicted in general from high school GPA's test scores. Confirmation of the usually consistent relation between grades in high school and grades in college emerged again from a recent study of nearly 37,000 students who enrolled at 180 different colleges and universities in the Fall of 1966. The study, conducted by the research director of the American Council on Education, makes two other facts clear, however. One is that there is substantial predictive error in these grade and test criteria; for example, "...among students who made only a C average in high school and whose test scores were below the 10th percentile, about 10 percent nevertheless managed to obtain at least a B average." The second finding relates to dropout, defined as failure to return for the second year of college; less than half of the students who had D averages in high school dropped out of college.

The foregoing comments are intended to convey some of the recent doubts which have been raised about reliance on fixed merit standards for admission decisions. The doubt is whether previous academic performance can be identified directly with future academic potential. All sorts of factors combine, for many minority high school students, to form a syndrome operating to depress academic achievement: poor schools, low educational level of parents and peers, economic disadvantage, negative teacher expectations, feelings of personal inadequacy, low expectation of reward even if successful, and the like. Given motivation to attend college, however, and given special academic, counseling, and support programs, the level of academic performance of even these "high risk" students may well be expected to be different.

Minority students with good admission credentials pose no problem; they are easy to accept and much in demand. But an effort of the magnitude we are proposing to increase minority enrollment at this University will inevitably mean that relatively large numbers of so-called "high risk" students will have to be admitted and provided with strong and continuing support programs. Beyond emphasizing the inadequacies of the criteria on which "high risk" classification is based, we want to stress another point. The responsibility of a state institution is to educate its youth, to improve their performance, and to do this for all those who can benefit from exposure to university life; it is not merely to select only those with an already-guaranteed potential of succeeding. Many of these considerations were recognized at C.U. several years ago when fixed admission criteria were replaced by a flexible judgmental process. The latter approach makes it possible, at present, to admit any "high risk" student who, in the judgment of the admissions committee, has a probability of benefitting sufficiently from his experience here to be able, ultimately, to graduate.

Data on how well "high risk" students have actually done in different colleges are hard to locate at this early juncture. At Berkeley, 60% of the first-year EOP students admitted were not normally admissible and constituted a "high risk" group. According to one report, their dropout rate was lower than that for regularly admitted freshmen students. At the end of their first quarter, 45% did C average or better work. At the end of the third quarter this percentage rose to 57, and, in the final quarter, half of this latter group did B- or better. Obviously, this kind of data is of interest even though limited.

At C.U., our data are also limited but some figures are available. Of the initial group of 78 "high risk" students admitted to the first summer program in 1968, or admitted in the Fall of 1968, 60 remained in school through Spring semester. Of these 60, 49 were eligible to continue in the Fall of 1969, and the other 11 were able to petition to remain; this survival rate is a little better than that of the ordinary population

(although it was partly influenced by inappropriately high grades the first summer). With respect to their Spring semester grades, 50% of those in the Migrant Action Program (for Mexican-Americans), 24% of those in the regular Mexican-American Program, and 29% of those in the Black Program were doing C or better work. Some of the students in the programs were excellent, and nothing would have predicted it. Given the newness of our programs and their shortcomings, these results must be seen as encouraging.

We want to recommend that the University continue to admit minority students for whom there is some basis to believe that, with full support programs, they can benefit educationally at C.U. sufficiently to meet the usual exit standards. This means that "high risk" students will continue to be accepted and provided with the range and variety of support programs likely to maximize that educational benefit. This recommendation is generally consonant with the recently developed Guide for Minority Admissions and Registration prepared in Dean Douglas' office. That document constitutes a long-needed codification of procedures in the area of minority admissions.

Our differences with that document are generally matters of flexibility. We recommend the deletion of the quota that no more than 20% of minority students can be "high risk," and also of the requirement that "high risk" minority students must enter the University only through the summer program. While both of these may serve as guidelines, the development of future events may show that some departure from them would be beneficial. For example, greater numbers of "high risk" students can be enrolled when adequate, academic-year support programs are well established, and there would then also seem to be no reason why a "high risk" student could not enter the University at Fall or Spring semester without summer program experience, even though the latter would have been beneficial.

One final aspect of the admissions process bears comment. Various of the procedures involve financial cost to the applicant: test scores, parents confidential statement, application fee, and the confirmation fee. Continuation or extension of the present provisions for waiver of all fees where there is economic hardship is strongly recommended.

