



## **A Color Scheme**

*Questions Raised by Accounting and Business Practices  
Within the University of Colorado at Boulder's  
Multi-Million Dollar Diversity Administration*

*Jessica Peck Corry, Director*

*Bobbi Jo Whitlock, Brad Jones and Aaron Ross Powell,  
Research Associates Campus Accountability Project*

*IP-1-2007*

*January 2007*

---

13952 Denver West Parkway • Suite 400 • Golden, Colorado 80401-3141  
[www.IndependenceInstitute.org](http://www.IndependenceInstitute.org) • 303-279-6536 • 303-279-4176 fax

---

## **A NOTE FROM THE AUTHORS**

Three years after we first began asking questions about spending and budget practices within the University of Colorado at Boulder’s diversity administration, we are compelled to write this report. Our requests for information have not been satisfied; the time has come for an independent investigation. We are providing this report as a tool for those ultimately responsible for initiating such an autonomous evaluation, including CU President Hank Brown, CU system-wide officials, including the CU Board of Regents, as well as members of the Colorado legislature.

The public needs to know that diversity spending in Boulder—now in the tens of millions—rises each year without accountability and without any adequate budget oversight. CU-Boulder says it does not know how much it spends each year and has expressed no desire to determine an accurate figure. CU-Boulder’s complacency is inexcusable during this era when many Colorado families are struggling to meet rising tuition costs and CU President Hank Brown and Gov. Bill Ritter attempt to raise awareness about what they say are unmet funding needs in higher education.<sup>1</sup>

As a public institution responsible to taxpayers, CU-Boulder should be accountable for every dollar spent in the education of its students. CU officially agrees with this tenet, found within its Regent Policy, declaring that all employees have the “responsibility of preserving University resources and using those resources in a prudent manner.”<sup>2</sup>

While perfect resource efficiency cannot be expected, CU is nonetheless required to maintain a minimum level of cost-effective budgeting. Transparency, which currently does not exist within CU-Boulder’s diversity administration, is necessary to ensure even the lowest level of accountability.

Existing evidence overwhelmingly demonstrates that CU-Boulder’s record keeping is riddled with inconsistencies, omissions, duplications, and ambiguities. Direct inquiries made to responsible CU administrative personnel have offered little clarification.

The ultimate purpose of this report is to create public awareness about inadequacies within CU’s diversity administration and to provide a new vision for accountability in the future. We proceed with the strong belief that greater efficiency can help more Colorado children achieve the dream of a college education.

Jessica Peck Corry  
Bobbi Jo Whitlock  
Brad Jones  
Aaron Ross Powell

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- In January 2006, CU President Hank Brown convened more than 40 Colorado-based business and civic leaders to serve on the CU Blue Ribbon Diversity Commission. The purpose of this panel, one year after its first meeting, remains unclear, with one university press release suggesting it was to provide an impartial fiscal analysis of what was purported to be CU-Boulder's \$21.8 million diversity administration and another suggesting the panel was convened to promote diversity and minority student retention. [See page 6.](#)

- CU-Boulder's budget data is highly unreliable. Administrators admit that the \$21.8 million budget released to the media and public in 2006 is far from accurate or complete; they further admit they do not know how

much is actually spent on diversity efforts. When asked to explain how CU determined how much is spent annually on diversity, Mary Ann Sergeant, program director for CU-Boulder's Office of Diversity and Equity, noted that \$21.8 million was "a conservative estimate of our annual expenditures."<sup>3</sup> In February 2006, CU Assistant Vice President for Diversity Carmen Williams noted that the figure released only included Boulder programs "with a service component, as opposed to academic programs."<sup>4</sup> In December 2006, CU-Boulder Chancellor Bud Peterson

dismissed the figure entirely, saying "it's not even close to what we're spending."<sup>5</sup> [See page 8.](#)

- For all intents and purposes, the CU Board of Regents has abdicated and delegated its oversight role of CU's diversity efforts and presently exercises no substantial or ongoing oversight capability of the diversity funding process, having directly authorized funding for

the University Initiatives Fund, just \$397,500 of the \$21.8 million CU says it spent on diversity in FY2005. <sup>6</sup>

- CU offers "ethnic-specific" counseling through its Center for Multicultural Affairs. While such services purport to be open to all students, they clearly target specific racial and ethnic groups to the exclusion of others, raising questions about CU-Boulder's willingness to comply with the spirit of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, federal legislation that prohibits public institutions from discriminating on the basis of race.

- CU regularly invests in evaluations and analysis of diversity efforts on its Boulder campus. In 2003, CU commissioned a 2010 Vision Task Force to evaluate diversity efforts. No greater accountability appears to have been achieved as a result of such efforts.<sup>7</sup> [See page 5.](#)

- Continued support for CU-Boulder's diversity administration depends on the public perception that minority students need special assistance to succeed at CU-Boulder. In 2007, this stigma couldn't be further from the truth; at CU-Boulder, qualified minority students excel. [See page 6.](#)

- No efforts are made to ensure that CU-Boulder diversity efforts avoid resource duplication. In fact, despite not having a grasp on its current funding allocations or needs, Provost Phil DiStefano recently announced that CU-Boulder will consider adding a position of vice chancellor for diversity. This decision comes despite the fact that CU already has several administrators, including

