INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

UMI®

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

AND EVERYTHING'S THE SAME:
TRANSFORMATION OF A CAMPUS THROUGH THE EYES OF
AN INTENDED CHANGE AGENT

BY

ABIGAIL BROOKENS BROGA

A.B., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1972
M.Ed., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1995

THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education in Education
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2003

Urbana, Illinois

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

UMI Number: 3086021

Copyright 2003 by
Broga, Abigail Brookens

All rights reserved.

UMI®

UMI Microform 3086021
Copyright 2003 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

© Copyright by Abigail Brookens Broga, 2003

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

GRADUATE COLLEGE

JANUARY 2003
date

WE HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THE THESIS BY

ABIGAIL BROOKENS BROGA

ENTITLED AND EVERYTHING'S THE SAME: TRANSFORMATION OF A CAMPUS THROUGH THE EYES OF AN INTENDED CHANGE AGENT

BE ACCEPTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Director of Thesis Research

Head of Department

Committee on Final Examination†

Chairperson

†Required for doctor's degree but not for master's.

O-517

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ABSTRACT

This study explores the transformation of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (a large, selective, land grant, research institution) during the years of 1968 to 2001 through the eyes of an intended change agent. Following the April 1968 assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign decided to admit 500 "talented" minority students for the fall 1968 semester and to create a Special Educational Opportunities Program. Utilizing story telling as scholarship, epistemological considerations of race and talking across differences, and drawing from a theoretical framework of servant leadership, a portrait of a gifted administrator emerges. This study contributes to the discussion of how much and what kind of transformation has occurred during the last thirty years at one selective university.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

This thesis is dedicated to Clarence Shelley.
Mike. Eric. Brian. Penny. Susan. Dustin. Matthew. Jakob. Sarah. and David Broga.
and to the memory of
Norris L and Ruth Schurman Brookens. Taylor Thomas. and Paul C. Violas.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The seeds for this study were planted years ago by my parents and Taylor Thomas, my teacher, mentor, and friend. Nurtured by the ideas of the civil rights and women's movements, my worldview continued to evolve. The critical thinking demanded in my graduate studies by Paul Violas, Jim Anderson, Larry Parker, Chris Brown, Jeanne Connell, Kal Alston, and King Alexander resulted in another series of paradigm shifts that eventually led to this study.

I wish to thank Dr. Anderson, Dr. Brown, Dr. Ikenberry, Dr. Lanaan, and Dr. Parker, the extraordinary men who served on my committee. Their insights and questions helped focus my thinking and kept me excited. I am grateful to each, particularly Professor Brown, whose path I have been privileged to cross.

My colleagues, friends and family gave me invaluable support. I am forever indebted to Clarence Shelley for agreeing to this study. I was sustained by the quiet faith and engaged interest of Eric Weldy and Stephenie Graham. I wish to thank Bill Riley, Nancy Rotzoll, David Chih, Ruth McCauley, Mary Ellen O'Shaughnessey, Willard Broom, Dominic Cobb, Dick Justice, Tom Grayson, Diane McGraw, Tracey Berman, Jamie Lake, Ellie McGowan, Beverly Rodriguez, Emily Czysz, Kelly Cilek, Anne Maloney, and June Mitchell for giving so generously of their time. Thanks also are due Sharon Jeter, Paul and Jennifer Hixson, John and Marilyn Dewey, Clark and Ann McPhail, Randi Schneider, Kathryn Rybka, and Kathy Young.

Without my husband, Mike Broga, I would never have succeeded. He gave me the freedom and confidence I needed to take on this project. He, our children, and our extended family were patient participants in this exercise, always deferring to my need to research or write, and cheering after each chapter was written. I could not have completed my courses, exams or thesis without them. I love them dearly and I thank each of them.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION 1
Theoretical Framework 5
Significance of the Study 7

CHAPTER 2 INTERPRETIVE CONTEXT 9
Historical Overview 10
Civil Rights and Higher Education 18
Backlash 24
Diversity on Campus 35

CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY 42
Theoretical Framework 42
Methodological Framework 49
Data Collection and Analysis 60

CHAPTER 4 FINDINGS: THE MAN 63
The Making of the Man 65
The High School Teacher 72
At UIUC: "My Hustle Is Higher Education" 75

CHAPTER 5 FINDINGS: THE CAMPUS 101
Governance 103
Special Educational Opportunities Program 105
Aftermath 111

CHAPTER 6 REFLECTIONS 116
The Expected 117
The Unexpected 125
Change 132
Race 140

CHAPTER 7 A LEGACY 151
Change 151
Leadership 153
Continuing the Work 154
Lasting Influence 155

REFERENCES 157

VITA 166

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

American higher education has been in a state of development since the founding of Harvard College in 1636. From this beginning in colonial America, today's complex system of two-year and four-year institutions that range from community colleges to liberal arts colleges to comprehensive research universities has emerged. Students may commute to classes, reside on the college campus or enroll in a virtual university where all courses are taught on-line.

Harvard and the other colonial colleges were small liberal arts colleges modeled after the English residential colleges at Oxford and Cambridge. The curriculum was designed to train elite males for the clergy or civic leadership. After the Revolutionary War, new college development followed the westward expansion of the Euro-American population. The purpose of the college curriculum remained largely unchanged despite a growing interest in science and technology.

The first Morrill Act, passed during the Civil War, was designed to expand the college curriculum to include agriculture and the mechanical arts and to open college doors to the children of the industrial classes. During the latter half of the nineteenth century, many colleges adopted the German university model and transformed themselves into research universities. Faculty began to create as well as transmit knowledge, specialization occurred, and graduate student education was introduced. Universities adopted a three part mission of teaching, research, and public service which has continued to the present.

During the last century, college enrollment increased dramatically. The first great influx of students occurred after World War I. The GI Bill, passed during the latter stages of World War II, guaranteed education benefits to returning veterans who enrolled in college.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Enrollments swelled nationwide as millions of veterans, including many who otherwise would not have attended or been admitted, enrolled at colleges and universities. The final great influx occurred during the last third of the century, when case law and federal legislation expanded access for descendants of enslaved Africans and the economically disadvantaged. Following the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, many selective colleges and universities altered their admissions practices and policies to include racially based affirmative action selections (Bowen and Bok, 1998). Institutions admitting disadvantaged and minority students of latent talent have created support services and programs designed to offer personal and tutorial assistance, improve retention, and encourage graduate or professional studies.

The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC), founded in 1867, is the state's land grant university. UIUC is a large, residential, comprehensive research university, with a selectively admitted, predominantly white student body. Prior to 1968, UIUC made little effort to recruit minority or disadvantaged students. Consequently, very few black students attended UIUC in 1967-68. Following the assassination of Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. in April 1968, UIUC created a Special Educational Opportunities Program (SEOP) designed to admit and support 500 disadvantaged, mostly black students for the fall 1968 semester (Williamson, 1998). Although it is still a predominantly white campus, UIUC has significantly increased its minority student population since then. Nearly all of the currently admitted minority students meet the same selection criteria as white students. However, UIUC admits a limited number of latently talented minority and white students deemed desirable to the institution (M. Moore, personal communication, April 2, 2002).

This dissertation is an attempt to understand the experiences and perceptions of the first director of the Special Educational Opportunities Program, Clarence Shelley. Mr. Shelley was

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

an employee of the Detroit School Board who had been relieved of his teaching duties to serve in a district-wide effort to identify and recruit disadvantaged but talented students for college admissions. He had been given temporary leaves of absence to do the same work with other schools. When he was recruited by UIUC in May 1968 to direct its new program, the Detroit School Board agreed to lend him to UIUC for two years, beginning July 1, 1968. Mr. Shelley moved to Champaign-Urbana, expecting he would give advice on the creation of appropriate programs and services for students unlike those UIUC had previously enrolled. Mr. Shelley learned on his arrival that little planning or coordination had occurred to that point, and that the University was not even sure exactly how many SEOP students would arrive (Shelley, 1969e). Two months later, 583 students arrived at UIUC one week prior to the start of classes. At the conclusion of that week-long orientation, several students staged a protest at the student union, and were ultimately arrested (Williamson, 1998).

Despite the chaotic start of the first year, the arrests, and his initial expectation that his work at UIUC would be temporary, Mr. Shelley did not leave after two years. Instead, he resigned his position with the Detroit School Board, and settled into a career at UIUC. Although he remained committed to his initial role of advising and supporting minority (particularly black) students, Mr. Shelley was promoted several times. He was the Dean of Students for several years and retired as Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs on October 1, 2001. Mr. Shelley's long tenure on campus and increasingly responsible administrative positions offered him a unique opportunity to influence as well as implement change. When he arrived, there were so few black faculty and administrators on campus that he was an anomaly. By 2001, the faculty and administrative staff had been diversified to include women and minorities.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The purpose of this dissertation is an attempt to understand Mr. Shelley's perceptions of the transformation of the UIUC campus during the period from July 1968 to October 2001. Mr. Shelley arrived just prior to the influx of a significant number of students who did not fit the typical profile of students then being admitted. This influx of students had a major effect on the UIUC culture, which had endured for a century, but was about to undergo a sudden, substantial, controversial change. Further, the chancellor imposed the new admissions policy on the campus by fiat, ignoring the usual practice of seeking consensus and approval from the faculty senate (Carpenter, 1975). Although he had the support and assistance of many others at UIUC, in 1968 Mr. Shelley was clearly identified as a campus change agent at the time of his hiring. Mr. Shelley's responsibilities included fostering the transformation of attitudes and behaviors so the climate for minority students would improve (Shelley, 1969e). Gabelnick (2002) discusses the role of change agents in institutional transformation as follows:

> It is part of the leaders' role to uncover and understand [organizational] stories so as to be able to internalize them and, through a process of (conscious and unconscious) shared management, guide the organization to transform itself to work within a deeper experience and expression of its primary task. [Leaders] who can work with the narratives and metaphors embedded in their universities and can enable the institution to articulate, challenge and develop their stories are transformation leaders. While they manage the rhetorical and practical challenges of the role... they must also create a way to speak about the lived experience of learning in a community that has a history, a culture, a set of values and an interpersonal and organizational connectedness. (p. 3)

Understanding how an actor who was intimately involved in transforming activities views them at the conclusion of his career is crucial to understanding the changes that occurred at UIUC between 1968 and 2001. Understanding the actor himself is crucial to understanding his perceptions. The intent of the research is to identify the transformation of UIUC through the eyes of Mr. Shelley, an intended change agent.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Theoretical Framework

The framework for this dissertation is based largely on Greenleaf's model of servant-leadership. Chapter two places UIUC within the broader context of American higher education and contemporary society. Chapter three identifies issues of epistemology and methodology relevant to the servant-leadership model. Drawing from interviews, observations and documents, chapter four relates the experiences of Clarence Shelley in the form of narrative text. Chapter five describes the history of the UIUC during the last third of the twentieth century.

Using the actor's voice, the portrait is an effort to understand both his pre-UIUC and UIUC experiences. An analysis of the portrait framed in observations, the data, the literature and history of the campus is included in chapter six. Chapter seven draws conclusions as to the legacy Clarence Shelley leaves at UIUC.

Greenleaf (1998) defines servant-leaders as those who take a holistic approach to their professional work. The hallmark of servant-leaders is that they lead by serving others. The servant-leader often acts intuitively, although he may have to explain his intuitive actions or decisions logically, particularly if he works in a university setting. Servant-leaders eschew coercion in favor of persuasion. The servant-leader is a person of integrity, an able persuader, and a dedicated servant of the institution whose perspectives are trusted by many in the institution. This dissertation places Clarence Shelley into the servant-leadership model.

The theoretical framework also takes into account epistemological considerations of race and talking across differences. Stanfield (1993) argues that mainstream researchers often ignore asymmetric power relationships between themselves and their subjects while simultaneously ignoring class, gender and race differences. Andersen (1993) believes it is

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

possible for researcher and subject to talk across differences, but because researchers' standpoints are acquired, majority researchers can understand the experiences of minorities. Attention to these considerations is required to permit a Euro-American female to understand the experiences of an African-American male.

The methodological considerations in this research include story-telling as a form of scholarship, researcher's and actor's voices, and reflexivity. A researcher who wishes to understand others is required to understand their experiences. Stories give shape to experiences. Researchers make sense of others' lives by telling stories with beginnings, middles and ends (Denzin, 1994). Stories are a form of scholarship that permit researchers to study actors within the context of their work and history. Story-telling is an integral part of portraiture, which places the actor's voice within an historical and institutional context (Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997). Mr. Shelley's story is framed within the historical context of the Korean War, the Civil Rights Movement and the post-civil rights era. This context is particularly important to our understanding the experiences of an actor of color during that era.

Readers, authors, and actors are also involved in the narrative text or story. The researcher brings her own perspectives, experiences, and interests, which are never neutral, to the interviews. The researcher's voice is evident in the narrative, which permits readers, who bring their own perspectives, to assess the researcher's perspective. The researcher's voice is evident in the framework and content of the narrative she produces. While the actor's voice predominates, the researcher makes no effort to purposely silence her voice (Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The researcher claims authority over the interpretation of data collected from multiple sources. The researcher's interpretation is drawn from emerging themes in the data collection process of constant comparison. The interpretation of findings includes descriptors such as who, what, where and when as well as a "thick description" of thoughtful interpretation (Denzin, 1994; Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997). This thoughtful interpretation permits the reader to offer alternative explanations of the data.

Reflexivity requires the researcher to constantly scrutinize assumptions and interpretations during the data collection process (Hertz, 1997). The reader must understand the researcher's positionality in order to critically evaluate what the researcher questions, studies, or ignores. The researcher's positionality is especially important when she is studying across race and gender differences. In this narrative, the researcher tries to make her positionality clear.

Significance of the Study

Over thirty years have passed since UIUC first admitted a sizeable number of disadvantaged, mostly black students in September 1968. Since 1968 the University has developed systematic recruitment efforts that have resulted in an increasingly diversified faculty, staff, and student body. This study is not an attempt to find "the truth" about changes at the UIUC campus between 1968 and 2001. It is, however, an attempt to understand the perceptions of one administrator, whose initial assignment at UIUC was to be a change agent. This portrait of an intended change agent contributes to the discussion of how much and what kind of transformation has occurred during the last thirty years at one selective university. This dissertation endeavors to contribute to the dialogue on the changes in American higher

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

education resulting from the expanded student access made possible by Supreme Court decisions and the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER 2

INTERPRETIVE CONTEXT

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. (Declaration of Independence, 1776)

The men who wrote the Declaration of Independence, U.S. Constitution and Bill of Rights framed the documents in the Enlightenment ideals of individual liberty and freedom. However, individual liberty and the rights of citizenship actually did not apply to all residents in the former British colonies. The founders' notions of personhood excluded slaves and the indigenous peoples. Among those individuals accorded personhood, full rights of citizenship were extended only to propertied men, and specifically excluded all women as well as men who were not property owners. Since then, the United States has slowly, painfully and erratically extended full rights of civic participation to all citizens. American higher education has functioned within the social and political climate of the broader society with questions of higher education access being debated as hotly as questions of voting and other citizenship rights.

This chapter first gives a brief historical overview of the development of higher education in the United States from 1636 through the 1940's. During the second half of the twentieth century, colleges and universities (for purposes of this paper, the terms will be used synonymously) changed their admissions policies in response to judicial, statutory and societal requirements. The external demands on universities are briefly reviewed. The history of selective admissions policies, the effects of affirmative action on admissions decisions, and the resulting backlash is then discussed. Finally, there is a discussion of effects of diversity on campus.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Historical Overview

Higher education in the United States has its roots in educational practices and beliefs that began over 2500 years ago in Greece. In *The Republic*, Plato argued that the purpose of education or the life of the mind was to produce virtuous civic leaders from among the sons of the aristocracy. He also believed knowledge was a fixed and immutable Truth, requiring years of study and frequent testing. Basic literacy, numeracy and writing were considered useful skills for commerce or bureaucratic functions, but not the mark of an educated man (Plato, trans. 1992). Education was similarly important during the Roman Empire. Education for the mind declined after the fall of the Roman Empire, re-emerging in the thirteenth century European universities and sixteenth century English colleges.