Admissions cannot be discussed independently of recruitment, a process only recently elaborated at American colleges with specific respect to minority students. For many minority high school youth, the idea of college attendance is remote; few of their families or friends have set a precedent for them in this regard, many have been led to believe that they cannot succeed in college, and the economic realities of college attendance seem impossible to contend with. For these students, deliberate, persistent, and dedicated efforts are necessary to help them perceive their situation differently, to make college attendance both an attractive and likely-to-be-successful venture, and to make higher education financially feasible. This is what is involved in minority recruitment endeavors.

In the early stages of C.U.'s minority recruitment efforts, the minority student groups already on campus took a great deal of initiative and were highly successful in visiting high schools throughout the state and talking with potential applicants. Efforts were uncoordinated, however, and problems developed around where control over recruitment actually resided. Recently, codification of orderly procedures was accomplished in this area too. At present there are competent minority professional staff in the Dean of Admissions office in charge of recruitment for students of their own minority group. The Assistant Directors of Admissions for Black students and for Mexican-American students both have responsibility for coordinating and controlling recruiting.

It is clear that recruitment is the primary fulcrum by which the University can move minority students from their high schools to the campus. Without adequate recruitment efforts, the objective of enrollment of minority students in relation to their proportion in the state's population will not be achieved. Such efforts seem to us likely to require increased minority professional staff as recruiters; the development of "regional recruiters," i.e., minority persons responsible for only a portion of the state's high schools and therefore likely to be able to develop closer and more effective liaison with counselors and teachers; increased reliance on minority students presently on campus to visit the schools in their own community as recruiters or to serve as counselor-aids in schools in the Denver metropolitan areas under work-study support; reliance on minority faculty, as their numbers increase, to visit high schools for discussion with prospective applicants; and programs for bringing minority high school students for visits and tours of the campus.

Recruitment efforts should not be limited, however, to high schools alone. There is a large pool of potential college students among those minority persons who have been out of school for some years, who may have served in the Armed Forces, or whose work experience has made a college education seem more attractive or more necessary or more feasible than before. The development of recruiting procedures appropriate to adults would seem important to pursue; reliance upon contacts and organizations in the minority community is one promising avenue for adult recruitment.

Finally, deliberate recruiting efforts aimed toward the Indian population of the state have been relatively neglected. Contacts with the high schools in the Southwest corner of the state where Indian reservations are located, and with Indian youth in Denver, should become an explicit target of University recruitment activities.

Faculty Council support for these recommendations can be shown not only by endorsing them but by calling upon the faculty as a whole to offer its services in visiting high schools and assisting the recruiters wherever possible.

III. The success with which the University can increase minority student enrollment will depend in part upon the degree to which it can increase the number of minority group faculty and minority group staff in the academic community. The survey referred to in the opening paragraph of this report indicated that, for those same 80, predominantly white, state universities, the total Black faculty was less than 1%. Our own university is no exception; our Black and Mexican-American faculty colleagues number less than a dozen out of a total university faculty of nearly 2,000.

The need for a significant increase in minority faculty seems hardly to require justification. Their absence constitutes a serious limitation on the scope of the educational experience available to C.U. students and on the quality and diversity of the University's intellectual life; without minority faculty, adequate course programs in minority studies are impossible; and the almost exclusive occupancy of the faculty role by professors representing the majority group perpetuates for all students an exclusionary definition of the academic profession.

Any effort to recruit minority faculty quickly runs up against the legacy of the long history of segregation in higher education--the fact that at present there are insufficient numbers of minority persons with the conventional credentials to qualify for academic positions. Those who do qualify are much in demand, and successful recruitment requires deliberate search procedures and the availability of important inducements.

One of the latter, undoubtedly, would be the University's commitment to integrating the student body, our primary recommendation.

Beyond deliberate and intensive recruitment efforts, the number of minority faculty on campus can be increased by other procedures: joint appointments where minority faculty elsewhere spend part of each academic year on this campus; exchange arrangements with faculty at predominantly Black universities; and visiting professorships to bring Black and Mexican-American scholars to the University on a temporary basis. The success of these kinds of efforts obviously depends upon school and departmental commitments plus the availability of resources to make such arrangements attractive.

Finally, it is clear that there is a pool of potential minority faculty among those who, for one reason or another, have failed to complete their credentials for academic appointment. The short-range willingness of departments to appoint otherwise-qualified persons with incomplete credentials would make available previously untapped minority faculty resources. Such willingness would not, after all, be a radical departure from current practice where a large portion of the higher education function at the University is carried out by graduate students. Provision for such faculty to complete their credentials while teaching here would prevent their subsequent displacement and, in the longer run, would enable the maintenance of whatever appointment and retention standards a department insists upon. Such a policy, incidentally, was proposed to the Academic Senate at UCLA by its chancellor and was ultimately approved.