*Continued support for CU-Boulder's diversity administration depends on the public perception that minority students need special assistance to succeed at CU-Boulder. In 2007, this stigma couldn't be further from the truth; at CU-Boulder, qualified minority students excel.*

*Administrators admit that the \$21.8 million budget released to the media and public in 2006 is far from accurate or complete; they further admit they do not know how much is actually spent on diversity efforts.*

a system-wide assistant vice president and an associate vice chancellor for diversity, to oversee programming, budgets, and other needs.<sup>8</sup>

- Chancellor Peterson has said he is creating a plan to base budgeting on performance outcomes, while also stating that he does not envision a diversity administration where programs are encouraged to compete against one another for funding.<sup>9</sup> Peterson’s proposal, while not yet implemented, should be fully explored. The question remains: In practice, would it allow for the dissolution of programs that fail to meet measurable and desirable outcomes, while also encouraging successful programs to work together for greater efficiency?

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Given CU-Boulder’s inability and unwillingness to provide accurate budget information on its hundreds of diversity-related programs and initiatives, Colorado legislators, the CU Board of Regents, and CU President Hank Brown should initiate an independent investigation into CU-Boulder’s diversity spending practices. This investigation should focus on identifying waste and areas for greater budget efficiency, with the ultimate goal of better utilizing existing resources and ensuring adequate spending oversight. Specific areas for focus are suggested on [page 8](#). Focus on an initial inventory of expenditures should be a stated primary mission of any analysis.
2. CU must reevaluate the purpose of its diversity administration. Since its mission remains unclear ([see page 4](#)), administrators and participants should devote themselves to creating a new mission, with the focus on outreach to disadvantaged students of all races, and providing the financial assistance

*CU must reevaluate the purpose of its diversity administration.*

to make the pursuit of higher education possible for such students. Efforts promoting racial segregation or separatism should be dismantled and potentially reorganized into programs that encourage racial interaction, and more importantly, individual success. For minority students coming from disadvantaged socio-economic backgrounds, a support system will still exist. For those not coming from disadvantaged backgrounds, however, such students will not be targeted as being in need of special assistance (the process currently utilized under much of today’s CU diversity programming).

3. CU-Boulder should end “ethnic-specific” counseling as provided through its Center for Multicultural Affairs. In addition, it should dissolve all race-specific titles or any suggestion that any diversity-related program is race-specific, race-selective, or race-restrictive. [See page 4](#).
4. In an effort to ensure greater resource efficiency, CU-Boulder should undertake an ongoing internal evaluation of its own programming to determine where resource duplication might exist. Currently, several programs list similar or identical objectives and appear to provide the same or very similar services. Successful programs, including CU-Boulder’s Pre-Collegiate Development Program, geared toward increasing access and opportunity for disadvantaged students of all students, should be funded at greater rates than programs that have no proven measurable outcomes. [See pages 5 and 11](#).
5. CU-Boulder should implement a system of priority-based budgeting as well as outcome-based funding in future fiscal years. This new system would tie program

*In addition, it should dissolve all race-specific titles or any suggestion that any diversity-related program is race-specific, race-selective, or race-restrictive.*

funding to performance and priorities, with each program, department, and initiative being required to make adequate progress toward meeting its established objectives on an annual basis. These reports should be monitored yearly by CU-Boulder’s Assistant Vice President for Diversity, not every five years by CU-Boulder officials, as currently advocated by CU-Boulder’s “Diversity Action Plan”.<sup>10</sup> Programs that do not meet stated objectives should be abolished, phased out, or redesigned. [See page 8.](#)

6. Currently, according to CU-Boulder’s own disregarded budget figures, only 18 percent of diversity funding at CU-Boulder is devoted to scholarships. Pre-collegiate, financial aid and community service programs should be a top funding priority, over expanding administrative costs by adding new positions, as the means to attract a wider array of racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic backgrounds to the CU-Boulder campus.

## WHAT IS DIVERSITY?

Diversity is a top priority at CU-Boulder. One use of the university’s search engine will yield more than 6,000 links to diversity-related information on the CU Web site.<sup>11</sup> A diversity budget released in 2005 boasts of more than 400 diversity-related programs and initiatives.<sup>12</sup> Students can live in diversity-themed dormitories, take diversity-related academic courses, enroll in ethnic-specific counseling, and attend race-focused graduation ceremonies.<sup>13</sup>

*Students can live in diversity-themed dormitories, take diversity-related academic courses, enroll in ethnic-specific counseling, and attend race-focused graduation ceremonies.*

### *But what exactly is diversity?*

According to the CU Office of Diversity and Equity: “Diversity includes, but is not limited to, ethnicity, race, gender, age, class, sexual orientation, religion, disability, political viewpoints, veteran status, and

gender identity/expression.”

The site also notes that a climate of “healthy diversity is one in which people value individual and group differences, respect the perspectives of others, and communicate openly.”<sup>14</sup>

The Campus Accountability Project has raised serious concerns in recent years about CU-Boulder’s use of “diversity” to justify questionable educational practices.

In 2003, CAP exposed CU for funding racially-segregated workshops where students were brought together to discuss race. In 2004, CAP received support from the American Civil Liberties Union and The Denver Post, among others, when it questioned a decision made by university administrators to prevent student activists from protesting against Affirmative Action practices by hosting a satirical “Affirmative Action” bake sale. University administrators ultimately backed down, allowing the event to move forward. Also in 2004, CAP approached CU administrators with the prospect of a federal civil rights lawsuit after students reported that CU was using racially-discriminatory admissions standards for course sections in its undergraduate education department. In this situation, administrators again backed down, removing racial restrictions on courses.