1636 - 1860

The first American college, Harvard, was founded in 1636. Harvard adopted the English college model with its small residential setting, a male student body drawn from the ranks of the wealthy or the clergy, and a curriculum designed to train civic and religious leaders. The liberal arts curriculum was fixed, taught in Latin, and students learned by rote (Lucas, 1994). Other colonial colleges followed the same pattern. Lucas (1994) believes that despite their denominational differences, the aim of colonial colleges "was to foster among all students a common social, moral and intellectual life" (p. 11).

Lucas (1994) states that the first part of the nineteenth century was one of substantial growth in higher education; "at the time of the American Revolution there were nine colleges; the total had jumped to 250 on the eve of the Civil War. Not without reason did a certain Absolem Peters remark in 1851: 'Our country is to be a land of colleges'" (p. 117).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Denominational colleges followed the expansion of the European settlements westward. The curriculum was largely unchanged despite an increasing interest in science and technology.

Women and Blacks

The history of American higher education is traditionally viewed as the story of white males' higher education. Oberlin College in Ohio was the only pre-Civil War college that was both coeducational and desegregated (Lucas, 1994, pp.121-122). It is important, therefore, to note that white females and free blacks were part of the higher education story early in the nineteenth century. Although women were still excluded from civic life, "a few colonial precedents did exist for the instruction of girls at elementary and secondary levels" (Solomon, 1985, p. 15). Solomon (1985) states that coeducational and single-sex patterns emerged following westward settlements, with female education seen as favorable if useful to American society. According to Solomon (1985), "the ideal of republican motherhood had provided the first rationale appropriate to the perceived need of raising virtuous citizens in the new nation" (pp. 15-16). Women were drawn to school teaching by economic necessity, intellectual curiosity, and religious fervor. The first academies for females were founded in New England (Solomon, 1985, p. 17).

The Troy Female Seminary started in New York in 1821, followed by Wesleyan Female College in Georgia, Judson College in Alabama, and Mount Holyoke Seminary in Massachusetts. By 1890, 20 percent of American colleges were for women only, 29 percent were coeducational, and four women's colleges, Vassar, Wellesley, Smith and Bryn Mawr were becoming national institutions (Solomon, 1985, pp. 44-47).

The education of slaves was statutorily prohibited prior to the Emancipation Proclamation although "some schools [in the South] predated the Civil War period and simply

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

increased their activities after the war started" (Anderson, 1988, p. 7). However, three colleges for freedmen were opened prior to the Civil War, including Avery College and Lincoln University in Pennsylvania, and Wilberforce University in Ohio. Following the end of the Civil War, former slaves eagerly sought education and "early black schools were established and supported largely through the Afro-Americans' own efforts" (Anderson, 1988, p. 7). Two different kinds of education for blacks emerged in the South. The "Hampton-Tuskegee Idea" was for normal school training of teachers for the black educational system coupled with "a unique manual labor routine and ideology of 'self-help' as the practical and moral foundation of their teacher training process" (Anderson, 1988, p. 34). In contrast to industrial education, white missionaries defended the need for higher education for blacks. One missionary, Henry Morehouse, "placed top priority on the higher education of a black 'talented tenth'" as the best means for racial progress (Anderson, 1988, p. 69).

Land-Grant Colleges and Universities

The federal government's interest in education was demonstrated in war-time land-grant legislation, the Morrill Act of 1862. The Morrill Act required the states to take money from the sale of the land, create a perpetual fund and use the interest as follows:

> [for] the endowment, support, and maintenance of at least one college where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, in such manner as the legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life... (12 United States Statutes at Large, 503-505)

Fifty-five land grant institutions were created as a result of the 1862 Morrill Act. Following passage of the 1890 Morrill Act, fourteen black land grant institutions were founded in southern and border states where all schooling was racially segregated. Today there are a total

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of 107 land grant institutions in the United States and its territories (Goodchild & Wechsler, 1997, pp. 363-364).

Johnson (1981/1997) argues there are several popular misconceptions about the early land-grant colleges. He states there was a tradition of land grants first started by the English crown and continued by the Northwest Ordinance of 1787. Prior to the Civil War, seventeen states had received land grants of more than four million acres total and had "spawned almost a score of state colleges and universities" (Johnson, 1981/1997, p. 223). Johnson argues that these colleges were the "trunk" of the Morrill Act. He states "it is clear that the land-granting technique had become so pervasive before 1862 that turning to the federal government for education help, instead of to the state, had become a dominant fashion" (Johnson, 1981/1997, p. 223).

Although it is popularly believed that the land-grant colleges were a response to student demand, Johnson (1981/1997) argues that the colleges were actually created by reformers for a "noble, egalitarian ideal" (p. 224). He argues that early land grant colleges resorted to various stratagems to build enrollment. In 1870, an estimated 62,000 students were enrolled in college. By 1890, there were 157,000 and by 1910, 355,000 students were enrolled in a college or university (Lucas, 1994, p. 140). However, despite the initial anemic demand, the land grant institutions were, according to Johnson, extremely significant.

> Nothing did more *eventually* for mass or democratized education, but the land-grant colleges did little initially....They were committed, they opened their doors, and they pressed fate with action. Their early contribution was the ardent conviction and the provision of opportunity, the expectation, and the ideal, not the actual achievement. They were ahead of their times, not the slaves of popular demand. When the ideal did blossom, it did so magnificently, and these new institutions were often pacesetters. (Johnson, 1981/1997, p. 225)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Johnson (1981/1997) calls the Morrill Act a "masterpiece of nondirective federal aid" that was "vague enough to let the college accommodate to local reality" and eventually led to a national core curriculum as well as agricultural research, education and extension (p. 229).

Research Universities

A concurrent development during the latter half of the nineteenth century was the transformation of many colleges into research universities. Although the transformation was gradual, its origins can be found in expanding scientific knowledge, increasing secularization, an enlarging middle class, a demand for utilitarian knowledge, desire to emulate European (particularly German) abstract research, and a conception of practical public service. The changes in educational practices included specialization in the curriculum, creation of new academic disciplines, research-based graduate student training, the elective system, creation of new knowledge, abstract research, bureaucratization, utilitarianism, and development of a three-part teaching, service and research mission (Geiger, 1986; Levine, 1986; Veysey, 1965). Veysey (1965) identifies the "dominant characteristic of the new American universities [as] their ability to shelter specialized departments of knowledge" (p. 142). As the emphasis on specialized research grew, faculty became more interested in the creation of new knowledge than the transmission of old knowledge. The resulting curricular changes were not, however, without their critics, who argued in favor of the liberal, classical curriculum and against the emerging practical, scientific curricula. However, Veysey (1965) argues that by the beginning of the 20th century, the American research university had usurped the small liberal arts college as the pre-eminent post-secondary model.

Levine (1986) argues that higher education began to play a prominent role in American society between 1915 and 1940 as evidenced by skyrocketing enrollments, admissions quotas,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

new practical courses of study, federal financial assistance, social snobbery, trend-setting fraternity life, and scientific research (pp. 13-14). Middle class parents, part of a "culture of aspiration," sent their sons and daughters to college as the first step in upward mobility (p. 14). It was during this interwar period that colleges "set out to train, accredit, and impart social status to their students" while becoming champions of "broad economic and social values of society" (Levine, 1986, p. 19).

Exclusion

The realities of the 1920's and 1930's failed to match the rhetoric of American democracy; exclusion was the order of the day. The poor could rarely afford to attend college. Racial segregation, whether de jure or de facto, meant few blacks attended white institutions. Many schools anxious to improve their prestige limited the admission of women. This tendency towards exclusion was manifested most dramatically in the selective admissions policies first introduced at Dartmouth College. In a 1922 speech, Dartmouth's president, Ernest Hopkins, expressed concern that "too many young men are going to college" (Geiger, 1986, p. 129). Rejecting the notion that only the wealthy should attend college, Hopkins instead called for an "aristocracy of brains" made up of intellectually alert and eager men (Geiger, 1986, p. 129). Hopkins was interested in offering admission to students of superior intellect regardless of their social background. He devised a selective admissions process that was sensitive to exceptional scholarship, geography, and gave preference to "legacies" or children of Dartmouth alumni (Levine, 1986, pp. 141-142). This selectivity scheme, however, had the unintended consequence of the "wrong kind" of Jews meeting the exceptional scholarship criterion. Selection quickly became discrimination as quotas were instituted to keep out the socially undesirable, specifically Jews. These practices at Dartmouth and other

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

private colleges (especially those in the northeast) led to the emergence of national elite liberal arts colleges rooted in class and ethnic prejudice (Levine, 1986, p. 137).

Undergraduate Student Culture

Diversity in the student body was more evident in public universities than in the selective private colleges. Horowitz (1987), however, notes that regardless of four-year institution type, the "college man" of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries inherited an adolescent peer culture that devalued academic work, was willing to cheat, was disdainful of those outside its circle, utilized violence, and sanctioned drinking. Fraternities were established by 1850 for mutual protection, friendship and good times. Social stratification on campus mimicked the outside world and conformity was essential. College men took part in organized sports, particularly football, rowing, and baseball with intercollegiate as well as intramural contests. The college man had no interest in getting to know the faculty (Horowitz, 1987, pp.10-46).

According to Horowitz (1987), campus outsiders tended to come from poorer families, be serious students, and were characterized by the college men as "grinds." The outsiders saw college as a means to upward social mobility and often had little time for anything other than studying. Many outsiders were the socially excluded (particularly Jews, "ethnics," and blacks). The outsiders were often good students who found that study, inquiry, and persistence led to success (Horowitz, 1987, pp. 62-78).

The third group of students Horowitz (1987) identifies is the rebels. The rebels, unlike the college men, did not view the campus as everything in their rite of passage. Unlike the outsiders, the rebels challenged college men for control of the student newspaper and student government, organizing slates to run against fraternity men in elections. More importantly,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

rebels broke down the distinctions between males and females, as both could be rebels. Rebels questioned their parents and society and rejected their classmates and home (Horowitz, 1987, pp. 86-94).

Horowitz (1987) notes that while fraternity membership rarely exceeded one-third of the undergraduate student body, fraternity members' influence on campus far exceeded their numbers from the 1920's to the 1950's. This is partly attributable to college administrators (particularly deans) accepting student customs, encouraging student extra-curricular involvement, and working with student governments. It was during the 1920's that college men incorporated sexual play and conquests into their previously all-male culture, resulting in the sexually violent fraternity culture that persists today (Horowitz, 1987, pp. 119-131).

The GI Bill

Near the end of World War II, federal policymakers, alarmed at the prospect of millions of returning veterans entering the work force, succeeded in obtaining Congressional approval for the Serviceman's Readjustment Act of 1944, commonly known as the GI Bill. The GI Bill of Rights provided educational grants to returning veterans for one year plus the equivalent to their years of service prior to conclusion of the war at any "approved educational or training institution at which he chooses to enroll...which will accept or retain him as a student..." (Goodchild & Wechsler, 1997, p. 755). Over two million veterans utilized the GI Bill and entered post-secondary institutions following the end of World War II (Lucas, 1994, p. xvi). Once again federal legislation resulted in a significant increase in opportunity for individuals who might otherwise not have attended college. But the most far-reaching changes in college admissions were not achieved until after 1954.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Civil Rights and Higher Education

As part of the post-war Civil Rights Movement, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) successfully challenged de jure racial segregation in public education as a violation of the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. In *Sweatt v. Painter* (1950), the Supreme Court held that the "equal protection clause required that the Negro be admitted to the University of Texas Law School, since the school for Negroes did not afford equal facilities." In *McLaurin v. Oklahoma* (1950), the Supreme Court ruled that a "Negro admitted to a white graduate school be treated like all other students." Then in a landmark 1954 opinion, the Supreme Court overturned the doctrine of "separate but equal" articulated in the *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896) decision. The *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas* (1954) ruling stated "we conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal." Public schools were ordered by the Court to desegregate with all deliberate speed. The Brown decision specifically concerned elementary and secondary schools; two years later, its relevance to higher education was confirmed in *Florida ex rel. Hawkins v. Board of Control* (1956).

Securing voting rights and desegregating public transportation and accommodations were two other major components of the mid-century civil rights movement. College students played an active role in civil rights protests, beginning with a sit-in by four black students at a segregated lunch counter in Greensboro, North Carolina in 1960. White students picketed stores in the north, and went south with black students to participate in voter registration drives, bus rides and protest marches (Astin, Astin, Bayer and Bisconti, 1975, p. 19). The marches,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

violent reactions by police and white southerners, murders, and church bombings were covered by all the national media, most tellingly by television.

In a June 1963 speech entitled "Civil Rights Message" President Kennedy stated he believed every American should be able to attend any public educational institution they select, be able to register to vote without fear, and receive equal service in any public accommodation. He also stated he would be asking Congress to commit to the "proposition that race has no place in American life or law" by passing legislation to desegregate public accommodations, protect voting rights, and allow the federal government to participate in lawsuits to end segregation in school.

Following the November 1963 assassination of President Kennedy, Congress passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Title VII prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, sex, national origin or religion. Title VI of the Act reads "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance" (Kaplin & Lee, 1997, p. 545). Title VI also stipulates:

> (i) In administering a program regarding which the recipient has previously discriminated against persons on the ground of race, color, or national origin, the recipient must take affirmative action to overcome the effects of prior discrimination.
>
> (ii) Even in the absence of such prior discrimination, a recipient in administering a program may make affirmation action to overcome the effects of conditions which resulted in limited participation by persons of a particular race, color, or national origin [34 C.F.R. §100.3(b)(6)].

Title VI became the basis for several lawsuits seeking to force the desegregation of southern universities.

In his June 1964 commencement address at the University of Michigan, President Lyndon Johnson discussed his vision of the "Great Society." He said the Great Society

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

"demands an end to poverty and racial injustice, to which we are totally committed in our time" (Johnson, 1964, para. 4). Johnson (1964) also talked about the "100,000 high school graduates, with proved ability, who do not enter college because they cannot afford it... Poverty must not be a bar to learning, and learning must offer an escape from poverty" (para. 24). Finally, Johnson (1964) asked the graduates to "join the battle to give every citizen the full equality which God enjoins and the law requires, whatever his belief, or race, or the color of his skin" (para. 33).

Then in June 1965 at Howard University, President Johnson gave a speech justifying an affirmative effort to provide opportunities for black Americans. In his speech he said "'You do not take a person who, for years, has been hobbled by chains and liberate him, bring him up to the starting line in a race and then say, 'you are free to compete with all the others,' and still justly believe that you have been completely fair'" (Bowen & Bok, 1998, p. 6). Shortly thereafter, federal contractors were required to meet affirmative employment standards.

To address issues of access and equity in higher education, Congress passed the Higher Education Act of 1965. Title IV of the Act authorized federal scholarships known as educational opportunity grants, included the college work study program, and provided federally insured loans and interest subsidies for full-time students. The $70 million opportunity grant money was given to institutions for scholarships for first year students with "exceptional financial need." Title IV also set limits on maximum annual student loan amounts and created a loan insurance fund for students who did not have access to loans otherwise. Students who came from families earning less than $15,000 per year ($84,270 in 2001 dollars) were granted in-school interest subsidies on their National Defense Education Act loans.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

College work study funds subsidized all but ten percent of a student's earnings at part-time college jobs.

Admissions Practices

After the April 1968 assassination of Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., colleges and universities increased their efforts to admit minority students. While they concede that many university presidents acted in response to student protests, Bowen and Bok (1998) argue there were other reasons for increased minority student enrollment. University leaders sought to enrich education by including race as an element of student diversity. Also, university leaders perceived a need for more minority group members in the professions, business, and government and acted on the conviction that minority students should "have a special opportunity to become leaders in all walks of life" (Bowen & Bok, 1998, p. 7). Many institutions opened their doors to previously excluded students by altering their admissions policies. While some institutions adopted what came to be known as "open admission" policies, selective institutions tended to implement affirmative action policies for minority applicants.