Our recommendation in this area is that major efforts be made to increase the size of our minority faculty. The Faculty Council should call this matter to the attention of all Deans and department chairmen urging their special consideration of minority candidates in their recruitment activities and in their planning for departmental growth. Administrative commitments to cooperate in flexible appointment arrangements and in providing resources for intensive recruiting efforts should also be sought by the Council.

IV. A not-unrelated issue is that of the pattern of minority staff membership at the University. A university community in which there is only a small proportion of Black and Mexican-American staff sustains the image of segregation in higher education. Minority staff members are, of course, essential in the specific programs designed for minority students, but we are attempting to emphasize their necessity throughout the University and in all job categories. Unfortunately, the overall picture that obtains at present is not encouraging. Although reliable data are not readily available, the University did file an Equal Employment Opportunity Report with the Federal Government in March of 1968. That report shows that for a total employment figure of 3,265, only 104--approximately 3%--were members of any major minority ethnic group. Further, among the 84 minority staff members who were either Black or Spanish-surnamed, 56% were in the Laborer (Unskilled) or Service worker categories, the lowest classifications on the occupational hierarchy.

The University Director of Personnel is aware of the problem and has made attempts to increase minority staff recruitment. Our recommendation is that the Personnel Office undertake to amplify significantly its efforts to bring minority personnel to the University and to upgrade them during their employment here. Such amplification would necessitate the advertising of vacancies in channels and at locations that reach the minority population of the Denver metropolitan area. It would also involve the provision of on-the-job training programs so that initially unqualified persons can gain the skills necessary for adequate performance, and others can gain the skills necessary for upward



change in job category. Finally, the University should make sure that its large and continuing program of capital construction, a major source of University-related employment, involves contractors who themselves are employing minority personnel.

V. The movement that has swept across American campuses to increase educational opportunity for minority students has had significant implications, simultaneously, for the academic curriculum. These implications fall into three areas: the development of special curricula in minority studies; the development of new courses concerned with topics of more immediate social relevance; and the reorientation of existing courses to provide greater emphasis or attention to minority experience. In these developments, a good deal of controversy has occurred around the issue of Afro-American or Black Studies Programs. At the center of the controversy have been questions about the academic respectability of such courses, whether they come under the usual academic controls, and whether they are open to all students or only to those who are Black. The position expressed by this committee in the opening section of this report is relevant to this latter point and should be reiterated here: University policy should be to institutionalize an open and integrated educational experience.

During the previous academic year, the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences set up a student-faculty committee on Black Studies. Five students from that committee visited other campuses to explore their programs, and ultimately, an undergraduate Black Studies Program at C.U. was authorized by the Committee on Courses of the College. That program got underway last September under the direction of Professor Charles Nilon. Courses in the program are cross-listed in existing academic departments where possible, and, in addition, courses not fitting a single department are authorized to be listed simply as Black Studies. During the Fall semester of this academic year, the following courses were offered: Economic History of Africa (enrollment of 35); Afro-American History (26); Politics of Contemporary Africa (35); Afro-American Art (48); Swahili (51); and an Honors Course on Black Awareness (13). All but the first of these courses will be offered again in the Spring. Three of the instructors in the Black Studies courses hold departmental appointments (Mr. Nilon, Mr. El Mallakh, and Mr. Dorsey), and the others are regularly enrolled graduate students at the University. There was white student enrollment in all or nearly all of the Fall courses, and there are white students enrolled in all courses this spring.

A program for the Master of Arts in Mexican-American Studies under the aegis of the Graduate School is just emerging from the planning stage. The program is directed by Professor Salvador Ramirez, and a Policy Committee made up of faculty from ten different departments is available to advise the Director. Beginning with Spring semester 1970, the first course in this program will be offered. Enrollment for the course, The Mexican-American Culture of the Southwest, is expected to be about 200. It is coordinated by Professor de Onis of the Department of Spanish and Portuguese.

At the present time there is no formal program in American Indian Studies despite the University's obvious academic resources for such an undertaking.

There can no longer be any question about the academic respectability of minority studies, as universities across the nation have recognized in instituting their own studies programs. On the contrary, their neglect has reflected only the inertia of academic tradition, and their absence has meant that the domain of academic concern has been unjustifiably narrowed. The continued development of minority studies must be seen to be important to all segments of the academic community and not merely to the minority student groups; contemporary society can hardly be understood without reference to the content of minority studies.