*In 2004, CAP received support from the American Civil Liberties Union and The Denver Post, among others, when it questioned a decision made by university administrators to prevent student activists from protesting against Affirmative Action practices by hosting a satirical “Affirmative Action” bake sale.*

*The question remains, however: Why does CU continue to encourage segregation in the name of diversity?*<sup>15</sup>

On the Web site for CU-Boulder’s Center for Multicultural Affairs, services advertised have included “ethnic-specific” counseling for everything from grief-counseling to peer mentoring.<sup>16</sup>

Meanwhile, CU-Boulder's Student Academic Services Center and the Counseling & Psychological Services Office, together market support services to all students (not just those of targeted ethnicities), in a "multicultural" setting geared toward addressing student needs relating to academic and personal development, as well as mental health.<sup>17</sup>

## CU MINORITY STUDENTS EXCEL

The intense focus on race in all aspects of student life has been implemented by race-conscious activists who would like the public to believe that

minority students desperately need extra programs like those provided through the Center for Multicultural Affairs in order to compete academically. The fact is—minority students who are prepared to compete excel at CU-Boulder.

By failing to quantify the costs of individual diversity programs or a cost-per-student analysis, CU-Boulder has failed to provide quantitative proof that race-specific or race-conscience programming has any greater impact on targeted populations than already existing race-neutral academic and outreach programs.

Conversely, the university's own data offer widespread evidence demonstrating that minority students

who meet minimum academic standards at the time they apply to become freshmen are admitted and excel at the same rates as white students who meet these same standards.<sup>18</sup>

Specifically, minority applicants who meet CU-Boulder's admission criteria (an "index score" of 103 or higher) are actually admitted at much higher rates than white students. The admittance rate for all qualified CU applicants (with index scores of 103 or higher) is 89 percent, compared with a 95 percent

admittance rate for minority applicants. Despite displaying notably higher admittance rates, minority applicants enroll at exactly the same rates as white students.<sup>19</sup>

While statistics do show that minority graduation rates, at 60 percent, are 6 percent lower than overall CU-Boulder graduation rates, this deficiency can be accounted for by differences in admission test scores (SAT, ACT), differences in high school performance, and differences in financial capabilities that may limit disadvantaged students from continuing from matriculation to graduation on a desirable four-year track.

In fact, research has proven that graduation rates have a direct link to the student's SAT/ACT test scores. A study by CU Planning and Budget Director Lou McClelland, reports that "even controlling for the white graduation rate, rates for each other racial/ethnic group are related to the 25th percentile SAT/ACT math and verbal scores."<sup>20</sup>

Every year, under guidelines set by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education, CU is allowed to disregard minimum admission criteria for a certain percentage of its student admissions through a "window." In fall of 2005, 10 percent of all freshman matriculations to CU-Boulder were admitted through the "window," meaning they did not meet the minimum index score of 103.21 Minority "window" matriculations, at 16 percent, are at rates nearly twice that of white/Caucasian "window" matriculations, clearly indicating that CU-Boulder's practice of lowering admission standards in order to admit higher percentages of minority students has the postponed but inevitable effect of contributing to lower graduation rates for these same students. As education advocates around the nation have noted, one of the greatest roadblocks to achievement by students of all races in college

*Conversely, the university's own data offer widespread evidence demonstrating that minority students who meet minimum academic standards at the time they apply to become freshmen are admitted and excel at the same rates as white students who meet these same standards.*

*Every year, under guidelines set by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education, CU is allowed to disregard minimum admission criteria for a certain percentage of its student admissions through a "window."*

can be attributed to a lack of preparation at the pre-collegiate level.<sup>22</sup>

## BACKGROUND

In recent years, CU has regularly invested in evaluations and analysis of diversity efforts on the Boulder campus.

In 1999, CU established its “Campus Diversity Plan: A Blueprint for Action,” a plan to build on diversity efforts; in 2000 and 2003, it released follow up reports, titled “State of the Campus Diversity Report,” and in 2003, CU commissioned a 2010 Vision Task Force to evaluate diversity efforts and establish a system-wide vice president position to provide oversight on diversity issues.<sup>23</sup>

In the aftermath of both efforts, CU-Boulder’s diversity spending failed to realize any increased accountability or oversight.

*In the aftermath of both efforts, CU-Boulder’s diversity spending failed to realize any increased accountability or oversight.*

Most recently, in January 2006, University of Colorado President Hank Brown convened more than 40 Colorado civic and business leaders in Boulder to serve as members of the CU Blue Ribbon Diversity Commission. The purpose of the commission was “to engage in a system-wide, external review of diversity programs at the University of Colorado.”<sup>24</sup>

When Brown first announced his intention to create the panel in August 2005, a university press release stated the following:

“The costs and results of the university’s diversity programs will be individually analyzed” and the “Blue Ribbon Commission will critically evaluate the university’s efforts and recommend improvements and reallocation of resources as appropriate.” All recommendations for improvement were to be forwarded on to the University’s Board of Regents.<sup>25</sup>

While such an outline suggested a strong commitment to bringing accountability to CU-

Boulder’s diversity administration, the tone had dramatically shifted by the time the commission first convened five months later, in January 2006, when the university publicly released a set of “expected outcomes” from the commission’s work.

