

# The Plan has already increased diversity

**Editor's Note:**

Two issues ago, we printed an article which briefly discussed the Diversity Forum, held April 27, and printed, in full, the latest of "The Diversity Plan."

This week's coverage is focused on background leading up to the latest revision of "The Plan," as well as personal responses by administration, faculty and students. Our goal is and always has been to provide a more in-depth look at the timeline of events from conception to pending implementation of "The Diversity Plan."

The end of the school year is approaching and so is the June 2 deadline for suggestions on revisions of the proposed "Diversity Plan (The Plan)," a plan that has sparked criticism and support campus-wide.

In accordance with federal guidelines, the college currently has an Affirmative Action plan in place. "The Diversity Plan," while not mandatory, parallels the Affirmative Action plan, and focuses its intentions on increasing the diversity of the campus (see comparison of plans).

The Plan, which originated in November 1994, was developed by representatives from the President's Council (administration, classifieds staff, deans, faculty and students) with assistance from Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE).

According to Joe Uris, sociology instructor, WICHE is a non profit "umbrella organization" which sponsors research into higher education, grant programs for higher education and various projects, similar to The Plan.

CCC, in conjunction with Chemeketa, Lane, Rogue and Mt Hood Community Colleges, make up the consortium which, with WICHE's assistance, is striving to provide workable "diversity plans" that facilitate the individual needs of each campus.

In the fall of 1993, some members of the Gender and Ethnic Equity Committee formed a team to work with WICHE to implement a diversity plan.

WICHE provided a 12-month "training session" to assist members of the core planning team in determining what the necessary components would be for CCC's individualized plan. Part of the evaluation included three personal visits to the campus to ascertain the campus's diversity needs.

In October 1994, planning members from the five community colleges met in Corvallis with the WICHE staff and consultants from around the country to develop a workable plan for the respective schools.

The original plan, which was presented to CCC faculty in November, 1994, resembled the current plan. However it included policies, such as "a code of conduct and a hate-free zone" that were considered to be inflamma-

tory by representatives of various groups on campus.

"The suggestion for a code of conduct is more political correctness puffery -- grandiose self serving and also smelling to high heaven. This posture of moral vigilantism -- policing others without having solicited it -- is repressive and conformist, and ironically works against the tolerance and sensitivity it seeks to promote," said John Orrelle, psychology instructor and Plan adversary.

"The plan promotes the very thing it purports to prevent -- a homogenized and sanitized campus. There is genuine paradox here. Diversity and multiculturalism -- the words -- have been so politicized as to be damn near meaningless."

Orrelle's written response in opposition of the original plan was considered by some to be instrumental in having revisions made to the first draft.

"Had there been no resistance to the original draft, we would be stuck with an abysmally bad plan, one that is repressive and coercive in tone (codes of conduct, hate free zones and so on) and antithetical to the spirit that defines a college campus -- uncensored exchange of ideas free from vigilantism and administrative correctives," Orrelle said.

To date, The Plan has undergone two revisions, the first of which drew negative responses that were similar to the objections made regarding the original draft. While the second revision is significantly different than the original

plan and the first revision, opponents still object to many of the elements that supporters of The Plan feel are imperative in attaining its goals.

"I was not part of the original group that designed the plan... but I did have a role in this most recent draft because there were some things in it that I, and others, felt needed modification. The Plan (as it is now) is very mild. It doesn't do much. It really talks to intent rather than process," said Uris.

"I consider it a minimal plan rather than a maximum plan. There is very little in it that is aggressive or assertive or confrontive and I actually was a little bit surprised by the amount of concern that I heard," Uris continued.

College President John Keyser agreed. "...Diversity is part and parcel to the educational process. We study different cultures, different peoples, different theories and different concepts. So I don't think The Plan's going to change things that much. I don't think that this is a major leap forward or backward, depending on a person's perspective."

While many supporters feel The Plan is not going to drastically alter the climate at CCC, Ellen Wolfson, international counselor and WICHE planning team member, believes the principles included in The Plan will directly contribute to the improvement of campus diversity.