Bowen and Bok (1998) state that selective institutions, which comprise no more than 30 percent of the higher education institutions, have as their fundamental objective the admission of students who exceed a high academic threshold. After identifying the most promising students, selective institutions then use four principal criteria in screening remaining candidates. The first criterion is the admission of students who appear capable of academic success. The second criterion is the admission of students from widely diverse backgrounds. Third, universities attempt to identify and admit students who appear likely to make significant contributions to society or their professions. And finally, universities recognize long-term

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

family loyalties to the institution and often give preference to descendants of alumni/ae (Bowen & Bok, 1998, pp. 23-24).

The criteria Bowen and Bok describe are not unlike those set in 1922 by Ernest Hopkins at Dartmouth. Hopkins was interested in selective admissions partly because of a new phenomenon that emerged due to increased student demand in the 1920's; Dartmouth had more applicants than spaces and elected not to expand to meet increased demand. Consequently, some students had to be denied admission. Levine (1986) argues that Hopkins' admission plan which included evidence of exceptional or high scholarship, personal recommendations, geography, father's occupation, and preference to "properly qualified sons of alumni…summarizes "the guidelines for selective admissions processes widely followed today" (pp. 141-142).

Dartmouth, like many other colleges in the northeast, relied on entrance examinations to determine that "admittees had acquired an adequate foundation in core academic courses and that they were prepared to undertake rigorous academic work" (Wightman, 1999, p. 2). Beginning in 1900, a small group of colleges had agreed to a common entrance examination that covered core subject areas. This examination consisted of essay questions which were subject matter specific. However, when colleges began to recruit nationally, the essay examination was too cumbersome for continued use so multiple choice examinations were created. The Scholarship Aptitude Test (SAT) was seen as a means for more broadly testing applicants' abilities and knowledge. The SAT was first given in 1926 but did not come into broad use until travel restrictions during World War II made its use practical. The high number of post-war GI Bill applicants made return to an essay examination impractical and solidified use of the SAT. The American College Testing Program (ACT) was founded in 1959, for the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

purpose of predicting college success and helping high school counselors advise students on choice of vocation and college. Both the SAT and ACT are widely used in the college admissions process today (Wightman, 1999). Most selective postsecondary institutions treat test scores as one of many factors in their admissions decisions, which include attention to several criteria.

One significant factor in admission decisions made by selective institutions (particularly private colleges) is the long-standing practice of giving preference to legacies (children and other relatives of alumni). Bowen and Bok (1998) state this practice respects family institutional loyalty, which is particularly important to institutional fund-raising efforts. However, this preference also results in a "legacy advantage" demonstrated in an "overall admission rate for legacies [that is] almost twice that for all other candidates and roughly the same as the overall rate for black candidates" (Bowen & Bok, 1998, p. 28). While legacies as a group receive preferential treatment, it is those with SAT scores between 1300 and 1600 who benefit the most. Bowen and Bok (1998) state that 60 percent of legacies and 70 percent of blacks in this cohort are admitted in contrast to 24 percent of non-legacies. Athletes on coaches' recruiting lists are admitted at an even higher rate than legacies and blacks (Bowen & Bok, 1998, pp. 28-29). Sidel (1994) states that in 1997 Princeton admitted only 15.4 percent of its total applicants but 43 percent of its legacy applicants (p. 248). Critics of affirmative action policies tend to ignore the preferential treatment given to the largely white legacy applicant pool.

In the late 1960's and early 1970's colleges revised their admissions policies to include affirmative action programs for minority students, particularly blacks. These affirmative action programs were intended to increase minority enrollment. Trent (1991) states that affirmative

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

action efforts typically included "broadened information dissemination regarding the college-going process...; assistance in securing and completing the various forms and a precollege visitation and/or summer enrichment experience; [and] broadened and more sensitive admission criteria" (p. 109). These efforts were often combined with a quota for minority applicants, some of whom were admitted with lower SAT or ACT scores than most white applicants.

Backlash

By the early 1970's, backlash against affirmative action had begun. Perceived or actual differential treatment of minority and white applicants' test scores and grades led to litigation challenging admissions policies as violations of Title VI and the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Many conservative governmental administrations have publicly opposed affirmative action policies that benefited the poor and non-white. In the 1980's, Congressional actions restructured financial aid policies to favor middle and upper class loan subsidies at the expense of grants for poor students. Voters in California and Washington passed referenda eliminating affirmative action in state employment and admissions practices during the 1990's.

Federal Case Law

Michael Bakke sued the University of California at Davis (UC-D) in 1972 after he was not admitted to medical school. At the time, UC-D had a special admissions program for "disadvantaged" students in addition to its regular admissions program. Applicants who self-identified as minorities were placed in the special admissions pool and were not required to have the minimum 2.5 grade point average which was the cutoff for the regular admissions

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

pool. A quota of the total spaces for the incoming class was reserved for the special pool candidates. Bakke argued he had been discriminated against because his scores were higher than the scores of some applicants admitted under the quota system. UC-D argued that it had a state interest in training doctors to serve minority communities, a need to compensate for societal discrimination, to reduce the shortage of minority doctors, and to diversify its student body. The Supreme Court issued a split opinion, holding by a bare majority that the University had unlawfully discriminated against Bakke. There were six opinions written in this case. Four justices (Stevens, Stewart, Rehnquist and Burger) signed the Stevens opinion which ruled the UC-D quota system was a violation of Title VI. Justice Powell's opinion was that UC-D's policy violated the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Therefore, a majority of the Court ruled in Bakke's favor.

However, four other justices (Brennan, White, Marshall and Blackmun) endorsed the Brennan opinion that the "state has a substantial interest that legitimately may be served by a properly devised admissions program involving the competitive consideration of race and ethnic origin." Justice Powell concurred with the Brennan opinion (Kaplin & Lee, 1997, pp. 184-186). Justice Powell's separate opinion is important because it has been used as a precedent in subsequent decisions. First, Powell stated strict scrutiny must be applied to any racial and ethnic classifications which "are inherently suspect." Second, a quota system may not be used. Third, while the state has a legitimate interest in eliminating identified racism, "societal discrimination" is not an acceptable rationale. And finally, "the attainment of a diverse student body is a constitutionally permissible goal for an institution of higher education" (*Regents of the University of California v. Bakke*, 1978).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

In 1994, the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled in favor of Daniel Podbersky, a Hispanic student who sued the University of Maryland because he was not eligible for a scholarship reserved for black students (*Podbersky v. Kirwan*, 1994). In its ruling, the court noted that previous discrimination by colleges and universities was societal discrimination, which cannot be a basis for a race-based remedy. The court noted "application for admission to college is voluntary rather than obligatory. In addition, the choice of which institution to attend is voluntary, and is dependent upon many variables other than race-based considerations" (*Podbersky v. Kirwan*, 1994). The Supreme Court refused to consider an appeal of this ruling that invalidated race-based scholarships. Although the decision is binding only in Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, and West Virginia, it could be cited as a precedent in other lawsuits (Jaschik, 1995, para. 4).

The Supreme Court's 1995 decision in *Adarand Constructors v. Pena* is important although it is related to employment rather than education. In this case, the Court's majority opinion was that under the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, if a governmental actor bases a classification explicitly on race, the classification must be reviewed under strict scrutiny. The "classifications are constitutional only if they are narrowly tailored measures that further compelling governmental interests" (*Adarand Constructors v. Pena*, 1995). All challenges to public universities' admissions policies have been reviewed under the strict scrutiny standard since 1995.

In 1996, four white individuals claimed they had been illegally denied admission to the University of Texas Law School on the basis of race, claiming violations of Title VI and the equal protection clause (*Hopwood v. Texas*, 1996). The Law School argued that it had a compelling interest in diversity which it had narrowly tailored to achieve a diverse student

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

body, remedy past discrimination in Texas, and to comply with a consent decree and the standards of the American Bar Association. The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals rejected the Law School's argument that diversifying the student body met Justice Powell's opinion in the *Bakke* decision. Further, the Court argued that racial classifications were permitted only for remedial purposes and the Law School would have to present evidence of its own past unlawful segregation rather than rely on past societal discrimination. The Supreme Court refused to review the appellate court decision (Kaplin & Lee, 1997, pp. 195-197).

In an August 2001 decision, the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals upheld a district court's decision in *Johnson v. Board of Regents* [of Georgia]. The three white female plaintiffs sued after being denied admission for fall 1999, challenging the University's admissions policy which awarded a fixed numerical bonus to male and non-white applicants. The district court ruled the policy was invalid because diversity is not a compelling state interest that would withstand a strict scrutiny test but did not issue a prospective injunction prohibiting the University from ever considering race. Johnson's appeal did not challenge the preferential treatment for males but did challenge preferential treatment of non-whites. The appellate court's ruling stated "a policy that mechanically awards an arbitrary 'diversity' bonus to each and every non-white applicant at a decisive stage in the admissions process, and severely limits the range of other factors relevant to diversity that may be considered at that stage, fails strict scrutiny and violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment" (*Johnson v. Bd. of Regents*, 2001). The University did not appeal the decision, which is binding in Georgia, Alabama and Florida.

In 1997, white applicants filed suit against the University of Washington Law School alleging racial discrimination as the reason they had been denied admission. From at least 1994

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

to 1998, the Law School used race as a criterion in the admissions process to achieve a diverse student body. However, in 1998, the University of Washington and the Law School ceased all use of race as a criterion in admissions after Initiative 200 (I-200), a voter referendum prohibiting affirmative action by state agencies, passed. The Law School's new admissions policy contained a diversity clause which stated "important academic objectives are furthered by...students...from diverse backgrounds" (*Smith v. Washington*, 1999). In denying Smith's claim for prospective relief based on the possibility that the Law School might use race in future admissions decisions, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals said "[The district court] was also correct when it determined that *Bakke* has not been overruled by the Supreme Court. Thus, at our level of the judicial system Justice Powell's opinion remains the law (*Smith v. University of Washington*, 2000).

The Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals is currently hearing two lawsuits challenging admissions policies at the University of Michigan. One district court upheld the post-1998 undergraduate admissions policy (*Gratz, et al. v. Bollinger, et al.*, 2000) while another district judge found the law school's admissions policy illegal (*Grutter, et al. v. Bollinger, et al.*, 2000).

Wightman (1999) argues that these court decisions stem partly from universities' over-reliance on standardized test scores. Further, "this over-reliance has also fueled the efforts of the popular press to turn the debate from one of equal opportunity to one of abandoning merit and academic standards. Test scores and grades are portrayed as seemingly objective measures..." (Wightman, 1999, p. 9). Americans view merit in individualistic terms, with advancement determined by individual talent and ability. Consequently, selection procedures are seen as fair if all individuals are judged by the same objective measures of individual competence (Levin, 1999). Levin (1999) states "race is considered irrelevant to judgments of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

individual competence" (p. 8). Despite arguments that merit can be defined objectively, Sidel (1994) argues "the concept of merit has a deceptively simple and enticing ring, tied as it is to Americans' desire to see ourselves as a society that believes in and practices equality of opportunity, but merit is an extraordinarily difficult concept to define" (p. 27). However, Hurtado (1992/2000) states that the meritocratic ethic in higher education is essentially a concern for individual privilege. Sidel (1994) posits that the students from affluent backgrounds who perform well in high school and on standardized tests may actually not be as meritorious as students from low-income and minority families. Nonetheless, opponents of affirmative action continue to argue that any use of race in admissions decisions reduces academic standards and is inherently unfair.

Selective institutions reject both black and white applicants with high SAT scores for a variety of reasons. Bowen and Bok (1998) state the denials are based on other information in students' files, including low scores on standardized subject area exams or weak secondary school performance in particular courses. Students who do well on the SAT but have "disappointing" grades in excellent high schools may be seen as underperformers. Personal statements or references may result in denial of admission. Bowen and Bok (1998) state the selection process is far more complicated than public discussions typically acknowledge (pp. 26-29). In discussing the process, Bowen and Bok (1998) state:

> Admissions officers have been "picking and choosing," as we believe they should always do—admitting the candidate who seems to offer something special by way of drive and determination, the individual with a set of skills that matches well the academic requirements of the institution, someone who will bring another dimension of diversity to the student body, or a candidate who helps the institution fulfill a particular aspect of its mission. Talk of basing admissions strictly on test scores and grades assumes a model of admissions radically different from one that exists today. Such a policy would mandate a fundamental change of direction for institutions that recognize the many dimensions of "qualification": the importance of a good fit between the student and the educational program, the varied paths that individuals follow in

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> developing their abilities, and the pitfalls of basing assessments of talent and potential solely on narrowly defined quantitative measures. (p. 29)

Bowen and Bok (1998) state "it is also easy to exaggerate the degree of preference that has been given to black candidates" (p. 37). They argue that race-neutral admissions policies would hypothetically reduce the probability of admissions for blacks to roughly half the probability for whites. The hypothetical probabilities calculated by Bowen and Bok closely approximate the actual situation at the University of California at Berkeley after the voters mandated a ban on racial preferences which became effective in 1997. At Berkeley, the admission rate for whites in 1997 (prior to the ban) was 29.9 percent; in 1998, 30.3 percent of white applicants were admitted. However, the admission rate for black applicants dropped from 48.5 percent in 1997 to 15.6 percent in 1998 (Bowen & Bok, 1998, pp. 32-33). Bowen and Bok (1998) state that "even if white students filled all the places created by reducing black enrollment, the overall white probability of admission would rise by only one and one-half percentage points: from 25 percent to roughly 26.5 percent" (p. 36). Even if race neutral policies were adopted, there is very little difference between the SAT scores of those black students who would be retained and those who would be rejected (Bowen and Bok, p. 42). Bowen and Bok (1998) argue that the consideration of race as well as merit in admissions decisions should continue, stating:

> Above all, merit must be defined in light of what educational institutions are trying to accomplish. In our view, race is relevant in determining which candidates "merit" admission because taking account of race helps institutions achieve three objectives central to their mission—identifying individuals with high potential, permitting students to benefit educationally from diversity on campus, and addressing long-term societal needs. (p. 278)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Federal Executive Branch Backlash

Richard Nixon was elected President in 1968 after the assassinations of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and Senator Robert Kennedy, student protests, big-city riots, and riots at the Democratic National Convention. Nixon had adopted a "Southern strategy" during the election of appealing to disaffected Southern whites and ignoring black voters (Lugg, 1996, pp. 17-19). Following Nixon's election, black student protests and anti-war protests continued with colleges and universities adopting affirmative action admissions policies and opening their doors to the previously excluded. Vice President Spiro Agnew went on the attack as the Nixon administration reversed the Johnson administration's overt support for affirmative action. In a 1970 speech in Iowa, Agnew talked about revised admissions policies, stating

> [U]nqualified students are being swept into college [by two methods]. "One is called a quota system, and the other an open-admissions policy. Each is implemented by lessening admissions requirements. They may be equally bad."
>
> Quoting historian Daniel Boorstin, Agnew went on: "In the university, all men are not equal...Those better endowed or better equipped intellectually must be preferred in admission and preferred in recognition...If we are to give in to the armed demands of militants to admit persons to the university because of their race, their poverty, their illiteracy or any other non-intellectually distinction, our universities can no longer serve all of us--or any of us."
>
> In an era when professors were surrendering by battalions to student radicals, Agnew denounced the "levelers and ideologists" and attacked affirmative action and reverse discrimination policies that some Republicans, even today, lack the courage to oppose. (Buchanan, 1998, para. 6-8)

Nixon and Agnew were re-elected in 1972, again utilizing the "Southern strategy" which was also used successfully by Ronald Reagan in 1980 and 1984.

The Reagan administration used race as a wedge issue to spread the idea that African-Americans were benefiting while whites were suffering, thus mobilizing white middle class angst. By producing an agenda framed in "'ostensibly neutral language'" Reagan placed the interests of many African-Americans against the interests of many white Americans (Sidel,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1994, p. 62). Sidel (1994) argues "this strategy of encouraging the middle classes to blame the poor and people of color for their losses...is both a political ploy...and also a tactic to divert blame for the growing inequality within American society and the deterioration of the quality of life for the majority of Americans" (p. 63).

Lugg (1996) describes President Reagan's first term education policy as "PRolicy," a word derived from public relations politics. PRolicy stems from "speeches, forums, and public opinion columns" while policy stems from governmental debates about policy and procedures (Lugg, 1996, pp. 27-28). Although much of the Reagan PRolicy was directed at public elementary and secondary schools, Reagan made no secret of his opposition to affirmative action.