Noticeably absent from this second distribution was any reference to a critical evaluation of CU-Boulder’s budget priorities, and more specifically, to its budget priorities relating to diversity.

The list did include:

- Improving the campus climate: making the campus more welcoming for all students; increasing safety for students; and creating a stronger sense of community for all university members.
- Strengthening pipelines to college for K-12 students: improving and expanding the university’s successful pre-collegiate programs for greater outreach to middle and high school students.
- Improving recruitment and retention of under-represented students: bolstering recruitment of students of color through creative, effective outreach activities and enhancing retention rates for students of color.
- Strengthening community and corporate partnerships with CU: involving local communities and businesses to a greater extent in supporting diversity efforts at the University through mentorship, internships, and other activities.
- Refining the campus strategic plan for diversity: honing the diversity plan to reflect campus-wide responsibility and accountability for advancing the University’s diversity goals.

*Noticeably absent from this second distribution was any reference to a critical evaluation of CU-Boulder’s budget priorities, and more specifically, to its budget priorities relating to diversity.*

Resulting from this shift in focus was that commissioners were conflicted about the purpose of the panel's work, with some stating a budget analysis was crucial to their work, and others stating that it should not be part of the dialogue.<sup>26</sup>

Former Denver Mayor and Blue Ribbon Commissioner, Wellington Webb, told reporters that any review of diversity spending should have only been undertaken with the narrow focus of locating more money for the administration, noting that a budgetary review "sends the wrong signal."

He further noted that a spending review of the administration was "like blaming the victim" because the "diversity programs did not cause (CU-Boulder's racial) problems."<sup>27</sup>

The commission's first meeting was met with much media and public fanfare, after months of news reports alleging racial tensions on the campus.<sup>28</sup>

## **RUBBER STAMP FOR THE STATUS QUO**

After commissioners met in January 2006, CU-Boulder released a report presented to the public as representing the commissioners' findings. In reality, the report was authored by paid staff members of CU-Boulder's diversity administration.<sup>29</sup>

*Among suggestions outlined in the report to "increase diversity" was more money for diversity programs and exploring the idea of re-evaluating CU-Boulder's minimum academic standards as a means to admit more minority students.*

Among suggestions outlined in the report to "increase diversity" were more money for diversity programs and exploring the idea of re-evaluating CU-Boulder's minimum academic standards as a means to admit more minority students.<sup>30</sup> The idea was quickly shot down, however, after extensive public rebuke.<sup>31</sup>

The report did not include any suggestion that CU evaluate its programming to encourage more efficiency or a reallocation of resources to improve scholarship or

aid distribution.

On May 2, the Office of the CU-Boulder Chancellor released a "Diversity Action Plan" calling for an immediate "significant increase in the financial support of diversity programs, beginning immediately."<sup>32</sup>

The response came despite any sort of fiscal review; other notable action items included the implementation of mandatory diversity training for students and faculty, and evaluations of existing programs only once every five years.<sup>33</sup>

This limited schedule drains fiscal accountability from CU-Boulder's diversity administration, creating a culture of flippant budgetary expansion without the watchful eye necessary to ensure efficient and effective application of those funds.

*This limited schedule drains fiscal accountability from CU-Boulder's diversity administration, creating a culture of flippant budgetary expansion without the watchful eye necessary to ensure efficient and effective application of those funds.*

## **"GOOGLE" ACCOUNTING?**

When asked by the Campus Accountability Project to explain how CU determined how much is spent annually on diversity, Mary Ann Sergeant, program coordinator in CU-Boulder's Office of Diversity and Equity, gave the following explanation:

"This dataset of programs were generated from a key word search of organization and programmatic descriptions contained in the University's financial system. Key words, such as 'access,' 'minority,' and 'diversity,' were selected to help identify budgetary units that support our mission to maintain and enhance campus diversity efforts."<sup>34</sup>

Sergeant also made the following statement about the use of such methodology, noting that it "has limitations for identifying all the expenses associated with diversity efforts. We believe the (\$21.8) million is a conservative estimate of our annual expenditures, many of which are integrated into our regular

activities without separate budgetary codes.”<sup>35</sup>

In February 2006, in response to questions raised about the above budget figures, CU Assistant Vice

President for Diversity Carmen Williams responded by saying that \$21.8 million did not include any academic programs, instead only including those programs on the Boulder campus “with a service component.” Thus, the Ethnic Studies or Women’s Studies programs were not included in figures released to the public.<sup>36</sup>

In December 2006, at a meeting between CU administrators, CU Regent Tom Lucero, and Jessica Peck Corry, author of this report, Chancellor Bud Peterson entirely dismissed the \$21.8 million budget figure, saying “it’s not even close to what we’re spending.”<sup>37</sup>

*In December 2006, at a meeting between CU administrators, CU Regent Tom Lucero, and Jessica Peck Corry, author of this report, Chancellor Bud Peterson entirely dismissed the \$21.8 million budget figure, saying “it’s not even close to what we’re spending.”*

## **A YEAR AND COUNTING WITH STILL UNANSWERED QUESTIONS**

One year after the CU Blue Ribbon Diversity Commission first met, more questions have been raised about CU diversity spending and organization, than have been answered. Specifically, a multitude of questions have arisen about accounting practices within the CU-Boulder diversity administration, including the following:

**1. How does CU determine how much funding to allocate to each diversity program and is funding tied to a proven method of determining accountability or performance?**

The CU Board of Regents has no clear or ongoing oversight function over the diversity funding process. The University Initiatives Fund, which was approved by the Board, shows a total of only \$397,500 was appropriated to “Diversity Initiatives” for FY2005.<sup>38</sup>

Despite repeated requests by the Campus Accountability Project, it still is unclear who or what makes the ultimate funding decisions and whether there exists a methodology for distributing diversity funding tied to success or failure of existing programs.