It is recommended that the Faculty Council affirm its support for the full development of minority studies programs at the University. As minority enrollment increases and majority interest broadens, these programs will need to be expanded at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. More elaborate and intensive curricula will probably become desirable, requiring additional minority faculty and financial support over what presently obtains. Whether the future development of minority studies is best administered through new departments, a single Ethnic Studies department, or, as now, through programs cutting across existing departments should remain under consideration as the University's experience with minority studies cumulates.

The other two areas of curricular concern, the establishment of new courses and the reorienting of established courses to reflect more fully the contemporary concern with issues of social relevance, have not been the exclusive province of minority students. All students, including those from the affluent majority, have levelled sharp attacks on higher education for its irrelevance to the problems of contemporary man. For minority students, however, this perception of irrelevance has less of an abstract and more of a personal basis. Coming often from the ghettos, the barrios, and the reservations, they are seeking an education which speaks to those experiences and helps to illuminate them. Curriculum innovations, changes, and revisions which bring these issues into focus are essential if the vitality of higher education is to be renewed.

We recommend that the Faculty Council call upon the colleges and departments, especially those in education, the social sciences, and the humanities, to begin immediately an examination of their curricular offerings from this point of view, that they initiate discussions or hold departmental meetings with student groups, especially minority groups, to ascertain what course offerings or revisions might be contributive to the needs of those groups, and that they plan to initiate changes by Fall, 1970 wherever possible. In our discussions with minority students, we have been given to understand that, while suggestions from them for new courses have often been welcomed, the usual pattern is to place the burden entirely upon the students to come up with a syllabus for the new course. That students should have to design their own courses, exclusively, does not seem appropriate to us. It should be enough for them to make the faculty aware of their needs and to be willing to contribute to the design of new courses; the rest is a proper responsibility and obligation of the faculty.

VI. The discussion of the "high risk" minority student makes clear the necessity for developing special programs to support the student's efforts to overcome his less-than-adequate preparation and to adapt to the academic and social demands of college life. To encourage large numbers of minority students to enter the University without providing for special programs for them is to confront them with a revolving door.

Special programs at C.U. divide into summer versus academic-year activities and into academic versus non-academic activities. At present, the summer programs are the major vehicle for preparing students to enter the University. They provide academic experiences to help overcome deficiencies, for example in language usage; they provide an opportunity to learn about the history and culture of one's group and to develop a greater identity as a Black or a Mexican-American; they foster the formation of group ties and interpersonal involvements which are important mediators of adaptation to campus life; and they introduce the student to the University at a time when pressure and crowding are minimal. This past summer, there were approximately 150 students in the Black summer program. They took three classes: Exposition, Black Contemporary Social Issues, and College Algebra. The overall average GPA was 2.44. The Mexican-American summer program enrolled close to 200 students in three classes: Exposition, Contemporary Mexican-American Problems, and Introduction to Political Science. The overall average GPA

was 2.61. In addition, there were 21 students in the Migrant Action Program. They took only the Exposition course and the average GPA was 2.38. (Incidentally, these GPA's are all lower than those given the first summer, 1968, when they ranged between 2.99 and 3.19. The 1969 grades are probably more valid and reflect more reliably the actual performance of the students.)

Despite the cost of running summer programs, the possibility of greater economy from using the same funds during the regular academic year, and the various problems and difficulties which attended them the past two summers, we are convinced of the necessity of maintaining these summer programs. Beyond the reasons mentioned in the preceding paragraph, the programs are seen as successful by many of those involved in them--both students and staff--and the logic of their function as pre-entry academic, personal, and social preparation is compelling. They also can serve a diagnostic function and enable the academic-year program to be specially tailored to the needs of the individual students ascertained during the prior summer. We recommend strongly their retention, at least until the minority enrollment on campus during the academic year has substantially increased.

During the present academic year there are about 50 skills classes in reading, studying, composition, and mathematics organized through the Student Life Center and based almost entirely on volunteer services. In addition, there are extensive tutoring arrangements. The non-academic services involve counseling and also the provision of consultation to student-counselors working with groups of, in this case, Mexican-American students.

Two things seem clear: first, there has been a lack of careful planning and, especially, of coordination of programs during the academic year to provide remedial courses, tutoring, advising, and counseling; second, the present scope of these activities is not only insufficient at this time but completely inadequate to meet the needs of an expanded minority enrollment. This area strikes us as one of the main soft spots of the minority programs; we recommend immediate attention to the planning of special courses and services to support minority students in their initial educational experiences. Attention should be given to the design of a special, first-year curriculum involving coordinated academic and non-academic support efforts. Such a step could mean that five years might come to be seen as the normal time required for graduation by "high risk" students. Substantial financial resources will be needed for these efforts and for expanding the number of minority counselors and staff in this area.