In 1982, the Reagan administration "announced that private schools previously denied federal tax-exempt status by the Internal Revenue Service due to their racial policies (Bob Jones University...) would now be accorded such status" (Lugg, 1996, p. 84). Lugg (1996) characterizes this decision as ahistorical: "the decision to reverse an IRS policy that had been enforced by three presidents, two of whom were Republicans, and specifically affirmed by the Supreme Court in 1976, was based firmly in conservative ideology and racial politics rather than in tax policy or education" (p. 85). In 1983, the Supreme Court ruled "in an 8-1 decision that the IRS could deny federal tax-exemptions to schools that discriminate upon the basis of race" (Lugg, 1996, p. 141).

In 1984, the federal Civil Rights Commission was reconstituted with Reagan appointees. The Commission voted to review all policies since 1957, with the chair stating the current Commission did not feel bound by any previous policies. Among the items the Commission agreed to review was "the effects of affirmative action within higher education

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[and] mandatory and voluntary school desegregation" (Lugg, 1996, pp. 157-158). The Republican attacks on affirmative action continued under the first Bush administration. In 2002, President George W. Bush appointed a critic of affirmative action to head the Department of Education's civil rights division (Gose, 2002, p. A26).

Congressional Action

In 1972, Congress amended the Higher Education Act in a manner that resulted in a move away from institutional assistance toward student choice enhanced by direct student aid (Gladieux & Hauptman, 1995). Congress created the Basic Educational Opportunity Grants, a program of direct grants to needy students which they could use at any accredited post-secondary institution of their choice. The already existing grant programs that were campus-based or institutional aid were maintained. Congress also created State Student Incentive Grants, a matching program for state grants.

The 1976 re-authorization included federal incentives for states to develop student loan agencies. In a 1978 response to perceived difficulties middle-income families had paying college costs, Congress passed the Middle Income Student Assistance Act which widened eligibility for the Basic Educational Opportunity Grants and allowed any student to borrow a subsidized educational loan. Re-authorizations during the 1980's and 1990's increased eligibility for middle income students, particularly for loans, and continued the policy drift toward greater reliance on student self-help (Gladieux & Hauptman, 1995, pp. 17-19).

Recent action in Congress reflects a backlash as well. In 1996, the eight Republican members of the House Judiciary Committee approved a bill that would eliminate race-based criteria from federal student-aid programs. Called the "Equal Opportunity Act of 1996," the act was intended to eliminate all preferences by the federal government (Healy, 1996, p. 1). In

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1998, a California Republican introduced a bill that would prohibit any colleges receiving funds through the Higher Education Act from giving preferences in admissions based on race or gender. This bill would have affected virtually all colleges ("Bill would deny," 1998).

State Actions

Antipathy to affirmative action policies has surfaced in a number of states. While efforts to ban affirmative action failed in Arizona, South Carolina, South Dakota and Georgia, prohibitions did pass in California and Washington (Schmidt, 1998). Florida changed its university admissions policies as a pre-emptive measure against a possible voter referendum (Selingo, 1999).

In 1996, California voters passed an amendment to the state constitution, Proposition 209, which banned the consideration of sex, ethnicity and race in state employment and education decisions. The Supreme Court refused to hear a challenge in 1997, letting stand a lower court ruling banning affirmative action. The University of California Board of Regents had voted in 1996 to prohibit affirmative action decisions in admissions as well as employment. The race-blind admissions policy was instituted for graduate students in 1997-98 and for undergraduates in fall 1998. Applications from minority students dropped dramatically (American Council on Education, 1999).

Following the passage of I-200 in Washington in 1998, the University of Washington announced it would no longer consider race and ethnicity in admissions. The number of minority applicants to the law school plummeted almost in half (American Council on Education, 1999). Passage of this initiative made the lawsuit filed by Smith against the University of Washington Law School moot.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Diversity on Campus

Campus Culture

Higher education culture can be defined as "the collective, mutually shaping patterns of norms, values, practices, beliefs, and assumptions that guide the behavior of individuals and groups in an institute of higher education and provide a frame of reference within which to interpret the meaning of events and actions on and off campus" (Kuh & Whitt, 1988/2000, p. 162). While culture is relatively stable, it is also evolving from patterns of interactions between individuals, groups, the institution and the external environment. The transmission of culture is generally tacit, with individuals using contextual clues to interpret words and actions. Newcomers or members of underrepresented groups may have difficulty interpreting the nuances of the dominant culture. As a result, groups may reject the culture of other groups while reinforcing their own (Kuh & Whitt, 1988/2000, pp. 162-163). Culture is "changed primarily by cataclysmic events or through slower, intensive and long-term efforts" (Peterson & Spencer, 1990/2000, p. 173).

Institutional climate "can be defined as the current common patterns of important dimensions of organizational life or its members' perceptions of and attitudes toward these dimensions [and] is more concerned with current perceptions and attitudes" than deeply held beliefs and values (Peterson & Spencer, 1990/2000, p. 173). The primary features of climate are commonly held participant views of institutional phenomena, a focus on current behavior patterns and beliefs, its pervasiveness and its changeable character. Participants may experience climate objectively by observing formal activities, by their feelings or by their cognitive perceptions. Hurtado (1992/2000) argues that climate at selective institutions is due to a "conflict in priorities: the sources of conflict is not between diversity and achievement but

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

originates from differences in institutional priorities that work to preserve inequalities" (p. 185).

Opponents of affirmative action argue that campus diversity is problematic for all students. Media accounts of racist behavior on campus, reports of student "self-segregation" and allegations of silencing due to political correctness are frequent. Alger (1997) states "the opponents of racebased affirmative action have largely succeeded in convincing the courts and the public that the goal of racial diversity reflects and reinforces racial stereotypes, acts as a poor substitute for true intellectual diversity, and serves as a thinly disguised excuse for racial quotas" (para. 3). Sidel (1994) discusses the challenges facing college students:

> concerns with the precariousness of their Admission to college or university is, as has been noted, a first but crucial step in an individual's preparation for meaningful participation in the social, economic, and political life of postindustrial America. But admission is merely the first hurdle a student must clear in higher education. Financing college education, achieving academically, and maneuvering around the multitude of social, psychological, and political obstacles that impede the path to a bachelor's degree are often much higher hurdles than admission. Among the barriers that many students have had to face in recent years are virtually continuous clashes stemming from prejudice, ethnocentrism, and fear—fear of the unknown, of the stranger among us. At root these clashes are about entitlement and power, and about students' position in the social structure. (p. 79)

Although current students are more tolerant than their grandparents and parents, acts of overt intolerance continue to occur on college campuses. These bigoted, often violent acts occur in the face of increasing societal intolerance for overt expressions of hatred and the expectation of minimal civility in the increasingly open and heterogeneous academic setting (Sidel, 1994, p. 80).

Some observers are concerned about black students' self-stigmatization. Carter (1991) argues that affirmative action policies have resulted in black students being perceived not as the best but as the "best black." He states that blacks who are highly qualified will always be

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

dismissed as "nothing more than the best blacks" and therefore must commit themselves to being "too good to ignore" (Carter, 1991, pp. 60-61). Steele (1999) posits that students often suffer from "stereotype threat" when they recognize they are in a situation where negative stereotypes about their group apply to themselves. He argues that "stereotype threat follows its targets onto campus, affecting behaviors of theirs that are as varied as participating in class, seeking help from faculty, contact with students in other groups, and so on" (Steele, 1999, p. 7). Neal (2002) believes campus racial tension has a special form:

> The presence of blacks elicits derisive responses among some white students who question college-admissions standards and resist sharing space with black students. Other whites see black students as valuable to the campus fabric but are put off by acts of black solidarity, like the formation of black-student unions. Such organizations are often perceived as examples of Generation Hip-Hop's rejecting the integrationist ambitions of their parents. As if mixing together is not stressful enough, Generation Hip-Hop is moving out into white enclaves at a time of proliferating black images in the mass media. Many within the entertainment industry continue to rely on decades-old, albeit updated, caricatures of black culture...(p. B14)

Sidel (1994) asserts that black students must fight bias both inside and outside the classroom. Some black students attend predominantly white campuses where minority students are targeted by violent clashes, posters, signs, newspaper articles or advertisements, minstrel shows or "slave" auctions. Many black students are harassed in the community surrounding the campus, particularly when they are shopping or driving. Others, who may be the only black in their classes, encounter insensitive faculty who ask the students for the "black perspective." While media reports of "political correctness" and stifled speech on campus are abundant, Sidel (1994) states that most black students do not challenge faculty who express racist views and do not file complaints.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Benefits of Diversity

Other research indicates that race relations are not as strained as the media reports (Antonio, 1999). Hurtado (1992/2000) argues that "we have yet to obtain evidence which shows that diversity priorities are related to racial tension on predominantly white campuses" (p. 185). In research combining longitudinal studies of students drawn from a national data base, from a public, research university, and from specific classes, Gurin (1999) found:

> First, individuals who have been educated in diverse settings are far more likely to work and live in racially and ethnically diverse environments after they graduate; second, individuals who studied and discussed issues related to race and ethnicity in their academic courses and interacted with a diverse set of peers in college are better prepared for life in an increasingly complex and diverse society; and third, increasing the number of diverse students is essential, but colleges have to create the conditions to maximize learning and democratic outcomes in racially/ethnically diverse educational environments. (Appendix B, para. 2)

Structural diversity (the degree to which students of color are represented in the student body) has significant positive effects on classroom diversity, interactional diversity among all students, and creates conditions for students to experience diversity differently than they would in a homogeneous student body (Gurin, 1999, Empirical results, para. 3). Gurin (1999) also states "students who had experienced the most diversity in classroom settings and in informal interactions with peers showed the greatest engagement in active thinking processes, growth in intellectual engagement and motivation, and growth in intellectual and academic skills" (Empirical results, para. 7). As students become more active critical thinkers, they come to understand that knowledge is constructed, not given. Research indicates that students are more likely to become conscious learners and critical thinkers if they encounter new situations or their environment requires more than their previous environments (Gurin, 1999, Theoretical foundations).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Students at a fairly diverse university who were surveyed in their freshman year and again in their junior year reported that students cluster predominantly by race and ethnicity but only a small majority reported that students rarely socialize across racial lines. Only one in six students reported having only racially and ethnically homogenous friendship groups while nearly half reported having racially and ethnically mixed friendship groups (Antonio, 1999). Antonio (1999) states the results clearly indicate that students' perceptions differ from their interpersonal experiences. Other research indicates that white students tend to interpret ethnic group clustering as racial segregation while minority students view clustering as a means of support within an unsupportive environment (Hurtado, 1992/2000).

Milem (1999) argues that diversity benefits individuals and society as well as institutions. Student benefits range from increased earnings and higher degree aspirations (Bowen & Bok, 1998) to increased racial understanding (Astin, 1993; Gurin, 1999) to gains in critical thinking (Gurin, 1999). Students also benefit from informal interactions with their peers. Gurin (1999) states "much to our chagrin as educators, we are compelled to understand that students' hearts and minds may be impacted most by what they learn from peers" (Conclusion, para. 2). For example, students who join the corporate world also benefit from collegiate diversity experiences. Individuals with cognitive and social skills who are able to work effectively with diverse colleagues, are open to new perspectives and ideas and can empathize with others' perspectives are highly desirable employees (Gurin, 1999, Mission).

Diversity experiences have a positive effect on democracy outcomes. Gurin (1999) states that "students who experienced diversity in classroom settings and in informal interactions showed the most engagements in various forms of citizenship, and the most engagements with people from different races/cultures. They were also the most likely to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

acknowledge that group differences are compatible with the interests of the broader community" (Summary and conclusions, para. 6). Bowen and Bok (1998) found that nearly 90 percent of their survey respondents were participating in civic activities nearly twenty years after graduation. However, "in every type of civic activity…the ratio of black male leaders to white male leaders is even higher than the ratio of black male participants to white male participants" (Bowen & Bok, 1998, p. 160). Research also indicates that "students who had taken the most diversity courses and interacted the most with diverse peers during college had the most cross-racial interactions five years after leaving college" (Gurin, 1999, Empirical results, effects section).

Gurin (1999) states universities "have an obligation, first and foremost, to create the best possible educational environment for the young adults whose lives are likely to be significantly changed during their years on campus" (p. 1). Further, "higher education is obliged both to advance knowledge and to educate those who will become active in the professions and in society. Racial and ethnic differences are relevant to both these goals" (Gurin, 1999, Mission, para. 2). Sidel (1994) states:

> The educational system is, furthermore, of central importance in determining who will be able to participate fully and meaningfully in our democratic society. The ability to grasp complex ideas, to comprehend even in a rudimentary way the implications of constant scientific and technological change, to evaluate the trade-offs between economic expansion and environmental deterioration, and to acquire the knowledge necessary to evaluate differences in political and economic philosophy is in a modern, complex society dependent to a significant extent upon the level and quality of one's education. If democracy, the "rule of the people," is predicated, as we move into the twenty-first century, on a system of education that truly enables the people to understand the issues of our time and to feel as though they can participate in meaningful ways in the democratic process. (p. 25)

The history of higher education in the second half of the twentieth century is the story of increased equity of access for women and minorities. The doors to selective institutions are

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

open, even as arguments as to which individuals "merit" entry persist and students at those institutions clearly benefit from diversity. It is within this interpretive context that the UIUC and Clarence Shelley story emerges.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

> [It is necessary to enable] conversation across societal lines-of ethnicity, religion, class, gender, language, race-that have grown progressively more nuanced [and to] enlarge the possibility of intelligible discourse between people quite different from one another in interest, outlook, wealth, and power, and yet contained in a world where, tumbled as they are into endless connection, it is increasingly difficult to get out of each other's way. (Clifford Geertz, 1988, p. 147)

The goal of this study is to develop an understanding of the perceptions and experiences of one intended change agent at a public research university during the last 30 years of the twentieth century. Students involved in the Civil Rights and Women's Movements exerted tremendous pressure for change on higher education institutions in the 1960's and 1970's, particularly in curricular and access issues. The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign was no exception to this social pressure and in 1968 created a Special Educational Opportunities Program designed to support its post-King assassination decision to admit 500 African-American freshmen for the fall semester. On July 1, 1968, Clarence Shelley became Assistant to the Chancellor and Director of the Special Educational Opportunities Program, a position he held for six years. During his career at UIUC, he was promoted three times. He was Dean of Students for eleven years, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs for seven years and Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs for nine years. He retired on October 1, 2001.

Theoretical Framework

> The external marks of character are the product of the way a life is lived. (Robert Greenleaf, 1998, p. 70)

> The voices of older people of color are nearly obsolete in the social sciences. (Elisa Facio, 1993, p. 75)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The theoretical framework for this study is drawn from the servant-leadership model, epistemological considerations about race in qualitative social science research, and studying across differences. Use of these frameworks permits me, a white middle-aged woman, to listen carefully to an African-American, older man and, hopefully, to construct a narrative that authentically reflects his perspectives, experiences, and voice.

Servant-Leadership

In 1970, Robert Greenleaf defined a new kind of leadership model he called servant-leadership. The model put serving others as the top priority of the leader. Spears (1998) says servant-leadership is "a holistic approach to work; the promotion of a sense of community; and a deepening understanding of spirit in the workplace" (p. 4). Greenleaf (1998) describes servant-leadership as beginning

> with the natural feeling that one wants to serve first. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead. The difference manifests itself in the care taken by the servant-first to make sure that other people's highest priority needs are being served. The best test is: "Do those served grow as persons; do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants?" (p. 4)

Spears (1998) identifies the ten characteristics of servant-leadership. The servant-leader listens intently to others, tries to identify and clarify the will of the group, attempts to understand and empathize with others, and assumes that people are good although their behavior may be unacceptable. The servant-leader also believes in the healing force of relationships and is committed to helping make others whole. Finally, the servant leader is generally and self-aware and has his own inner serenity.

Seeking to build consensus rather than coerce others, servant-leaders rely on persuasion rather than their positional authority. Servant-leaders balance the day-to-day approach with conceptualizing broader perspectives. Servant-leaders try to understand lessons from the past

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

in order to foresee likely consequences of decisions for the future. Acting as stewards, servant leaders hold their institutions in trust for society's greater good. Servant leaders are committed to the growth of every individual within their institution. And finally, servant-leaders build community among those who work in the institution (pp. 5-8).