On its own, the Campus Accountability Project has attempted to identify the most successful programs.

CU-Boulder diversity spending—at least based on publicly released figures—demonstrates that scholarship funding can translate directly into academic success. According to CU-Boulder, its 17 CU-LEAD Alliance and Feeder programs, which provide nearly \$1 million in scholarships for participating students, enroll, retain, and graduate participants at higher rates than those seen by all UCB students combined.

For example, the Multicultural Engineering Program, which provides scholarships to 192 students, boasts graduation rates of 75 percent. Another program, the Ronald E. McNair Post-baccalaureate Achievement Program, has a 100 percent graduation rate with 83 percent of enrollees continuing their education in a graduate or professional school (these numbers contrast with the overall UCB rate of graduation of 66 percent).<sup>39</sup>

**2. How is the money allocated for CU diversity programs actually spent?**

While released budget information shows the diversity administration receives a total of \$21.8 million in funding, it is not clear how this money is spent. Repeated budget requests have yielded only partial information from approximately 66 programs.<sup>40</sup>

*...the Ronald E. McNair Post-baccalaureate Achievement Program, has a 100 percent graduation rate with 83 percent of enrollees continuing their education in a graduate or professional school (these numbers contrast with the overall UCB rate of graduation of 66 percent).*

The complete diversity budget is likely to be much higher because this \$21.8 million stated budget only includes the 58 programs listed as receiving funding under the administration (as compared to the “77 organizations and 423 programs and projects” listed as part of CU-Boulder’s diversity administration).

In addition, uncertainty remains about the utilization of outside funding. According to the CU-Boulder Office of Contracts and Grants, CU received more than \$16 million from external sources in 2005 such as the US Department of Education, the Carnegie Corporation, and the National Science Foundation. However, only “somewhat more than \$8 million of external funding was spent on UCB diversity programs during FY2005.”<sup>41</sup>

### ***3. How many diversity programs, services, organizations or projects actually exist?***

As highlighted above, it appears that CU has no account of exactly how many programs are funded by Diversity resources. A footnote to a partial budget released to the public explains that “there are 77 orgs and 423 programs and projects in the dataset.”<sup>42</sup> Only 112 of these programs can be

found on the CU Office of Diversity and Equity Web site.<sup>43</sup>

While complete budget information was requested for all diversity-related programs, incomplete and fragmentary budget information has been made available for only 66 of these programs. Complete budget information should include revenue/ expenditures, as well as the sources of and objectives for all appropriated funds.

### ***4. How many individuals are employed under CU-Boulder’s diversity administration and what***

***are their salaries?***

CU, an institution well-known for its controversial Affirmative Action hiring policies, prides itself on keeping precise and detailed data on the ethnicities and corresponding salaries of all employees.

Given this fact, it would appear that CU should have accurate and accessible information on the exact number of persons employed in diversity-related positions, as well as any other personnel receiving funding from diversity sources. This, however, is not the case.

Nearly a year after the Campus Accountability Project first submitted formal requests for such information, CU still remains unable to give a reliable account of the number of employees that fit these criteria.

Evidence provided by CU shows that 211 persons are employed in only 9 of the 17 CU-LEAD Alliance programs, and an inquiry to the Vice Provost and Associate Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Equity revealed the Office of Diversity and Equity employs just “2.5 administrative staff members.”<sup>44</sup>

While the CU Board of Regents approved \$99,500 for diversity-related faculty positions, the diversity budget shows instead that \$11.4 million is actually spent in personnel costs for 58 of CU-Boulder’s diversity programs.

### ***5. What efforts are currently underway to ensure that CU-Boulder’s diversity programs do not suffer needlessly from resource duplication?***

While the exact number of students served by CU-Boulder’s myriad diversity programs is still unknown, strong evidence suggests that multiple independent programs duplicate services offered by others also on the Boulder campus.

Based on the partial budgetary information released

*Given this fact, it would appear that CU should have accurate and accessible information on the exact number of persons employed in diversity-related positions, as well as any other personnel receiving funding from diversity sources.*

*While complete budget information was requested for all diversity-related programs, incomplete and fragmentary budget information has been made available for only 66 of these programs.*

by CU-Boulder, it appears that the majority of programs have individual personnel, administration, and operating costs, creating much unnecessary waste.

Below are several examples of resource duplication within CU-Boulder's diversity programming:

*Based on the partial budgetary information released by CU-Boulder, it appears that the majority of programs have individual personnel, administration, and operating costs, creating much unnecessary waste.*

All CU students have access to—and are encouraged to use—the university's Student Academic Services Center and Counseling Services to address academic, social, intellectual, or emotional concerns.