VII. The character of the University administrative structure responsible for minority programs is likely to be a crucial determinant of the success of those programs. A large number of activities are involved for each minority group, ranging from recruiting of new students, to counseling and tutoring, to financial aid, activities that cut across both academic and non-academic matters, and that are organized separately into summer and academic year programs. To this must be added the fact that the two main minority groups have their own distinctive needs for these services, and that, understandably, they each insist upon their autonomy. In addition, there is a third minority group, the American Indian, for whom program development is also necessary. Finally, there are disadvantaged students from the majority group also requiring special program assistance. The administrative structure most likely to be able to handle such complexity and to maximize the educational benefits while minimizing conflict and strain is not easily come by.

Initially, the various Educational Opportunity Programs were under an EOP Coordinator (Mr. Mark Hannon) who reported to Vice-President Manning. During this interim period,

administrative development was primarily in two directions: the recruitment of additional minority personnel for various staff roles in the different programs, and the establishment of the two main minority programs, the Black Education Program and the Mexican-American Affairs Program. Problems around lines of authority, failures of coordination, and inadequacy of communication occurred frequently as would be expected from any temporary structure dealing with a rapidly evolving set of activities.

Very recently, a tentative administrative reorganization has been put into effect, placing all of these activities in the President's Office under the direction of Dr. George Rainsford, assistant to the President. While this move has certain advantages, it has, in our view, less to recommend it than an alternative we wish to propose for consideration.

Clearly, there is no single or ideal solution to an administrative task of such complexity and sensitivity. Whatever the structure, however, it should eventuate at a level of active authority which has both the power of decision and the control over resources to make that authority compelling. Further, it should serve to minimize the problems of coordination, coordination among the diverse activities involved within each of the minority programs for example, between counseling and financial aid, between minority and non-minority students. In addition, it should allow significant participation of minority students or their elected representatives in policy and program decisions. And finally, it should provide open and ready access for students to communicate with responsible authority.

These considerations lead us to recommend that the administrative structure be one that eventuates in the Office of the Vice President for Educational and Student Relations. The vice-presidential level is, of course, one with substantial and effective authority. This particular vice-presidential office is already responsible for all of the non-academic support services for C.U. students--counseling, tutoring, housing, financial aid--services which are absolutely essential to the success of any minority program. Coordination of these services, and coordinated allocation of resources to minority and majority student groups, should, therefore, be maximized within this framework. This particular vice-presidential office has, in addition, maintained good and effective relations with minority students during the developments of the last couple of years so that open communication and mutual respect already obtain. The only crucial area of administrative activity which lies outside this office is that of recruiting and admissions; close liaison will need to be established in that direction.

Beyond this recommended shift of locus of authority from the President's to the Vice President's Office, the other aspects of administrative structure involved in the recent reorganization seem to us to be quite appropriate. Three main coordinate units, each with its own Director, have been established. (Each Director, in our proposal, would be directly responsible to the Vice President for Educational and Student Relations.) There is an Office of Black Educational Programs, an Office of Mexican-American Affairs, and an Office of Resource Coordination and Program Development. The Directors of the Black and Mexican-American Offices are responsible for coordinating tutorial assistance, counseling services, work-study, financial aid, admissions and recruiting, liaison with academic units, community activities, and the like. While coordination across these offices should be diligently pursued, it is also important that each office operate with a high degree of autonomy and responsibility. It is important also that the Directors be selected and appointed to their Directorships with the advice and participation of the relevant student groups. The director of the third office will have responsibilities for those programs falling outside the province of the other two offices, e.g., programs for American Indians and for disadvantaged majority students, and for developing funding proposals to outside agencies, coordinating between this university and others in the state, etc.

This approach to the problem of administrative structure--a vice president and three coordinate program directors--seems to us likely to be functional at the present time. It may well be, however, that the increasing size of minority enrollments will require the establishment of a Vice President for Minority Affairs or a Presidential Special Assistant for Minority Affairs at sometime in the future; consideration of this possibility should not be delayed too long. Whatever the ultimate administrative structure, it will be important to make clear the lines and limitations of authority and responsibility. Lack of clarity in this regard, thus far, has generated frequent occasions of anomic.