The servant-leader displays maturity by the process of growing or becoming. Greenleaf (1998) defines his concept of growth around entheos or "the power actuating one who is inspired" (p.72). He permits himself and others to make and learn from mistakes. Keeping a private faith in times of triumph and disaster, the servant leader finds his unique self in the work that he does. The servant-leader expands his intellectual life. Recognizing that conformity is an "external adjustment to the group norm of behavior in the interest of group cohesiveness and effectiveness" he does not allow himself to lose his internal identity to conformity (p. 68). The servant-leader finds his own significance without succumbing to the temptation to define his significance in terms of status, property or achievement. The final mark of his maturity is the servant-leader's acceptance of a process for drawing forth his own uniqueness. Entheos is the essence for the servant-leader's desire to hold himself together under stress, for risk-taking, for keeping his religious beliefs in contact with his attitudes and practices in the workplace, and the prod to staying open to knowledge (Greenleaf, 1998, p. 72).

Servant leaders function within various institutions. Greenleaf (1998) believes that institutions, including universities, are dominant in current American society. Institutional history and myths have a profound influence on the institution's values, leadership and goals. Individuals need to understand the institution's past in order to understand their current place in it. Knowledge of history and myth are both necessary to understanding today (p. 20).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Universities, according to Greenleaf, possess coercive powers in credentialing, discipline, and information. Highly civilized people who are motivated by high ideals employ much of this coercion. University leaders, who may have information they do not share, may employ manipulative power that is based on plausible rationalizations. Greenleaf argues that many leaders actually make decisions intuitively but have to justify these decisions using logic. Since we live in a society that values conscious rational thinking, leaders must make logical sense to followers (pp. 82-84).

Greenleaf (1998) posits that university servant-leaders should use persuasion as power. When persuasion is used, the person being persuaded takes an intuitive step towards a feeling of rightness about a belief or action that is not subject to coercion or manipulation. Persuasion takes time, but both leader and follower respect the integrity and autonomy of the other; mutual criticism and spirited arguments are possible. In fact, Greenleaf argues that "every institution should harbor able persuaders who know their way around, who are dedicated servants of the institution, whose judgment and integrity are respected, who do not manipulate, who hold no coercive power, and who, without the formal assurances that faculty members usually have, feel free and secure" (p. 86). Trust in the servant-leader and his perspective is built over time among many members of the institution.

Epistemological Considerations

Stanfield (1993) states that qualitative research reflects value biases that are evident in the cultural and political constructs of inquiry logic, and in the ethical disregard of people of color as researched and researchers. These biases result in much thinking about race that is rather obsolete.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Researchers construct categories that often treat race as a "taken-for-granted" attribute. Stanfield (1993) says, "research in race and ethnicity is essentially inquiry into particular categories of humans" (p. 16). In the U.S., people are socialized to see themselves and others in terms of racial and ethnic categories. Everyday vocabulary is race-saturated and determines how Americans describe themselves and others. Americans and Western Europeans link phenotype characteristics with presumptions about intelligence, personality, moral character and behavior. "Black" and "white" have stereotypical but not empirical meanings. These racial categories come from folklore beliefs that rose during the 19th century. In an era of human liberation movements, Americans and Western Europeans had to construct theories of sub-humanness for people of color to justify their political and social oppression and enslavement. Researchers also tend to treat race categorizations as unproblematic. Dominant researchers assume every American has a racial identity. They also confuse subjective and objective racial identifications (Stanfield, 1993).

Stanfield (1993) argues "the historic race relations research literature in the social sciences and humanities is dominated by homogeneous examinations of people of color" (p. 19). This homogeneity is due not to the actual experiences of African Americans but to the assimilationist world-views of pre-World War II sociologists. The outgrowth of this view has been the assumption that people of color have no differential identities. This assumption ignores the range of identities in people of color and the extensive ethnic and intercultural mixing that has occurred in the U.S. In the two-tiered American racial system, researchers do not know where to place people of mixed backgrounds. Additionally, "class, gender, religion, age, region, and language in historically specific contexts all complicate 'what identity is and means' for individual people of color" (Stanfield, 1993, p. 23). The assumption of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

homogeneity also means that it is the oppressed, not the dominant, who "have their heads examined" (Stanfield, 1993, p. 24). Stanfield (1993) argues that acknowledgment of the humanity of people of color threatens the status quo of social science research.

Ethical and human values issues also must be considered in any research. Stanfield (1993) believes "researchers in mainstream disciplines rarely if ever reflect seriously on the effects their racial and ethnic identities and consciousness might have on what they see and interpret" (p. 25). White male authority dominates in defining issues that are theoretically value-neutral but are actually hegemonic dominance in knowledge production and dissemination.

Much of the thinking about research is rather obsolete (Stanfield, 1993). Researchers select samples or populations of Euro-Americans with little or no regard for comparable samples or populations of people of color. Yet dominant scholars criticize scholars of color who use samples of people of color but no Euro-Americans. Stanfield (1993) argues "the realities of people of color are never considered as legitimate standards of generalization to Eurocentric realities" and that mainstream scholars rarely "select empirical observations about people of color, such as female-headed family structure or religious behavior, to explain Eurocentric realities" (p. 28).

Ethical dilemmas abound in mainstream race related research. Stanfield (1994) states "there is a disturbing naiveté in the folklore of Eurocentric social science that all people of color are stupid" (p. 30). Researchers show little sensitivity to cultural, class and gender differences between themselves and their subjects. The power relationships between the dominant researcher and subordinate subject are asymmetric. Mainstream researchers rarely consider the social oppression literature and either selectively respect or ignore the subjects'

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

human rights. And finally, the work of scholars of color is often ignored or viewed as mediocre, making it difficult for scholars of color to compete for authoritative voices (Stanfield, 1993, pp. 25-30).

Studying Across Differences

Andersen (1993) discusses the attempts of women's and black studies to "build more inclusive research through incorporating the experiences and perspectives of traditionally excluded groups" (p. 40). One of the core tenets is the assumption that minority or women scholars bring their lived experiences to their studies and thus are better able to understand the nuances of oppression. Consequently, minority scholars are encouraged to study race relations. It is believed to be difficult if not impossible for dominant scholars to formulate conceptually and grasp empirically the phenomena of racial oppression. Research, which does not operate in a vacuum, is viewed as an asymmetric power relationship between the dominant researcher and the subordinate subject (Andersen, 1993, p. 40).

Andersen (1993) argues that "doing research in minority communities poses unique methodological problems for members of both minority and majority groups" (p. 40). She states that the relationship between researcher and subject is always unequal, if only because it is likely there are social class differences between researcher and subjects. Andersen acknowledges that majority and minority researchers ask different questions, but argues that majority researchers can attempt to understand race relations as experienced by minorities (Andersen, 1993, pp. 40-41).

Feminist scholars who argued that members of subordinate groups have unique viewpoints on their own experiences developed standpoint theories. Standpoint theorists posit that "race, class, and gender are origins of, as well as objects of, sociological knowledge"

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

(Andersen, 1993, p. 42). Standpoint theorists contend that researchers and subjects are situated in certain social-historic settings and that research must be seen in context. Researchers are not objective and cannot remove themselves from their research. Andersen (1993) cites Patricia Hill Collins' work on black feminist scholars and Collins' suggestion that "all intellectuals can learn to read their personal and cultural biographies as significant sources of knowledge" (p. 42). In other words, standpoints are not inherent in one's ethnicity or gender or class but can be achieved. The achievement requires white scholars to examine the influence of institutional racism on their research formulation and development. White scholars cannot assume a color-blind stance. White scholars also must understand they are situated in their research, time and place. Andersen (1993) credits Hooks with her conclusion that "the question is not whether white scholars should write about or attempt to know the experience of people of color, but whether their interpretations should be taken to be the most authoritative" (p. 43).

Methodological Framework

When the purpose of a study is to develop understanding, a researcher uses qualitative research methodology to be sensitive to context, actor's and researcher's voices (Denzin, 1994; Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997; Mishler, 1986) and ethnicity (Andersen, 1993; Facio, 1993; Stanfield, 1993; Stanfield, 1994). The methodological framework of portraiture permits the researcher to be sensitive to context and voice while simultaneously taking into account the epistemology of race/ethnicity. The purpose of the portrait is to capture the actor's story, voice and the setting authentically.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Storytelling

Storytelling is a form of scholarship that contributes to understanding the experiences of others (Andersen, 1993; Denzin, 1994; Facio, 1993; Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997; Mishler, 1986; Stanfield, 1993). Citing Featherstone, Lawrence-Lightfoot and Davis (1997) state portraiture is a form of "people's scholarship" that permits the voices of people of color to be heard within an historical context (p. 10). The narrative text that is produced reflects the researcher's willingness to study actors within their work context rather than treat them as "fruit flies." Mishler (1986) argues that "one of the significant ways through which individuals make sense of and give meaning to their experiences is to organize them in a narrative form" (p. 118). Researchers tell stories with beginnings, middles, and ends. These stories embody explicit and implicit theories of causality. Researchers "write to make senses of 'another's' life. In the end it is a matter of storytelling and stories we tell each other" (Denzin, 1994, p. 512). Storytelling is apparent in the portrait narrative.

Lawrence-Lightfoot and Davis (1997) describes storytelling as follows:

> ...Featherstone...recognizes...'The telling of stories can be a profound form of scholarship moving serious study close to the frontiers of art in the capacity to express complex truth and moral context in intelligible ways. ... Historians have used narrative as a way in which to make sense of lives and institutions over time, but over the years they have grown abashed about its lack of scientific rigor. Now, as we look for ways to explore context and describe the thick textures of lives over time in institutions with a history, we want to reckon with the author's own stance and commitment to the people being written about. Storytelling takes on a fresh importance.' [Featherstone, 1989, p. 377 in Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997, p. 11]

Context

There is ample literature that speaks to the essentiality of context (Andersen, 1993; Facio, 1993; Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997; Mishler, 1986). In discussing traditional survey research, Mishler (1986) argues that the "pervasive disregard of respondents' social and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

personal contexts of meaning" is problematic. He argues that context is an essential component of "meaning-expressing and meaning-making" that should not be overlooked (p. viii). Lawrence-Lightfoot and Davis (1997) state "context becomes the framework" (p. 41) and explains the essential nature of context in portraits as follows.

> The portraits are designed to capture the richness, complexity, and dimensionality of human experience in social and cultural context, conveying the perspectives of the people who are negotiating those experiences. The portraits are shaped through dialogue between the portraitist and the subject, each one participating in the drawing of the image. The encounter between the two is rich with meaning and resonance and is crucial to the success and authenticity of the rendered piece. (p. 3)

In portraiture methodology, context can be internal, personal or historic. Internal context refers to the physical setting and "works from the outermost circle inward, macro to micro, large to small, backdrop to foreground, general to specific, public to private" (Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997, p. 45). In order to fully describe the setting, the researcher gathers multiple sources of data, including interviews, relevant documents such as annual reports, newspaper clippings and questionnaires (Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997, pp. 63-64).

The personal context relates to the researcher's perspective. Lawrence-Lightfoot and Davis (1997) say "the researcher does not come as an empty slate to the job of interpreting the subject of the portrait" (p. 66). The researcher's assumptions, questions and framework are explicitly present as illumination in the portrait. The researcher assumes the stance of an outsider, "sufficiently distanced to encompass the various sources of data, the broader physical and ideological landscape, and the developing vision of the whole" (Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997, p. 69).

Historical context is also important to the portrait narrative. The history of the institution, including its evolution, is necessary to the context. Current symbols and signs in

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the physical environment also help to set the context. The physical environment and internal culture may reflect synchrony or dissonance (Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997, p. 53). External contextual elements that help explain the "action at center stage" are also a necessary component of the portrait. The researcher uses multiple sources to identify these external contextual elements. Additionally, the researcher also provides context for the actor's "personal or institutional journey in which the action is situated among past objectives, current realizations, and visions of the future" (Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997, p. 70).

Lawrence-Lightfoot (1997) state that the portrait is "a narrative that is at once complex, provocative, and inviting, that attempts to be holistic, revealing the dynamic interaction of values, personality, structure and history" (p. 11). They further argue that "the only way to interpret people's actions, perspectives, and talk is to see them in context" (p. 11). Context is seen as a "resource for understanding" and the narrative "is always embedded in a particular context, including physical settings, cultural rituals, norms, and values, and historical periods. The context is rich in how the actors or subjects negotiate and understand their experience" (Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997, p. 12). The standard for portraiture is the authentic capturing of the essence of the actor's experience and perspectives in context.

In a critique of portrait methodology, English (2000) argues that the researcher "bestows upon herself the authority to enter a context and find *the story* which reveals *the truth*. There is no doubt in the proponents' prose that *the truth* (as opposed to *a truth* or *their truth*) is attainable by portrait methodology" (p. 23). Indeed, according to English, portraiture relies on a "near inexhaustible predilection for contextual detail" that does not allow for multiple truths to exist within the given context. English (2000) further argues that because the "truth telling

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

capacity and limitations" of the researcher are all grounded in context that she controls, there is no independent referent for verification (p. 23).

Hertz (1997) offers a different view on the role of the researcher in constructing the narrative. Researchers determine which stories to include and which accounts to privilege while constructing theory from collected data. When the author's voice is present in the text, the reader can assess the author's perspective while reading the narrative. Readers, however, bring their own perspective to the narrative and may make interpretations that differ from the author's intent (Hertz, 1997).

Voice

According to Hertz (1997), "voice is a struggle to figure out how to present the author's self while simultaneously writing the respondents' accounts and representing their selves" (p. xi). Voice is multi-dimensional and includes the author's voice and the actor's voice, although "the [actor's] voice is almost always filtered through the author's account" (Hertz, 1997 pp. xi-xii).

In portraiture, the voices of both the actor and the researcher/portraitist are present. Lawrence-Lightfoot and Davis (1997) state the researcher's voice is present in the assumptions, questions and framework she uses, the data and stories she uses and the language of her narrative. "Voice is the research instrument ... of the portraitist ... voice is omnipresent" (p. 85). She argues that it is the actor's voice that predominates but the researcher's voice is still present unlike the purposeful silencing of the researcher's voice in quantitative research. Voice in portraiture includes "epistemology, ideology, and method" as part of authorship and interpretation. Lawrence-Lightfoot and Davis (1997) compare the portraitist's voice to the author's voice in quantitative research.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> Even though the voice of the researcher is purposely silenced in quantitative research where the structure and processes are relatively codified and routinized, it is important to recognize that the researcher's hand is, nevertheless, evident. We see the researcher's imprint in the selection of the research question, in the design of the study, in the data collection strategies, and in the interpretation of data. (p. 86)

Lawrence-Lightfoot and Davis (1997) identify six uses of the researcher's voice: as witness, as interpretation, as preoccupation, as autobiography, listening for voice and voice in conversation (p. 87). These different voices are used in constructing the text with the researcher's voice ranging from restrained to actively involved.

The portraitist uses voice as witness when she assumes the role of "boundary sitter" or outsider. Lawrence-Lightfoot and Davis (1997) argue that the outsider with new eyes is better able to discern the whole from patterns than the actors involved in the setting. The researcher is alert to the implicit behaviors and assumptions that permeate the setting and are second nature to the involved actors. The researcher's voice as witness is present in framing and selecting the story for the portrait (pp. 87-88). Lawrence-Lightfoot and Davis (1997) state the researcher's witness voice can be made explicit by use of I/we or made implicit by relating the researcher's perspective through the voice of an actor. However, she warns that the implicit mode should be used only when the story is representative of many (pp. 107-109). At times the researcher may relate a view of an insider that deviates from the majority insider view. Lawrence-Lightfoot and Davis (1997) argue that the researcher has a responsibility "as witness to tell a story that is neither just the portraitist's nor just the subject's, but instead belongs to both story tellers, attaining and reflecting an outsider-insider view" (p.110).