For minority students, the SASC is also supplemented by "Ethnic-specific" counseling and support services offered by a variety of vast variety of programs including the Center for Multicultural Affairs, Multicultural Graduate Student

Services, Multiracial Services, African American Student Services, American Indian Student Services, Asian Pacific American Student Services, Chicano/Latino Student Services, the Student Outreach and Retention Center for Equality. Similar services are also offered for faculty through additional CU offices.

At least two housing programs focusing on race—the Hallett Hall Diversity Program and the Ethnic Learning and Living Community—house their own administrative and support offices.

The University also funds gender and sexual orientation-specific counseling, including but not limited to the Gay Lesbian Bi-Sexual, and Transgendered Resource Center, and Women's Resource Center.

CU offers a plethora of diversity-related training programs, including the CU Dialogue Network (CUDN), a Diversity Education Team (DET), Leadership Education for Advancement and

Promotion (LEAP), an employee training program, discrimination and harassment training, interactive theatre, and a training program relating to sexual-orientation to CU-Boulder's Gay, Lesbian, Bi-Sexual and Transgendered (GLBT) Resource Center.

Some individual academic departments also house multiple diversity programs that could potentially be consolidated to conserve administrative costs. Diversity resources for CU-Boulder's engineering program are broken into four separate programs: the Multicultural Engineering Program, the Minority Engineering Program, the Women in Engineering Program, and an unspecified "Engineering" program. Each program serves at least one of the same function, which is to provide access to scholarships and academic resources.

#### **6. How is "Miscellaneous" defined?**

CU-Boulder's budget reporting, as it is conducted now, is too vague and incomplete to comfort suspicions that the university really is using its funding in a publicly accountable manner. One specific example: the CU diversity budget given to the Blue Ribbon Diversity Commission, including "Misc" and "Other" categories, which amount to more than \$1 million in total spending with no explanation of how this money is spent.

#### **7. How many students are served by diversity funds?**

While CU diversity programs "are sensitive to a variety of diversity issues, including gender, class, age, race, ability, sexual orientation, religion, and national origin," the implication of having such a broad concept of diversity in its programming is that CU seems to have no indication as to exactly how many students are the direct recipients of Diversity services.<sup>45</sup>

*...the CU diversity budget given to the Blue Ribbon Diversity Commission, including "Misc" and "Other" categories, which amount to more than \$1 million in total spending with no explanation of how this money is spent.*

The information assembled from the university's diversity-related documents gives an incomplete estimate as to the number of students served by this administration.

Specifically, CU-Boulder's data shows that 5,476 students are served by the 17-program CU-Lead Alliance, and 1,954 students are served by a set of 10 externally funded Diversity programs.<sup>46</sup> However, there is no count of how many students are served by or participate in the other 400-plus diversity programs and initiatives.

***8. How much funding is actually allocated for in-class instruction or faculty expenses and what percentage of CU diversity resources are devoted to administrative and operating costs, as opposed to concrete and explicit educational services?***

In an era when students face rising tuition costs and CU says it is losing top faculty due to fiscal restraints, CU-Boulder's diversity administration devotes just one-third of its total budget to in-class instruction. CU says it allocates \$3.7 million, or 32

*In an era when students face rising tuition costs and CU says it is losing top faculty due to fiscal restraints, CU-Boulder's diversity administration devotes just one-third of its total budget to in-class instruction.*

percent, of the \$11.4 million spent in personnel costs for regular and part-time faculty.<sup>47</sup> This figure remains ambiguous, potentially conflicting with information provided by CU Assistant Vice President for Diversity Carmen Williams in February 2006, which stated that CU-Boulder's \$21.8 million diversity budget (of which the \$11.4 million referenced above is purported to originate under) does not include funding for any academic departments or programs, including Women's Studies and Ethnic Studies.<sup>48</sup>

Ultimately, if the information provided by both sources is legitimate, one conclusion can be made: In 2005, CU-Boulder spent \$3.7 million on professors and faculty

teaching diversity-related programming initiated outside of any academic departments. The figure is astounding.

***9. How does CU-Boulder hope to attract and retain minority students when the vast majority of its diversity money is spent in purposes other than recruitment and financial aid?***

The CU Diversity program declares that it is specifically designed to promote educational access to underrepresented student groups. This is a worthy goal, yet the program does not seem to be adequately fulfilling its purpose. The \$21.8 million budget for 58 diversity programs shows that only \$4 M is being spent in the provision of student scholarships. Instead, over 76 percent of diversity resources are exhausted in personnel salaries and the general administration of the program.<sup>49</sup>

Statistics provided by CU show that each of the 17 CU-LEAD Alliance and feeder programs do produce higher graduation rates when compared to the combined average of all UC-Boulder students.<sup>50</sup> This is remarkable, and its success should be applauded. However, these 17 programs account for less than 16 percent of the diversity funding.

The limited amount of data supplied by CU has made it impossible for Blue Ribbon Commissioners to rank programs as a means to protect the financing of programs which effectively do create opportunities for students the administration seeks to serve.

## **CONCLUSION**

One year after CU Blue Ribbon Diversity Commission first met, CU-Boulder's diversity administration still houses an unknown number of programs that receive an unclear amount of funding for an uncertain number of employees who serve an unspecified number of students.

*...over 76 percent of diversity resources are exhausted in personnel salaries and the general administration of the program.*

In an era when education expenses are rising exponentially, CU-Boulder's diversity efforts should focus on expanding merit-based and need-based scholarship money. This can only effectively happen if CU is willing to evaluate its current spending to determine how best to utilize existing resources to help meet such a goal.