The foregoing discussion has been confined to the non-academic arena. But the overall administrative structure for minority programs must involve the faculty as well, and at all levels of the University. In this regard we want to recommend the following actions. First, that the Faculty Council establish a standing Committee on Minority Programs. This committee should have responsibility for advising the administration and the faculty on minority matters; it should monitor the growth and development of the various programs and keep the Faculty Council informed; and it should serve as liaison between the Faculty Council and the Deans and department chairmen to facilitate at those levels actions (e.g., minority faculty recruitment) in which the Council would have a continuing interest. A standing committee of this sort would be visible evidence of faculty involvement in these matters.

Second, that the Faculty Council urge the Deans of each college to establish a college committee on minority programs; its duties would be similar, at the college level, to those of the Council committee.

Third, that the Council petition each departmental chairman to designate, within the department, a committee or a faculty member responsible for minority concerns. It would be this committee's job to worry about minority faculty recruitment, to look into reshaping the departmental curriculum in order to increase its relevance to minority issues, to be a point of contact for minority students wishing to communicate about departmental offerings, and to be available to the Directors of the minority programs when they need academic advice from the department.

VIII. If the developments foreseen by this report are actually accomplished, it will mean a noticeable change in the nature of the academic community and the surrounding Boulder community. Fifteen percent of the student population will belong to minority groups, and there will be a significant increase of minority persons among the faculty and staff by the end of the next five years. Accommodation to such changes will require University attention to a number of ancillary matters which inevitably transcend the University perimeter. Three of these will be mentioned briefly to illustrate the need for seeing the minority student enrollment issue in the broadest possible terms.

The first is the problem of housing, a matter ancillary but essential to the growth of minority enrollment. A recent report from the University Housing Policy Committee points out that there is a shortage of housing, especially low-income housing, in Boulder, and the situation is probably much more difficult for married students than for single students. In 1958, University housing facilities accommodated 33% of the married students; in 1969, only 18% of married students were in University housing. This sharp reduction is seen to be even more significant when the fact that the number of married students increased 106% between 1958 and 1969 is considered. Family housing facilities in the same period increased only 29%.

Lack of low-income housing provides a barrier to students whose financial resources are limited. The problem of limited financial resources for housing is multiplied for those older students and graduate students who are married and have families. The same problem is faced by staff. Efforts to recruit minority staff from the Denver metropolitan area are often frustrated by the lack of low-income housing in Boulder and therefore the inability to move here to accept employment.

The University must be willing to enter the housing field in a way which will make it possible to provide low-income facilities for minority students and staff. It is recommended that the University Housing Policy Committee consider the implications of increased minority enrollment on the University's housing needs over the coming period. Joint University-City housing projects, rental subsidies, and new University construction, as already suggested by that Committee, are all important to pursue. Consideration of temporary or trailer facilities may also be necessary if permanent construction is delayed. And University communication with owners of local, private housing must guarantee that discrimination on racial or ethnic grounds will be vigorously opposed. Within the University's own dormitories, the employment of Black and Mexican-American student counselors would be an important step to implement.

A second ancillary problem lies in the more general area of University-community relations. Greater understanding in the community about minority groups, their history, culture, and current needs could insure a more supportive community context. University cooperation with the Boulder Human Relations Committee would be one avenue to pursue. The organization of community seminars and discussions would be another. The provision of special courses on minority groups for local police and sheriffs would be a third. In all of these efforts there is an important role for the Extension Division to play.

The final ancillary matter to mention is that of developing University involvement in community change efforts. Such involvements would provide an immediate context for minority students to contribute their special skills or knowledge to the solution of social problems as well as bring increased relevance into the overall academic curriculum. Credit courses for work in the community and with local agencies and community groups need to be elaborated. Educational use of the laboratories provided by the Denver urban area, the migrant communities, and the state's Indian reservations, while of general importance to the University, can make a signal contribution to the success of the University's minority programs. The unique location of the Denver Center at the edge of the state's largest concentrations of Black and Mexican-American residents makes this issue an especially relevant one for minority program development at the Center.

IX. All of the recommendations made in this report in one way or another imply the need for additional financial resources; taken together, the need must be characterized as massive. The funding situation is exacerbated by the current inflation, the rising costs of higher education, and the Federal government's leveling off or retrenching on its programs of support.