Charmaz and Mitchell (1997) argue there is merit in "audible authorship." They state that "these simple acts of outward inquiry and inward reflection together with effort and creativity will give us something to say worthy of sharing. We do not pretend that our stories

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

report autonomous truths..." Rather, the stories "involve readers' imaginative participation with subjects and authors in the described experience" (Charmaz & Mitchell, 1997, pp. 194-195). The researcher's "ways of viewing the experience shape what is viewed as well as the voice of the viewer" (Charmaz & Mitchell, 1997, p. 206).

The researcher's interpretive voice makes sense of the collected data. According to Denzin (1994), "the writer presents a particular and unique self in the text, a self that claims to have some authority over the subject matter that is being interpreted" (p. 502). The researcher gathers data from multiple sources, including interviews and documents, and then interprets the findings. The findings are presented as "thin description" (who, what, where, when) and as "thick description" (thoughtful interpretation). Both forms of description are necessary for authenticity. Indeed, the portraitist must provide "enough descriptive evidence in the text so the reader might be able to offer an alternative hypothesis, a different interpretation of the data" (Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997, p. 91). The researcher is careful to avoid descriptors that reflect personal evaluative judgments (i.e., "handsome"), opting for direct quotes from actors, descriptions of actions or selected physical details. The researcher's constant comparison of data, identification of patterns, and observations lead to a coherent interpretation of the data. The researcher's interpretive voice is present in the language, images, and melding of the separate parts of the portrait into a coherent whole (Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997, pp. 111-113).

Denzin (1994) says "in the social sciences there is only interpretation. Nothing speaks for itself" (p. 500). The researcher's theoretical perspectives, understanding of the literature, and academic discipline comprise her voice as preoccupation. Mishler (1986) argues that the researcher's interests are never neutral and serve as the framework guiding questions and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

interpretation. This voice as preoccupation is the lens through which the portraitist first interprets the data she collects (Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997, p. 93). The researcher's preoccupations are the result of experience and knowledge that help guide inquiry and interpretation (Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997, p. 113). Denzin (1994) says the researcher structures the interactions between herself, the data and the final narrative to make sense of the findings.

The researcher uses her autobiographical voice (experiences, insights, perspectives) as a resource for understanding and connecting with the actors. Because she is using herself as the research instrument, the researcher must engage in self-reflection and self-criticism throughout the data collection process. The researcher sketches enough of herself into the portrait so that the reader can identify her lens or filter. The reader who knows where the portraitist is coming from can scrutinize the work and make independent interpretations (Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997, pp. 95-96).

The researcher constantly listens for the voice of the actor. Portraiture follows the work of novelist Eudora Welty, who distinguished between listening *to* a story and listening *for* a story. Listening *to* a story requires the researcher to take a passive, receptive stance and absorb, but give little shape to, information. Listening *for* a story, on the other hand, requires the researcher to be active and engaged in searching for and creating the story. The researcher is active in identifying, selecting and shaping the story. This active stance distinguishes the portraitist, who listens *for* a story, from the ethnographer who listens *to* a story (Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997, pp. 12-13).

Listening for voices requires the researcher to listen, watch, question, and be attentive to silences which may denote confusion, ambivalence, or evasion. The actor's idiosyncratic use

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of words and tone are also important to the researcher (Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997, pp. 99-100). Listening for voice occurs during the interview dialectic between researcher and actor. The researcher notes responses that lead to new directions of inquiry or dialogue. The narrative is co-constructed by the researcher and actor because the researcher is an active listener (Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997, pp. 120-122).

Finally, the researcher's voice occurs in dialogue with the actor, which is unlike the researcher's voice as witness. The emerging trust and developing relationship between the researcher and actor is present as they define meaning-making together. The researcher's methodology, interpretations, and questions are apparent to the reader in the final text (Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997, p.103). At time, the portraitist's voice might be implicit while the actor's voice is explicit, but the narrative reflects the dialogue between the two (Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997, p. 123).

Reflexivity

Hertz (1997) states that qualitative studies should attempt to situate the author's and actor's voices more completely for the reader. In order to situate herself, the researcher must be reflexive, that is, constantly be scrutinizing "what I know" and "how I know it" during the data collection experience. The reflexive researcher "actively constructs interpretations of her experiences in the field and then questions how the interpretation came about" (Hertz, 1997, p. viii). The outcome of reflexive knowledge is insight into both the actor and setting and into how the knowledge came to be. Thus, researchers are "situated actors" in the research process. Consequently, it is necessary for the reader to understand the researcher's "location of self" in terms of positionality (i.e., race, class, gender, and power hierarchies). Researchers must

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

become aware of how their positionality impacts what they study (and ignore) and the questions they ask (and ignore) (Hertz, 1997, pp. xii-xiii).

Interviews

Mishler (1986) describes interviews as "a joint product of what interviewees and interviewers talk about together and how they talk with each other. The record of an interview that we researchers make and then use in our work of analysis and interpretation is a representation of that talk" (p.xii). Interviews are meaningful speech between the two individuals who share language. Reliance on the stimulus-response paradigm diminishes the discourse and shared meaning of the interview. Meanings are contextually grounded. The decontextualization of the stimulus-response paradigm disconnects the respondent's answers from their sociocultural meaning (Mishler, 1986, pp. 9-22). Citing Paget, Mishler (1986) suggests that answers continually inform the evolving conversation during in-depth interviewing.

Respondents are empowered through the assumption "that one of the significant ways through which individuals make sense of and give meaning to their experiences is to organize them in a narrative form" (Mishler, 1986, p. 118). There is an asymmetry of power in the traditional approach to interviewing which removes respondents' control over "what they mean by what they say." The power imbalance is reduced when interviewees are accepted as collaborators and as full participants in the analysis and interpretation of data (Mishler, 1986, pp. 125-126).

Emerging Themes

The researcher analyzes data from interviews, observations, documents and videos – "anything that may shed light on questions under study" (Corbin & Strauss, 1990, p. 5). Data

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

collection and analysis are interrelated and iterative processes of constant comparison (Corbin & Strauss, 1990; Lawrence Lightfoot & Davis, 1997; Strauss & Corbin, 1994). Interview data are analyzed immediately after collection with the analysis guiding the next interview and observation.

Constant comparison is a systematic and sequential process that leads to identification of emerging themes and evolving theory (Corbin & Strauss, 1990). The researcher acts on the principle that actors "make choices according to their perceptions" and seeks to discover those choices by systematically analyzing the collected data (Corbin & Strauss, 1990, p. 5). The researcher begins by analyzing incidents, events and happenings in search of "patterns of action and inaction" (Strauss & Corbin, 1994, p. 278). The researcher may discover patterns from the repetitive refrains voiced by the actor, as well as the metaphors and symbolism the actor uses to express his reality. Patterns may also emerge from perspectives the actor omits. Institutional values expressed through rituals or symbols may be another source of emerging themes (Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997).

Concepts are tentatively labeled from the emerging patterns discovered during the systematic analysis of collected data. The researcher also analyzes institutional values expressed through rituals or themes as a potential source of emerging themes (Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997). The researcher's constant comparison of emerging concepts permits her to group the concepts into more abstract categories. This iterative and systematic development of categories involves a search for concepts that are consistent and representative.

Consistency arises from the relationship of changes in patterns of interaction or action with changes in conditions. The emerging themes expressed in abstract categories permit

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

interpretations from a perspective that is a theoretical explanation of social phenomena and is provisional and limited in time (Strauss & Corbin, 1994).

The portrait achieves authenticity when empirical and aesthetic forces come together. The researcher combines empirical choices with insight and emotion to write a narrative that informs and inspires. The portraitist conceives the development of the overarching story, structures the emerging themes, gives form to the narrative and then writes a cohesive and integrated story. The synthesis of rigorous methodological themes gives the portrait its validity.

Data Collection and Analysis

To develop an understanding of Mr. Shelley's experiences, four interviews ranging from sixty to ninety minutes were conducted over a two-week period. A follow-up interview was held a few weeks later. The interviews were audiotaped and transcribed immediately afterwards. Mr. Shelley was informed of his right to refuse to answer questions or to turn off the tape recorder at any time. The interviews consisted of some pre-determined, open-ended questions designed to elicit information about his background and life experiences prior to 1968. Most questions, however, were open-ended and informal, permitting the exploration of his unique experiences at UIUC, his perspectives on those experiences, and his sense of personal or institutional changes. The interviews covered Mr. Shelley's experiences with students, the implementation of programs and services, his policy-making roles, and his interactions with faculty and senior administrators. The interviews were conversational as we collaboratively explored his experiences at UIUC during his thirty-three year career. Data were

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

also collected from those private records Mr. Shelley was willing to share in addition to public documents.

Constant comparison and analysis enabled the search for patterns, consistencies, emerging themes, incongruities, and the unexpected as well as the expected (Corbin & Strauss, 1990; Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997; Stake, 1995; Strauss & Corbin, 1994). Emerging themes were also informed by the writer's assumptions, disciplinary background, theoretical perspectives, and understanding of the relevant literature (Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997). Great care was taken to be sensitive to the differences in race and gender. Once the emerging themes were informed by context, relevant literature and document analysis, I created a draft of a portrait of Mr. Shelley that attempted to give voice to his experience in thick description. I shared a copy of this draft with Mr. Shelley and asked for his comments and factual corrections before constructing the final narrative.

Confirmation of interview data with document analysis is critical in triangulation. Observations are another component of triangulation. Since Mr. Shelley is now retired from the University, it was not possible to observe him in his work setting. However, Mr. Shelley and UIUC were not unknown to me prior to the beginning of this study. I joined Student Affairs at UIUC in 1980, when Clarence Shelley was the Dean of Students and watched him from a distance for many years. In 1994, I was appointed to a committee chaired by Mr. Shelley, after which our nodding acquaintance gradually became a more collegial relationship. I have observed Mr. Shelley interact with students, staff and administrators. The context and content of the narrative is therefore modulated by my own familiarity with and assumptions about the institution which helped to insure accuracy and logical interpretation of the narrative (Stake, 1995, p. 108). This triangulation of data also contributed to the systematic process of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

reviewing and informing data, resulting in a grounded theory with propositions that are verifiable (Corbin & Strauss, 1990).

Summary

Mr. Shelley's formal positions at the University of Illinois afforded him an opportunity to interact directly with students and to influence or formulate policy. These dual roles afford him a unique perspective on the history of UIUC during his thirty-three year tenure. He engaged students and administrators during a period when significant legal, political and social changes directly impacted the functioning of the institution. We cannot understand the history of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign between 1968 and 2001 if we do not understand Mr. Shelley's story.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS: THE MAN

> When I go places, people who find out I'm from the University [of Illinois] ask me "is Dean Shelley still there?" and I say, "yes, Dean Shelley is still there." There's a feeling that if he's still there then everything's all right. There's still hope. I don't want to be the first to say no, he's not there. . . . If I knew how one person could affect so many... (Dr. James Anderson, October 1, 2001)

He's the kind of man people do not forget. People who do not know his name remember the tall, neatly dressed, African-American man with the shaved head and unhurried gait, who could be found anywhere on campus. Students who did not know him may occasionally recall the man who got on an elevator or sat in a lobby with them and struck up a conversation that always included questions such as "Are you studying hard?" or "Do you go to all your classes?" or "Do you use the library?"

The students who were fortunate enough to know him remember "Dean Shelley," the man who listened, encouraged, laughed, teased, challenged, chastised, praised, and believed in them. Dean Shelley *knew* them when they were here and *knows* them still. He knew about their academic interests and challenges, their class projects, and their post-graduation plans. He knew about their families, their friends, and their activities. He knew when they were happy or sad. Today, he still knows what they are doing and where they are. They invite him to their weddings and they see him whenever they return to campus.

His colleagues remember "Shelley," the man who eschewed titles and formality unless the occasion demanded it. Those who walked with him knew the unhurried gait was deceptive; he could get places in a hurry. But at times, walking with him was like walking with a young child – he noticed and commented on everything and pointed out changes that escaped most eyes. Shelley was the man who appeared irregularly, but not infrequently, to inquire after his

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

colleagues or a student, to find out what was new or to share an anecdote. His colleagues remember the man who knew what was going on, talked with everyone, observed closely, and remembered well. They remember the man who would ask a question that sometimes made them uncomfortable and always made them think. He could make a comment with a perfectly straight face and then succumb to laughter that began with his eyes and ended with his chin on his chest and his head shaking back and forth. Colleagues suffering personal difficulties remember the man who stopped by for a quiet chat or to give a hug. And at the end of the day, even those colleagues who talked with him often realized he knew them a lot better than they knew him. Clarence Shelley is a modest and private man, a man of great passion and commitment, a man who retired, but whose work is not finished. There is a mystique about him on campus that has as many definitions as there are definers.

This chapter is a description of Clarence Shelley based on emerging themes from a series of six interviews, videotapes of an hour-long television interview and his retirement reception plus an analysis of documents he shared with me. There was a significant level of trust between us prior to the start of our interviews, based on our existing collegial relationship. In an attempt to more fully understand the adult, the narrative addresses his boyhood, adolescent, college, and military experiences. His adult experiences are addressed as a section covering his years as a high school teacher and finally, his experiences at UIUC. Shelley is an articulate and eloquent man. Wherever possible, I have used his voice rather than mine, sometimes briefly and other times at length.

A word about terminology is important here. First, in this narrative I will refer to either "Shelley" or "Clarence Shelley" instead of "Mr. Shelley." Shelley is what he prefers to be called by his colleagues; I have honored that preference for many years and am disinclined to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

change now. Second, during our interviews, he used Negro, black and African-American interchangeably. I have chosen to follow his lead and use whichever he used during particular segments of the interviews as the most faithful representation of our dialogue.

The Making of the Man

Growing Up

A child of the Depression, Clarence Shelley was born in August 1931 in Detroit, Michigan. He is the third son and fourth child of a family of three sons and six daughters. His parents had moved from the South to Detroit, where his father got a job in a steel mill. Shelley says "rumor has it my father had to leave the South because he beat up a white man but lots of men told the same rumor." Shelley describes his father as a man "who drank a lot and fought a lot." He says that as an adult he came to understand that much of his father's rage had to do with his life.

The Shelley family lived in the "Black Bottom" neighborhood (what he says would now be called a ghetto). Their lives were like those of most in the area. He recalls that people did not move far from the neighborhood because they had no money and nowhere to move. Consequently, extended families all lived nearby and the neighborhood operated according to the African proverb, "It takes a village to raise a child." He recalls that children were expected to respect adults and adults were expected to care for the children. When childish transgressions were discovered, the nearest adult punished all the children who were involved, not just their own. Trains would stop near their house and people from the neighborhood would check to see what they could take off the train. Shelley recalls his brothers would lift

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

him up into the coal car so he could throw down coal they used for heat. He remembers "swarms" of people moving towards the trains to scavenge whatever they could.

Neither of Shelley's parents finished high school. Shelley's father expected his children to finish high school, find jobs, and live at home until they married. His parents never held the expectation that their children should go to college. Shelley was the first in his family to go to college; his brothers and one sister also went to college. One brother is a college English professor and poet. He says his mother was proud of all her children's accomplishments, but once told Shelley "the smarter you get, the dumber you act." Shelley describes himself as a "rambunctious" child and his early school career as "not stellar." But he spent "hours and hours" reading at the library and developed a love for words. When he was finishing eighth grade, he got into a fight with a boy who had been taunting him all year. The principal told Shelley he would be sent to a high school for socially maladjusted boys; Shelley ran away before the social worker could take him there. The school librarian intervened with the principal on Shelley's behalf and convinced the principal to give Shelley another chance. Shelley is not sure "what she saw in me" but says he had spent many hours in the school library and the librarian knew he had won two school spelling bees. Shelley was allowed to enroll in the regular high school.

Shelley continued to be "rambunctious" during his first two years at Miller High School. During his first year, he was expelled twice for fighting. He says he does not think of himself as having a temper, but friends from those days tell him he was easily set off by those who knew how to aggravate him. During his sophomore year, he was assigned to the vocational curriculum. He is not sure how he avoided being re-assigned to the high school for

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the socially maladjusted. He did well in all his English classes but was an indifferent student otherwise.