"I personally am a strong supporter of The Plan. I worked hard on it for two years.... I think The Plan is educationally based. It provides opportunities to increase your knowledge base, communication, tolerance and understanding. I think the goals are things that lots of different kinds of people can get involved in," Wolfson explained.

In an effort to lessen the degree of miscommunication, a diversity forum was held April 27. Moderated by Uris, the intention was to bring both sides together on neutral ground to debate the issues as well as to inform participants of the pending plan in an open atmosphere.

"The purpose (of the forum) was to have an open exchange of ideas -- and that did occur. So in those terms it was successful,"

"The purpose (of the forum) was to have an open exchange of ideas -- and that did occur. So in those terms, it was successful."

-Kate Gray  
English Instructor

English instructor Kate Gray said. Despite the fact that open exchanges did occur, many participants on both sides equally expressed frustration at the negativity regarding the manner in which ideas were presented.

"I saw faculty not speak out because of hostility. People were

not quite sure how to address that. John Keyser had no clue that students didn't feel included (in the developmental process of The Plan) and that's why he spoke so strongly," Gray continued.

Wolfson agreed stating, "I think the forum provided an opportunity to see the strong emotions in the room and to really provide an opportunity for people to hear how scared people are about change or how they perceive change, and to see a lot of miscommunication...."

"There is some personal kind of labelling and attacking going on which I thought really meant that we need to educate and listen to each other more. So in that sense, I think the forum was a good tool," she said.

Wolfson feels there is a language needed when sharing differences of opinions. When individuals aren't cautious of the way they express their feelings and beliefs, the statements "ignite and make the division even farther," she said.

Dean Darris, political science instructor, felt the forum was a contradiction in its intent.

"I saw some of the 'applied diversity' at the discussion (forum) and was somewhat appalled by the lack of respect-dignity to the students or the recognition of their diverse opinions," Darris said.

Guy Crooks, volunteer coordinator for ASG, was involved with planning sessions for WICHE, during which comments were made regarding the eligibility of campus input.

"I brought up the question, 'what are they going to do with the input from the forum?' because I've heard people say in meetings 'we're just going to have this (the forum) so that people think they have some input when really they don't.' And then they went so far as to say, 'let's not even have it (the forum) so that people don't get the idea that they have input when they really don't'. So they decided to have the forum and I was just curious as to whether the input was going to count," Crooks said.

Darris said he appreciated that students were willing to share their opinions at the forum.

"I saw the first glimmer of hope here. I thought the students did a phenomenal job, even though I didn't agree with all of you (the students) -- but I'm not supposed to -- that's diversity,"

Darris added.

Keyser felt the forum accomplished what it realistically set out to do: open up lines of communication.

"I think generally the forum was an effort to open up the process. I think it did that. I think some people obviously have some very strong emotions about as-

"...I don't think problems is racism. I think being screwed

pects of it but generally we've tried to put it into the educational process, to be part of educational exchange, to be part of an ongoing dialogue about what is best for Clackamas, really to the issues raised. So I feel that is a healthy process.

"One of the outcomes from

**Original Draft  
11-21-94**

- Goal 1 - Develop at least courses with diversity content
- Strategies:**
- a) develop criteria for "diversity content"
  - b) examine existing courses to see which satisfy "diversity content" (department level)
  - c) research courses from other schools for "diversity content"
  - d) determine number of additional classes needed in consultation with curriculum committee so all AA degrees and certificates include one class
  - e) award mini-grants or release time to develop/modify classes to meet criteria (i.e., support development of diversity classes) student credit for research or course development

- Goal 2 - Provide diversity training for at least 10 different faculty per year (5 years or 10 years)
- Strategies:**
- a) determine nature of training for instructors and staff and secure courses and instructors (i.e., hire consultant or form a consortium with the other cooperating community colleges)
  - b) recruit and identify faculty cohort
  - c) identify and provide "completers" of cohort with reward

- Goal 3 - Establish diversity advisory committee that includes community, administration, faculty