The surprising conclusion of our analysis of CU-Boulder's diversity administration finds that scholarships and financial aid seems to be a minor priority (comprising only 18 percent of the budget).

*...CU-Boulder's diversity efforts should focus on expanding merit-based and need-based scholarship money.*

Unfortunately, the majority of the administration's resources are devoted to the staffing and administration of support services. CU-Boulder's funding choices have effectively prioritized the social culture of the institution above its own ability to reach out to those who do not currently have access to it.

Outreach programs, including the university's pre-collegiate development program, which encourages academic achievement and scholastic integrity, should be the goal of university education.

While the purpose of this report was not to focus on the emotional aspects of the debate over diversity, there is an aside worth mentioning. Philosophically, CU faces a dilemma. How can the creation of categories and labels to support the identification of every imaginable human difference be expected to enhance an inclusive environment?

CU-Boulder's predisposition to dwelling on difference, as opposed to fostering similarity, contradicts its goal of developing a cohesive and open community.

## ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

- To view background information on the CU Blue Ribbon Commission on Diversity Commission, see <https://www.cu.edu/diversity/brc/>
- To view budget information provided to members of Diversity Commission in a notebook, see <http://www.colorado.edu/cu-diversity/BlueRibbon2.html>. Documents from this notebook are cited frequently throughout this report.
- To view this report online, see [www.IndependenceInstitute.org](http://www.IndependenceInstitute.org).

Copyright © 2007, Independence Institute

INDEPENDENCE INSTITUTE is a non-profit, non-partisan Colorado think tank. It is governed by a statewide board of trustees and holds a 501(c)(3) tax exemption from the IRS. Its public policy research focuses on economic growth, education reform, local government effectiveness, and Constitutional rights.

JON CALDARA is President of the Independence Institute.

DAVID KOPEL is Research Director of the Independence Institute.

JESSICA PECK CORRY is the Director of the Independence Institute's Campus Accountability Project and Property Rights Project. She also serves as a commissioner on the CU Blue Ribbon Diversity Commission. She can be contacted at [Jessica@i2i.org](mailto:Jessica@i2i.org).

BOBBI JO WHITLOCK is a graduate student in public policy and business at Pepperdine University in Malibu, California. She served as a research associate with the Campus Accountability Project during Summer 2006. She can be contacted at [bobbi.whitlock@pepperdine.edu](mailto:bobbi.whitlock@pepperdine.edu).

BRAD JONES currently serves as a research associate for the Campus Accountability Project. He is also a Denver-based public policy analyst and political strategist. He earned his BA from the University of Colorado at Boulder in 2005. He can be contacted at [Brad@Jones.name](mailto:Brad@Jones.name).

AARON ROSS POWELL is a first-year law student at the University of Denver and an internet publisher. He served as a research associate with the Campus Accountability Project during Spring 2006. He can be contacted by email at [aaronpowell@gmail.com](mailto:aaronpowell@gmail.com) or online at [www.aaronrosspowell.com](http://www.aaronrosspowell.com).

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES on this subject can be found at: <http://www.IndependenceInstitute.org> or by calling 303-279-6536.

NOTHING WRITTEN here is to be construed as necessarily representing the views of the Independence Institute or as an attempt to influence any election or legislative action.

PERMISSION TO REPRINT this paper in whole or in part is hereby granted provided full credit is given to the Independence Institute.

## ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Berny Morson, "Colleges Strapped, Ritter, Brown Warn," *Rocky Mountain News*, 7 December 2006.

<sup>2</sup> CU Administrative Policy Statements: Fiscal Code of Ethics.

<sup>3</sup> Response letter to CAP inquiries by Jessica Peck Corry from MaryAnn Sergeant, Projects Manager and Program Coordinator, Office of Diversity and Equity, received 21 February 2006.

<sup>4</sup> Letter from Carmen Williams, CU Assistant Vice President for Diversity, to Jessica Peck Corry, 7 February 2006.

<sup>5</sup> Peterson's comments were made at a meeting held at the CU President's Denver office on 8 December 2006. In attendance were Peterson, Corry, Regent Tom Lucero, Assistant Vice President for Diversity Carmen Williams, and Vice President for Administration and Chief of Staff Leonard Dinegar.

<sup>6</sup> University of Colorado FY2006 Budget Request

<sup>7</sup> Jefferson Dodge, "Task force: Hold leaders accountable for diversity," *Silver & Gold Record*, 19 June 2003.

<sup>8</sup> Brittany Anas, "CU Looks at Hiring Diversity Czar: Provost May Elevate Position to Level of Vice Chancellor," *Rocky Mountain News*, 3 January 2007.

<sup>9</sup> Peterson/Corry mtg.

<sup>10</sup> CU-Boulder "Diversity Action Plan" 2 May 2006.