But Shelley's life changed during the 11th grade. Mr. Kinnard, one of the first male black teachers, was hired to teach English (joining two black female teachers in an otherwise all white faculty). Shelley was enrolled in a literature class Mr. Kinnard taught. Mr. Kinnard was also the sponsor of the school newspaper and asked Shelley to join the paper but Shelley refused. One day Shelley got into a scuffle in the hallway outside Mr. Kinnard's room. Mr. Kinnard pulled Shelley outside and talked to him about "a lot of wasted potential." Shelley says he was "acting sullen" and all of a sudden Mr. Kinnard slapped him ("I'm not sure why") and asked, "Do I have your attention?" Shelley views that slap as a turning point. He joined the school paper and "life was much calmer for my last two years of high school."

Shelley wrote several articles for the paper, including one that got him into trouble with the school's athletes. Miller High had football, basketball, and track teams coached by Mr. Will Robinson, a black man who believed because the students at Miller had nothing, it was important for them to experience victory and have fun. The school had very poor athletic facilities so the teams practiced wherever they could at borrowed sites. "He used to tell the kids 'you're black and you're poor and no one likes you.'" The Miller High School teams, however, were very good and the track team won five city championships in a row. (Mr. Robinson later became the first black college Division I coach in the country and coached basketball at Illinois State University. He coached Doug Collins, who became a National Basketball Association star player and coach.)

The Miller High athletes wanted every student to wear the school colors (orange tee shirts and jeans) and "convinced" noncompliant students to change their attire. When Shelley

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

learned that some of the star athletes were scalping tickets, he wrote an exposé in the school paper. Needless to say, the athletes were incensed and "trashed" the newspaper room at school while looking for him. Eventually, the coach and Mr. Kinnard were able to calm the athletes down and it was safe for Shelley to be seen at school again. Shelley says they still talk about his article in the halls of Miller High School.

Shelley had one other memorable interaction with a high school athlete, Gene "Big Daddy" Lipscomb, a football player. Big Daddy had a locker next to Shelley's and was "big and mean and nasty." (At that time, Shelley, who is nearly six feet tall, weighed 130 pounds.) Prior to this incident, Shelley's father had brought home a large crate of mackerel. The Shelley family ate mackerel for two months, cooked in every imaginable way. (Shelley says that to this day he cannot even look at mackerel.) The incident with Big Daddy occurred near the end of the two months, when Shelley took a mackerel sandwich to school and put it in his locker. Shortly thereafter, Big Daddy came to his locker, sniffed the air, and asked who had fish in their locker. Neither Shelley nor any of the others nearby said a word. So Big Daddy pulled the doors off each of the lockers until he found the offending mackerel sandwich in Shelley's. Big Daddy chased Shelley through the hallways for half an hour, but Shelley managed to get away; "they talked about that for a long time too." (Big Daddy was drafted by the Baltimore Colts of the National Football League out of high school and played for several years. Big Daddy never graduated from high school and died of a drug overdose.)

After a confrontation with his father and prior to finishing high school, Shelley left home to join the Merchant Marine and work on the lake cruise ships. He and the other black crew members worked at all the jobs not seen by the passengers. The waiters, busboys and bellmen were all white college students who worked on the boats as a summer job. Some black

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

crew members were also college students who worked just in the summer. Shelley became friends with some of these college students and talked with them about books and about life in college. "I had never thought much about college before this. It never occurred to me. I was just looking for a job." Shelley returned to Miller High School to finish his senior year. He says he was one of about twelve students Mr. Kinnard mentored. They put the newspaper together on weekends at Mr. Kinnard's home and talked about attending college. Shelley was offered a journalism scholarship from the University of Missouri but didn't even consider attending. He did, however, attend Wayne State University in Detroit.

Attending College, Joining the Army, Attending College

During Shelley's first year at Wayne State, he describes himself as "not very successful." He earned mostly B's and C's in his courses although he earned A's in his English classes. Shelley was a college student during the Korean War, a time when the brightest students could get educational deferments from the draft. During his sophomore year, Shelley went down to take the test that would determine whether he qualified for an educational deferment. However, he and six of his pledge brothers went to take the exam after they had been awake for "four days of harassment and other stuff" from the fraternity actives. When they got to the exam, it was the first time they had been warm and had anything to eat and they were tired. Shelley and four others fell asleep and failed the exam, after which they were "allowed to volunteer for the draft." Like all other recruits, Shelley received eight weeks of basic training. Shelley knew that the "slowest" troops went to Korea after the initial eight weeks of basic training, where "people were being killed so fast we had funeral missions for some who had trained with us in the first eight weeks." Shelley says he did not want to go to Korea and became "motivated to become creative." He was apparently perceived as one of the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

smarter recruits and took a test for the State Department's language school at the Presidio. He passed the test and was to be trained in Russian or Chinese in Monterey, California provided he would extend his enlistment for one more year. Someone told him they were being trained to be spies. (He says, with a chuckle and shake of his head, "can you see me as a spy?") Shelley agreed to extend, but to make sure he did not get sent to Korea, he "pretended an outrage I did not feel" about racial treatment and was sent instead to Germany. In Germany, Shelley was a chaplain's assistant, a mail clerk, taught history on Saturday mornings, and was on both the basketball and football teams, which resulted in his traveling a lot. While he was in Germany, his father died. Shelley could have taken a hardship leave and gone home for the funeral, but he did not want to go because for several years he had been estranged from his father. However, as the chaplain's assistant, Shelley knew he could still take a hardship leave; by pretending a great sadness he did not feel at the time, he managed a four day leave in Italy where he could "grieve." Shelley enjoyed his visit to Italy, including time in Rome, Milan and Venice. He did eventually leave the Army early so he could return to Wayne State when the semester started.

Shelley's last two years at Wayne State were "a lot of fun." He was older than most students, and had income from the GI Bill, his football scholarship, a fake job the Athletic Department obtained for him, and unemployment compensation from his job on the ships. He had his own apartment and "lots of money." In addition to being an athlete, Shelley was president of the student chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and worked on the school paper.

Shelley's social life revolved around the other black students at Wayne State. He says he remembers it seemed there were hundreds of black students on campus when he was there

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

but he later went back and checked and "there were only 52. But it seemed like more because we were always together." The social stratification of the students' families was repeated on campus. Shelley recalls being told by one fraternity that "we don't accept people from your high school." Shelley, however, helped one girl from the "uptown" group with her homework. She was a "nice girl and I was able to ease my way into the group." He remembers being asked by one girl, "What's your father in?" and responding "He's in a hole on Eight Road" (the cemetery) to which she responded, "Oh, you mean construction."

Shelley says he was "first aware of how things work" when members of his fraternity called him in just after he had returned from a trip to New York with a fraternity brother. They said they wanted him to run for president because he was older, an athlete and a veteran. They also said there was a problem in the chapter and they wanted him to take care of it. When Shelley asked what the problem was, they told him "we think we have a sissy problem" with some of the members, and we want you to put them out of the chapter. Shelley agreed to be president but said there would be "no purges because the chapter grade point average would go down and those guys do all the work." He became president and all the members stayed.

Shelley was the only black on his football team during his junior year and one of three during his senior year. Because athletes then (and now) were allowed five years in which to play four seasons, Shelley returned for a third season of football, paid for by his scholarship. Shelley remembers being "thrown out of two football games for unnecessary roughness." Once was because an opposing player "called me the 'n' word and I crashed my helmet on his head and broke it in half." As a senior, Shelley was a captain, which made him very happy. Shelley also played basketball at Wayne State but he "wasn't very good. Mostly I sat on the bench and did homework for the other players. I played when we were way ahead or way behind or when

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

they needed me to go in and foul someone and disrupt the other team's game." He learned to tear his shirt and act as if he had been playing after the game when the "girls would hug all the players – they couldn't tell who had played but eventually they figured me out." He really enjoyed playing both football and basketball.

However, playing football and basketball was not compatible with being an English major. One teacher in particular "who harassed me the most became my favorite teacher and mentor." Shelley recalls walking into class and the teacher saying "Here's Saturday's hero – how did you do?" Once when Shelly hurt his arm playing football he offered to dictate his assignment to someone or to recite it, but the teacher told him that was not acceptable. Shelley said he began doing more than was expected. "If the assignment was to write one sonnet, I wrote four. I was the only black student in every class I ever had. I never got over the need to do well." Shelley had entered college as a journalism major, but his adviser told him there were "very few jobs for Negro journalists" and convinced him to change his major. Shelley changed his major to English and got a high school teaching certificate.

The High School Teacher

Shelley taught English and speech classes at Northeastern High School, a low-performing predominantly black school in Detroit. He coached junior varsity football, sponsored the jazz club, the African American history club, and organized an activities day. He says he enjoyed all these different activities; teaching was a good experience and he learned a lot. In those days, whenever he asked himself why he was so busy, he concluded it was because the students were so deprived he wanted to fill their lives with successful, fun things to bring them some kind of comfort. The students at the school had some success with music, and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

that success attracted more and more students. Shelley knew several singers of popular rock and roll music when they were high school students: one of the Temptations, two of the Miracles, Martha Reeves of Martha and the Vandellas, and two of the three Supremes, Florence (Flo) Ballard and Mary Wilson. He recalls telling Flo and Mary and some of their friends whom he encountered in the school hallway "to stop that damn humming and go learn typing." He shakes his head and smiles when he reminisces about when the Supremes came to the UIUC Assembly Hall for a concert, and they told that story about him; "the audience booed."

In addition to teaching and sponsoring various clubs and activities, Shelley put together a scholarship program for the Northeastern students and had some success getting them accepted into colleges. He was asked by the Detroit Board of Education to do the same for the six lowest performing high schools in the city and worked full-time at that. Then the federal government made funds available through the Talent Search program. The Talent Search administrator who came to Detroit was Hugh Satterlee, who would move to UIUC at the same time as Shelley. At that point, the Board of Education loaned Shelley to Wayne State University so he could develop a scholarship program for the entire city. For two summers he worked with Cranbrook Academy, a private school in exclusive Bloomfield Hills, Michigan, helping to bring in inner city kids. Next he was loaned to Dartmouth ("I kept getting loaned") to work with Ivy League prep schools such as Exeter, Phillips and Andover, to bring in inner city kids. He was offered a permanent job at Dartmouth College, which he did not want. Shelley was offered a job at Andover in 1967, after the riots had occurred in Detroit. Being concerned about the city's ability to heal, he had accepted the position, which required him to live in a house with students and coach soccer, "but in those days they interviewed the wives.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

My wife came out and interviewed and said she was going home and did not want any part of it. So I cancelled my contract and went home to Wayne State and Detroit."

In January 1968, Shelley gave the Commencement Address at Northeastern High School in Detroit. The speech is "a very personal and private letter I have written to two of the graduates" and summarizes his feelings about students and teaching as follows:

> I have come to say goodbye to you and your classmates this morning assuming that for all we have been through together at Northeastern, and there has been much, that we will never see each other again....
>
> [M]y friends, despite my own passion for poetry and even grammar I have a feeling as you prepare to begin again the search for yourselves, that there are things about life as I have seen it, that I have not explained to you—and there is never enough time—Even now there is not enough time.
>
> I have been so involved in and concerned with my own subject area that I have not paid close enough attention to you. We, in education have a responsibility and a job that is so enormous and so important that it is staggering and frightening, and we turn from it. Because it is difficult we reject you as students, accusing you of indifference and incompetence and your parents of not caring.
>
> We decry the public's unconcern and ignore our own. We bemoan administrative procedures as being restrictive and unnecessary and we blame the system and turn from our real chore, and it is indeed a chore, of preparing you to live with us as if you as students and we as adults and teachers are going to be inhabiting separate planets after you are graduated....
>
> What can I say to you Cecil to help you control the anger you will feel so often, the rage at the system, the government and the people. How can I help you to understand that although anger like frustration and hysteria has a cause, it blinds and weakens and limits. You must somehow reach beyond rage and find reason—and you may well one day find the truth.
>
> And dear Terry, how can I prepare you to accept and deal with people who will dislike you for not being what they have tried to make you? Or for those contemptuous of you because of your color and not your character or the school you come from, the neighborhood you live in or the things you believe. Please do not fear them for the loss will be theirs and not yours. (Shelley, 1968, pp. 2-4)

In April, 1968 Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. was assassinated. Once again, riots erupted in Detroit; Shelley decided that Detroit was no longer a good place to live. Following the King assassination, administrators at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign decided to admit five hundred black freshmen for the upcoming fall semester. Subsequently,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Miriam Shelden, the UIUC Dean of Women and Special Assistant to the Chancellor, attended a National Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) Convention in Detroit. She had been given Shelley's name by Hugh Satterlee and interviewed Shelley in the elevator of the hotel. (All NASPA attendees had been told not to leave their hotel.) The Detroit Board of Education agreed to lend Shelley to UIUC for two years, and in May he accepted a position as Assistant to the Chancellor and Director of the Special Educational Opportunities Program. On July 1, 1968, Clarence Shelley began his life's work at UIUC.

At UIUC: "My Hustle Is Higher Education"

> The special Educational Opportunity Program at Illinois was conceived in hope and born in haste. (Clarence Shelley, 1969e, p. 1)

When Shelley came to UIUC, he did not think his job (which he expected to be temporary) was "that big a deal." He expected to work with staff in admissions, financial aid, counseling, housing and the college offices on how to understand the new student population. He assumed there would be little to do, that the job was "simple – 'what do you need to know?'" When he arrived in July, he discovered the "campus was empty and nothing had been done."

Creating a "Village"

> [SEOP was created to admit] large numbers of students for whom this institution was not designed. (Clarence Shelley, 1970a, p. 4)

Finding himself on an empty campus, Shelley set out to prepare for the incoming SEOP students, who had been recruited by current black UIUC students hired by the University following King's assassination. His intent was to create support services and programs for students who were academically unprepared for UIUC. While he was concerned about

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

housing, financial aid and other support services, "we made a decision early on that the battle would be won or lost in the classroom."

Shelley describes himself during the first several weeks as being "not sure what to do" and reactive. Arriving during a period of student activism and tension, he had to learn which students he could trust, which were "about show" and which were trouble. He also needed to find faculty and staff allies quickly. Many on campus were opposed to SEOP; some wanted to expose the program for "a sham" in the belief that the "kids shouldn't be here." There were few black administrators and faculty on campus (and one black faculty member opposed SEOP). But Shelley was able to find many whites of goodwill who were very helpful and "wanted the kids to succeed." (He believes there was "a lot of guilt and shame going around and some whites saw the students as a way of doing penance" for Evers, King, and Kennedy. However, says Shelley, "guilt doesn't last long.")

In 1968, Illinois law required all University students to have a physical examination and a tuberculosis (TB) test. The University required students to provide proof they had had both. Knowing the SEOP students were highly unlikely to have the necessary proof, Shelley convinced the Director of the University's McKinley Health Center to give the SEOP students the required physical exam and TB test. He says they discovered several cases of tuberculosis and sickle cell anemia, and that three students died from complications of sickle cell. Later, when state law changed and only the TB test was required, Shelley arranged for McKinley to give SEOP students the TB test if necessary.

UIUC students were also required to take the ACT standardized test prior to admission and to take placement tests prior to the beginning of the semester. Many SEOP students had taken neither. Shelley made arrangements for them to be tested on campus. The SEOP

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

students expected to receive financial aid but few had completed the requisite applications. Those too had to be completed on campus.

The Project 500 students arrived a week prior to the beginning of classes and were housed together in the Illinois Street Residence Halls (ISR), then one of the newest residence halls on campus. Because the housing food service was not open, Shelley arranged for all the students to eat three meals a day at the Illini Union. During that week, several members of the local black community came into the Union to eat. Because many local people were seen as so "threatening and militant and the campus was not prepared to do anything about it," they also ate free of charge in the Union that week.

During the first week, the students took placement tests, completed financial aid applications, were assigned housing, and given physical exams. "It was at times chaos." Shelley had drafted the Dean of Students Office staff to meet students at the airport and train stations. He recalls, with a bemused smile, the student who drove up in a truck with a flat tire, accompanied by his wife and child, "looking like a scene from the Grapes of Wrath." He remembers another SEOP student coming to his office one day and saying "I'm here for my money." Shelley asked him "what money?" and he said "my recruiter promised me the University would give me walking around money until I got my financial aid."