Approximately \$1,900 is needed to provide full support-tuition, books, board and room--to a student on the Boulder campus. EOP students requiring full support have been provided with a financial package comprised of \$900 as a grant, \$900 from work-study remuneration, and \$100 as government loan. Funds for student support have come from the Federal Economic Opportunity Grant, Federal Work-Study, State Work-Study, National Defense Loans, Student Referendum Funds, the State Legislature's undergraduate budget support, and other sources. During the 1968-69 year, the budget for student financial aid came to just over \$2,000,000. For the 1969-70 year, that budget increased by almost \$1,000,000. This enabled financial aid for non-minority students to remain at about the same level as the preceding year, with most of the million dollar increase allocated to

support of the nearly 640 undergraduate minority students currently receiving financial aid on the Boulder campus. These figures give a beginning idea of the magnitude of funding that will be required to implement the increased minority enrollment called for in this report. Funds for faculty and staff positions and for expanded support services must also be added to this.

The University's budget request for 1970-71 has already been submitted. Provision for the enrollment of 400-500 additional minority students is anticipated. While this continues the significant progress made thus far, it is clear that sharply increased numbers will need to be admitted in future years if the goal we have urged in this report is to be met.

In our talks with various University officials, we have been informed that the future Federal aid picture is essentially unclear. Every effort to secure Federal funds will, obviously, have to be pursued with vigor and persistence, but it is possible that the curve of Federal support has levelled off. Private foundation support for minority programs, while helpful, is generally not continuing support, and is likely to be provided only to initiate programs later to be funded by the institution itself. The fundamental obligation for financial support of increased minority enrollment belongs, it is clear, to the State. It is the enduring responsibility of the state to provide for the full educational development of its youth; no other resource is as valuable as its youth, and no other responsibility is as fundamental.

The unfortunate fact, as we have come to see in the past few years, is that state support of higher education in Colorado is already inadequate. To the extent that the Governor and the State Legislature continue this stance, increased minority enrollment becomes nothing more than a vague hope. One reason for the lengthy development of this report has been to make the need for increased minority enrollment amply clear; if that aim has been achieved, it should follow that the state must assume its inherent obligation to provide the necessary financial support. We recommend that the Faculty Council take every action possible to see that state funding is provided. This will include instructions to the University administration about the necessity to formulate a budget request that encompasses these financial needs, and pressure on the University Regents to adopt such a budget and work diligently for it throughout the state. The entire issue of financial support must be approached in such a way that responsibility for inadequate support can be laid by the citizens of Colorado on the proper doorstep, and pressure can be focused where it can be most effective.

If, for whatever reason, adequate financial support is not forthcoming we recommend a re-ordering of existing budgetary priorities within the University to enable significant progress in minority enrollment. Such re-ordering of priorities will obviously meet resistance and generate strain and frustration. Nevertheless, an unwillingness to pursue this approach, if other avenues have been closed, would be tantamount to rejecting the importance of equal educational opportunity at C.U. In our view, this would be an error of the utmost seriousness.

Faculty commitment to the goals urged in this report can be evidenced in another way, taking the example the students provided with their Referendum Fund. At the Medical School a faculty scholarship fund has been established. There is also a Martin Luther King, Jr. Scholarship Fund which is already supporting minority students with funds contributed by faculty and staff. We recommend that the idea of faculty salary contributions be supported by the Faculty Council. Such contributions, while completely unable to match the needs involved, can provide evidence of faculty support and commitment to equality of educational opportunity.

X. So large an effort and allocation of resources over the next five years, must be accompanied by ongoing and intensive evaluation and assessment. Such assessment can help steer the programs through continuing feedback, and can enable an "accounting" of its successes and failures. Evaluation should include appraisal of the various programs and of their educational consequences, not only academic but personal and social, for the students involved. It should also provide continuing appraisal of attitudes and reactions of the academic community as a whole. The University has available a variety of evaluation skills resources in the Institute of Behavioral Science, the Psychology and Sociology Departments, the Department of Student Services, and the Laboratory of Educational Research in the School of Education. An organized and continuing evaluation effort involving these units is strongly recommended as a way of "keeping account" of the success of the University's minority program developments.

This report has been long since the matters dealt with have been complex and we have sought to provide the faculty with information as well as recommendations for policy. Our focus, as noted at the outset, has been on the Boulder campus, and perhaps, mainly on the undergraduate level; brief descriptions of other programs and of developments at the graduate level and at the other campuses will be presented during the Faculty Council discussion. We want to emphasize, again, however, that our recommendations are meant to apply, insofar as it is reasonable, to the University as a whole.

The work of our committee has been facilitated and made gratifying by the unstinting cooperation of faculty colleagues, administrators, and students and by the evident commitment of all of them to making progress in minority education. We have borrowed freely from their reports and comments and want to express our appreciation for their help.