- <sup>11</sup> Search using CU Web site for "Diversity" links conducted on July 2006 via [www. http://search.colorado.edu/](http://search.colorado.edu/)
- <sup>12</sup> "Diversity Resources for All Students, Faculty, and Staff" released to CU Diversity Commission, January 2006.
- <sup>13</sup> CU Office of Diversity & Equity: <http://www.colorado.edu/cu-diversity/resources.html>
- <sup>14</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>15</sup> Campus Accountability Project: [http://www.i2i.org/main/page.php?page\\_id=11](http://www.i2i.org/main/page.php?page_id=11)
- <sup>16</sup> CU Center For Multicultural Affairs: <http://www.colorado.edu/studentaffairs/cma/index.html>. See also Web site established to provide information given to CU Diversity Commissioners. <http://www.colorado.edu/cu-diversity/BlueRibbon2.html>.
- <sup>17</sup> See CU Student Academic Services Center: <http://www.colorado.edu/sasc/>. See also CU Counseling & Psychological Services: <http://www.colorado.edu/sacs/counseling/>.
- <sup>18</sup> For statistics on students applying as new freshman to Colorado public four-year colleges and universities for fall 2004, see document available at CU Web site to provide information given to CU Diversity Commissioners (at <http://www.colorado.edu/cu-diversity/BlueRibbon2.html>) titled "CU-Boulder PBA: I:/ir/minor/AppFlow2004.xls, by ResEthnicity2, 12/7/2005."
- <sup>19</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>20</sup> Lou McLelland, *Freshman graduation rates at AAU public universities comparisons using IPEDS public-release data*, <http://www.colorado.edu/pbs/records/time/ovv6.htm>, 7 December 2005.
- <sup>21</sup> University of Colorado Window Admissions, <http://www.colorado.edu/pba/adm/windowadmits.htm>.
- <sup>22</sup> U.S. Department of Education, "Changes in College Completion Rates," January 1999, <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/CollegeForAll/completion.html>.
- <sup>23</sup> CU Campus Diversity Plans and Reports, <http://www.colorado.edu/cu-diversity/policies.html>
- <sup>24</sup> CU Blue Ribbon Commission Purpose Statement, <http://www.cu.edu/diversity/brc/purpose.html>
- <sup>25</sup> "Diversity a Top Priority for Hank Brown," University of Colorado Press Release released on 3 August 2005, <http://www.cu.edu/news/releases/diversity-blueribbon.htm>.
- <sup>26</sup> CU Blue Ribbon Commission Objectives, <http://www.cu.edu/diversity/brc/purpose.html>
- <sup>27</sup> Sara Burnett, "Corry asks for halt to diversity report," *Rocky Mountain News*, 10 February 2006.
- <sup>28</sup> Brittany Anas, "Diversity at CU Hot Topic," *Boulder Daily Camera*, 4 January 2006.
- <sup>29</sup> Sara Burnett, "Diversity report assailed: Panelist asks CU president to halt commission's work," *Rocky Mountain News*, 10 February 2006
- <sup>30</sup> Blue Ribbon Commission Recommendations for the University of Colorado at Boulder - Final Report Released on 1 March 1 2006, available at <http://www.colorado.edu/cu-diversity/BlueRibbonReport.html>.
- <sup>31</sup> Jennifer Brown, "Diversity panel, diverse ideas: CU-Boulder's blue-ribbon commission suggests adding flexibility to admission standards and making more efforts to promote racial tolerance." *The Denver Post*, 8 Feb 2006.
- <sup>32</sup> CU-Boulder Action Plan, Released by the Office of the CU-Boulder Chancellor on 2 May 2006.
- <sup>33</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>34</sup> Response letter from Sergeant to Corry, 21 February 2006.
- <sup>35</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>36</sup> Response letter from Williams to Corry, 7 February 2006.
- <sup>37</sup> Peterson's comments, CU President's Office, 8 December 2006.
- <sup>38</sup> Campus Diversity Plan: A Blueprint For Action (July 1999), <http://www.colorado.edu/cu-diversity/blueprint/index.html>. See also University of Colorado FY2006 Budget.
- <sup>39</sup> CU-LEAD Alliance and Feeder Programs: Measures of Success, <http://www.colorado.edu/pba/div/retain/index.htm>.
- <sup>40</sup> Diversity Resources.xls, released to CU Diversity Commission in January 2006. CU-Boulder's stated \$21.8 million diversity budget purports to include \$8.84 million from the General Fund, \$3.04 million from Auxiliary and Self-Funded Revenue, including student fees amounting to nearly \$400,000, \$1.17 million in gifts, and \$8.72 million from Federal/Private Sponsored Projects.
- <sup>41</sup> Externally Funded Diversity Programs at University of Colorado at Boulder.
- <sup>42</sup> Diversity Resources.xls.
- <sup>43</sup> Office of Diversity & Equity, <http://www.colorado.edu/cu-diversity>.
- <sup>44</sup> Vice Provost and Associate Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Equity Christine Yoshinaga-Itano response to CAP inquiries, received on 22 June 2006. Information on CU-Lead Alliance salaries and positions provided by CU in data sheet titled "CU-Lead Alliance, Affiliates, and Feeder Programs: Position Information."
- <sup>45</sup> Response letter from Sergeant to Corry, 21 February 2006.
- <sup>46</sup> Information on externally-funded CU diversity programs and CU-LEAD Alliance and Feeder Programs available at
- <sup>47</sup> Response letter from Sergeant to Corry, 21 February 2006.
- <sup>48</sup> Response letter from Williams to Corry, 7 February 2006.
- <sup>49</sup> Expenses for All Orgs1.xls
- <sup>50</sup> CU-LEAD Alliance and Feeder Programs: Measures of Success, <http://www.colorado.edu/cu-diversity/BR/6MeasSuccess.pdf>.