This report is submitted to the Faculty Council with a request for discussion and action on its recommendations. Beginning on the next page, the latter are summarized for convenience. In sum, we have proposed a long-range objective and we have described various ways of working toward it. The achievement of that objective should bring equality of educational opportunity to the University and contribute, at the same time, to the revitalization of the academic environment.

Respectfully submitted,

Faculty Council Committee on  
Minority Programs

Richard Jessor, Chairman  
Delmos Jones  
Julius London  
Salvador Ramirez



## ADDENDUM

Summary of Major Recommendations  
of the  
Faculty Council Committee on Minority Programs

The following summary provides a brief review of the main proposals in the report and can serve as a device for organizing discussion and action by the Faculty Council. A reading of the full report is necessary in order to see the rationale for each recommendation, the interrelations among them, and the many ancillary proposals not repeated in this summary.

1. The general spirit of the report expresses the faculty's involvement in and concern for expanding educational opportunity at the University of Colorado for minority students. Endorsement of the spirit of the report as a whole would be evidence of that involvement and that concern.
2. Our primary recommendation is that the University commit itself explicitly to a substantial increase in minority enrollment at all campuses, and insofar as it is feasible, at all levels.
3. Specifically our recommendation is that the University commit itself to a minority enrollment, by the 1974-75 academic year, in which in-state minority students make up the same percentage (15%) of the in-state enrollment that those minority groups occupy in the state's population.
4. Further, our recommendation is that the same proportion (15%) of out-of-state enrollment be minority students in order to extend equal opportunity and assure diversity in that sector of enrollment as well.
5. We recommend that the University continue to admit minority students who are "high risk" as long as there is reason to believe that, with the appropriate academic and support programs such students can meet the same graduation or exit standards currently applied to all students.
6. The report recommends increased minority recruitment efforts in order to meet the enrollment objective proposed. Recruitment targets should include the adult community, as well as the high schools, and special efforts to recruit Indian youth should be initiated.
7. Intensive efforts should be made to increase the number of minority faculty at the University. Such efforts should include the appointment of otherwise-qualified minority faculty with incomplete credentials, and the provision of opportunity for them to complete their credentials while at the University.
8. Amplification of recruitment efforts to bring minority staff to the University and of in-service training efforts to up-grade minority staff is strongly recommended.
9. It was recommended that the Faculty Council affirm its support for the full development of minority studies programs at the University. Such programs are of educational value not only to minority students but to the academic community as a whole and they should be open to all students.

10. It was recommended further that general curriculum offerings be examined with regard to the degree to which the educational needs of minority students are being met. The initiation of new courses and the reorientation of current courses could both have important educational consequences for minority students and for the campus as a whole.

11. Massive support program efforts--both academic and personal--need to be planned and coordinated immediately. Such programs can provide skills, orientation to college life, motivation to achieve, knowledge of the academic labyrinth, a greater sense of personal adequacy, a feeling of group identity, and the like--all factors likely to influence success in college. Remedial classes, tutoring, advising, and counseling must be available and employed if "high risk" students are not to suffer one more experience of failure--this time at C.U.

12. To provide these support services in a coordinated and intensive way, we recommend the continuation of the pre-entry summer programs and the development of an integrated first-year, academic-year support program.

13. Our recommendation is that administrative responsibility for the minority programs be located in the office of the Vice President for Educational and Student Relations. Three coordinate units would report, through their Directors, to that vice president: an Office of Black Educational Programs, an Office of Mexican-American Affairs, and an Office of Resource Coordination and Program Development. Coordination among these three units would assure an efficient and mutually supportive operation.

14. We strongly recommend the establishment of a standing Committee on Minority Programs of the Faculty Council and similar committees in all colleges, schools, and departments.

15. University involvement in extensive minority programs will require University attention to expanding low-income housing, to developing University-community relations, and to involving the University in community change activities. Efforts along these lines are strongly recommended.

16. Recognizing that the fundamental obligation for financial support of increased minority enrollment belongs to the State of Colorado, we recommend that the Faculty Council take every action possible to see that state funding is provided. Administration budget requests and Regent support for such requests are obviously the initial steps. If adequate financial support is not forthcoming, we recommend a searching re-appraisal and ultimate re-ordering of present budgetary priorities to enable significant progress in minority enrollment.

17. Continuing and extensive evaluation, applied to all aspects of the minority programs, is recommended as essential to a proper "accounting" of the successes and failures of the programs, and as a way of learning where improvement is needed early enough to benefit from that knowledge.