At the end of the first week, the Project 500 students were to leave ISR and go to their assigned rooms in other residence halls. The new room assignments were to often smaller rooms less comfortable than those at ISR and, in some cases, to lounges pending the availability of regular rooms. The unhappiness of some women students triggered a demonstration at the Illini Union, which Shelley describes as the defining moment of the program. (See Williamson (1998) for a history of black UIUC student activism and events

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

leading up to and on the night of September 9, 1968.) When the protesting students, and several local blacks who had joined them, refused to leave the Union after closing hours, the University administration called in the police. Shelley says many of the arrested students had been asleep since midnight and the police were "walking around with guns pushing people with their [booted] foot. It was just a terrible thing." The "militant types" in the Illini Union told the other students the police had lots of dogs out there (they had one) and the students were afraid to leave. In addition to everything else, Shelley quickly had to become an expert on the University student discipline system.

Shelley says "aside from the arrests being a defining moment, it was a unifying experience and the group became extremely close, very close." On the other hand, he said that the experience of being confronted by police with batons and guns, "those trucks and hearing those jail doors slam" also meant "loads of students never came near a black student event in the years they were here. Some parents told them they had better not." Others can still talk about the arrest "in great detail and will take their sons and daughters who are here now into the Union and show them where they got locked up."

In the meantime, Shelley was avoiding the press. The University never made a formal announcement about the Special Educational Opportunities Program, although the spring negotiations between the Black Student Association and the Chancellor leading to creation of the program had been public, as were the arrests at the Illini Union. Instead, he "chose to have the kids enrolled and housed before the others came. Things began to leak and I was not sure whether I should be forthcoming so I chose not to discuss it." He hoped the students would melt into the crowd although he says "why I thought I could bring 580 in and not be noticed – I must have been insane."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

From the beginning, Shelley had fun with the students. He often teased students, "but always in perfect English" (Dr. James Anderson, 2001). At his retirement reception, several speakers reminisced about how Shelley used to play basketball with the students, often recruiting the graduate students to play on his team. Once he showed up for a one-on-one basketball game wearing an Army helmet and boots. Another time, he arranged a game, recruited people for his team, and then arrived very late. By the time he arrived the SEOP team was really mad and Shelley told his teammates they had to win (which they did, by 50 points). Shelley is, according to the director of the campus recreation facilities, the only person who has been permanently banned from the facility. He did not play to lose.

By the end of the 1968-69 academic year, Shelley had given several speeches to various groups and conventions. In one speech, he said "we are exhausted – but we have learned" (Shelley, 1969f, p.1). Discussing program efforts at a convention in Las Vegas, he said:

> In many ways it has been a difficult semester. We have attempted, where necessary, to modify existing admissions, financial aids, recruitment procedures. We have made all kinds of adjustments in the areas of curricula reform, housing, student employment, extra-curricular activities and other areas. (Shelley, 1969b, p. 1)

Since the beginning of the program, Shelley has served as a mentor to countless students. He tells of an interaction with a student:

> And I said to this student – younger brother – you come from a long line of black people who have survived the middle passage – the lash – the hose – the cities of despair and dead land all that America has put on us – who have often bent but seldom broke – who have loved and served this terrible nation – and more – much more. Surely – you can survive the University of Illinois and Champaign-Urbana. He left feeling better – I think. To take one more class – one more day. (Shelley, 1971c, p. 1)

Shelly believes minority faculty and staff "function between the cliché rock and a hard place. There is no question that on a campus where there are few minorities the minority staff member must assume some responsibility for minority students no matter what her or his

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

specific assignment is" (Shelley, 1984). Shelley also employed graduate students as assistants and student helpers at the inception of the program. Originally, "we had eight or nine law students – they were the best organized – and four or five white students." One white student, David Eisenman, worked in the office "for $1.00 per year" organizing the graduate assistants and looking for funding because, as he told Shelley, "'you can't afford to pay me what I'm worth.'" Shelley says "David was a godsend really, a blessing." By 1973, Shelley was describing the success of their also employing undergraduates to mentor new SEOP students "because Black students trust other Black students.... We think we're right. Our students have told us so and we believe them" (Shelley, 1973b, pp. 3-7). The current Office of Minority Student Affairs continues the practice initiated by the man who as a child was "raised by the village" and took his place as an elder (albeit at a young age) in the "village" at the University.

Making Mistakes

> We made mistakes – so many mistakes - but we learned and the program was stronger because of them. (Clarence Shelley, 2002)

It appears that Shelley has always been generous in his use of "we" as many mistakes originated with the institution rather than with him. The primary mistake was "nothing was done" between May (when he was hired) and July (when he started). Shelley says, "everything was 'wait till the director gets here.'" And, of course, when he arrived, the faculty and most of the staff were gone. Consequently, there was no formal planning for any of the elements of the program such as staff, training, assessment, housing, the police, the black community, and no meetings with the college deans. The University housing staff had already made all its room assignments and the academic advisers were "all used up." Since the University had hired current black students as recruiters for SEOP before his arrival, Shelley had never met them, had no idea what they were promising potential students, and had no control over the quality of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

incoming students. He could assign work to no one; he and Jean Hill, an Assistant Dean of Students, were the only staff for the program. Rather than being able to plan for the implementation of a new program, he spent the first several months reacting and tending to thousands of details and problems all at once. "I am reminded" he says, "that someone asked me at the end of September [1968] how things were going and I said 'pretty well for the first of May.'"

One of the major problems was that the University knew nothing about the currently enrolled black students and nothing about the local black community living in the "North End" of Champaign. In a time of tension and racial unrest, Shelley not only had "no one to give me the straight scoop on the students" but no one who could tell him about the community activists. He discovered, in visits to three black churches, that the local community was terribly upset because the University was admitting black students from Chicago and other areas, but not as many from Champaign. After talking to the twelve black high school graduates who were going away to college, Shelley learned that they had all been motivated to do well so they could get away from Champaign. Shelley also discovered that neither the University nor the police could tell the difference between the students and community members. He counts as one of his mistakes a failure to accurately assess the on and off campus communities. He advised others in a 1970 speech to make an accurate assessment that "should include social, economic, political, racial climates which must be realistically and honestly articulated and interpreted to incoming students" (Shelley, 1970b, p. 4).

By 1970, Shelley also had concluded that "identification, motivation and recruitment are not the problems we once thought they were. The hours and meetings and committees discussing admission criteria, test scores, grade averages, etc. have all proved counterfeit"

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

(Shelley, 1970b, p. 4). Of greater concern was parental and local community support and involvement. Shelley had worked hard with the local community to provide support for the SEOP students, just as he worked hard himself to support the students. Black fraternities and sororities opened many social events to the local community, a practice that continues today.

It did not take Shelley long to recognize some of the mistakes or to learn from them. Some mistakes were identified in a 1969 speech to the American Personnel and Guidance Association.

> In the spring and summer of 1968, the Urbana campus of the University [of Illinois] launched a massive identification and admissions program to encourage over 500 minority group students to the campus. Our planning was in many crucial ways hasty, imperfect, and in serious instances, haphazard. ...And we have learned a great deal more because we are in this activity up to our ears and our errors have elevated us to truth. Much of the truth has been painful, but it has all been profitable. Large universities tend to be insufferably bureaucratic mazes and passing through them one often stumbles over the bruised and battered bodies of students who have lost their way. One of our tasks was to make the rough places plain wherever possible for this large number of students for whom the University is truly alien land. (Shelley, 1969b, pp. 1-2)

When creating a brand new program, Shelley, who says "I was trained to do recruitment. I was not trained to do this other stuff," developed a broad expertise. He battled with housing staff, financial aid administrators and admissions staff ("the gatekeepers of the academy. I discovered their job is to keep people out.") He made several speeches to financial aid administrators, repeatedly urging them to find University funds to supplement federal and state financial aid dollars. In a 1971 speech he talked about the implications of black students leaving the residence halls in terms of student financial aid administration. He noted that many black students were leaving university residence halls and finding housing in the community. Financial aid administrators who were not attuned to the cost of housing in the local community were often not awarding sufficient aid for the students to cover their living

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

expenses. Shelley decried the financial aid administrators who were more interested in keeping money from students than in recognizing the reality of minority students' lives. Many times minority students left university housing because it was unbearable.

> The universities (i.e. student personnel people) have not, as a matter of procedure done enough to make university housing-staff-services-meals, social life, etc. responsive to the peculiar needs, habits, concerns of minority students. Further, we have not gone outside the gates of academe to examine those communities to which our students are running for their lives. (Shelley, 1971b, p. 3)

In a 1973 speech for the Educational Testing Service, Shelley reflected upon the errors he believed black administrators of special programs, including him, had made.

> Generally, the errors or miscalculations in such programs were of two classes—philosophical and administrative. Most of us did not accurately assess the institutions [where] we were coming to work. We had no clear notion of how universities function or saw their mission. We were not clear on where power was located, how it moved, or how it was acquired. We did not understand the autonomy of department heads and college deans. We did [not] understand clearly funding cycles, reporting systems, how institutions relate to governing boards or state and federal agencies. Federal legislation was not on our minds in those days. The enrollment and funding trends in junior colleges had no special significance to us. I could go on and on....
>
> What we did have, however was a great deal of enthusiasm and energy—which until recently was considered almost as valuable as information and skill. Had we understood that universities are political organizations as much or more than they are educational ones we would have been able to anticipate the 1972-73 school year in 1968.
>
> That time was spent fighting admissions directors, arguing for hours on end with financial aids offices, chasing foundation grants, antagonizing college deans, harassing testing services, making deals with housing officials, rejecting research—and writing proposals, that flowed like the great American novels and generally consuming ourselves like so many Phoenixes. (Shelley, 1973a, pp. 1-2)

Again in a 1984 speech to the Midwest Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, Shelley talked about the mistakes black administrators on white campuses made in the late 1960's and early 1970's.

> We came to these roles by some rather circular routes with, in most instances, different credentials and bona-fides from our white colleagues....Many of our problems (perhaps most) were of our own creation. Indeed: 1. We lacked understanding of how institutions operate and make decisions. 2. We were unaware of the politics of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> education. 3. We lacked mentoring systems – up and down. 4. We often misjudged or misinterpreted the kinds of decisions that minority students make in the variety of situations in which they find themselves. It was assumed by many white staffs and perpetuated by many minority staff that the language rhythms, behaviors, interests, needs and concerns of minority students were so exotic, so peculiar, so different that only they – minority staff – could make any sense out of what they were saying, doing and feeling and then re-interpret that to the campus. We all know people who made careers out of explaining black students to white staff. (Shelley, 1984, pp. 2-3)

When Shelley reminisces about his early days on campus, whether in our interviews, the televised interview or in documents, making mistakes is a prominent theme. He is, however, quick to acknowledge that he learned, often very quickly, and adapted accordingly. For a program "born in haste," it would seem that mistakes were inevitable, especially in the early days of 1968.

Centering on Students

> [These are] the most beautiful, most precious things I know of—the few black children left in this country who believe that education can somehow make a difference ...and you are presumptuous and arrogant enough to believe that the schools you represent deserve the privilege of my kids. You people are crazy." (Clarence Shelley, 1969b, p. 7)

Today Shelley looks back on his first years at UIUC with nostalgia. He recalls those first students with great fondness and marvels at what they endured and accomplished, for Shelley is student-centered at heart and he cares for and about all "his" students from 1968 through 2001. He emphatically rejects any notion of a student deficit model and believes students should be at the center of the academy.

Shelley says one of his initial difficulties was he had not had "time to identify people who could give me the straight scoop on which students were the real crazies, who were in it for show and who I could count on to be supportive." He says that most of the black students were from Chicago and "they knew each other and had similar social and educational experiences; many were from the same high schools and neighborhoods." In addition, Shelley

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

had to meet and try to work with the black community activists. He recalls that at a meeting he and Miriam Shelden, Dean of Women, had with some "foul, nasty, smelly" community activists, she gave a "wrong answer and [one] pulled out a gun and pow, he put it on the table." Shelley said he learned much of the student and community activists' behavior "was theater."

From the beginning of SEOP, Shelley took care of his students. During the early days he was "dumbfounded daily" by questions he remembers over thirty years later. One woman in housing asked him why "those" students smell "different" and "I made up some outrageous answer about 'it's the food they eat.'" He also recalls the dance instructor who told him that black women could not master the moves in classical ballet. When he asked her why, she said to him, "'well, you know – it's their big butts.' When I asked her, 'what do you mean, their big butts?' she said 'well, it's their center of gravity, they can't do the moves.'" He then mentions, with evident satisfaction, the black dance alumna who was the number three ballerina for the American Ballet Company. He knows a black alumna, now a well-respected actress, who refuses to return so the Theater Department, which would not stage any plays black students could have roles in when she was enrolled, can give her an award. Shelley remembers that some of the SEOP students were told and believed that "EOP" would be on their diplomas (a falsehood). Shelley says he has "always resisted racism as the answer; I prefer to say it is stupidity or incompetence. Sometimes they're not very bright."

SEOP began prior to the demise of universities' acting in loco parentis. So Shelley protected his students by setting out program rules. He would allow none of his students to take basketball to fulfill the physical education requirement and made sure all the advisers kept the SEOP students out of basketball, making many students very unhappy. Students were not permitted to join fraternities their first year on campus. He required all students to have their

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

then-mandatory physical exams and tuberculosis tests at the University's health center. And, based on his own experience as a collegiate varsity athlete ("I had seen too much"), he absolutely refused to allow any of the SEOP students to compete in varsity sports. Consequently, he says, he fought with the basketball and football coaches all the time but if an SEOP student did join a varsity team, "I kicked him out of the program and announced it." He says now he made these rules on the basis of hunches, not research, and that the rules were "kind of bogus."

One way Shelley took care of his students was to work with the chair of the Rhetoric Department to redesign the freshman rhetoric courses. In order to develop a "sense of how the students were doing, get to know the faculty better, and be in that circle," Shelley taught a special freshman rhetoric class and "it worked very well until it became too much." In a 1969 National Council of Teachers of English Conference, Shelley discussed what he had learned from the fall 1968 semester when 330 of 583 students were enrolled in special rhetoric sections.

> There being no one to consult, we developed our rhetoric and composition sections as we went along. We are generally pleased with our results.
>
> Because of my own teaching experiences I was more concerned with the composition program for special program students than I was for any other aspect of the total program. We would agree, I'm sure, that the success of any student, but more importantly, the less well prepared student is dependent on his facility with the communication skills. Early on in our planning we knew that we had to develop a freshman rhetoric program that would bring these students as far and as fast as possible....
>
> There is little, if any, attempt made to change drastically the style but rather to improve on it. This first requirement of course is that the teacher must do a great deal of learning in the process. This was one of the great bonuses of these sections....
>
> Our rhetoric program of necessity began with certain assumptions as did all of our programs. One of these assumptions was that black students as a group would be delighted and excited to see that some of our rhetoric courses would have a definite black orientation. We discovered that this assumption, though generally true, did not follow for all students....
>
> We have learned that many of our preconceptions of what turns students on and around aren't accurate, and furthermore our notions of how such programs are to be

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> managed, staffed, and constructed need to be examined more closely than they have in previous years. (Shelley, 1969c, pp. 1-5)

Another way Shelley tried to protect his students was his adamant refusal to permit any kind of research connected with the Project 500 students. His refusal stemmed partly from his distrust of researchers (which continues to this day), partly from his unfamiliarity with research methodologies, and partly from his not understanding the "political importance" of research. But more importantly, Shelley did not want his students to be objects or specimens. During the first year, campus researchers "were lined up at the door" and he received over forty requests. Shelley was supported in his stance by Chancellor Peltason although the Chancellor believed the research should be permitted; "he almost ordered me to allow research once, but he never did." During our interviews, Shelley muses as to whether his refusal to permit the research was a mistake "because we lost lots of data" but decides upon reflection, that he made the right decision. He says "I didn't want them to be treated as different because in this world, different is less."

Telling It Like It Is

> [N]othing was done for black student interests until the plea became the request, the request became the demand and the demand became the ultimatum. Then there followed some kind of confrontation. (Clarence Shelley, 1969a, p. 6)

> In my view, programs do not fail students, but institutions do. (Clarence Shelley, 1973a, p. 1)

Concurrent with protecting his students to the best of his ability, Shelley identified white institutions, not black students, as the problem. We did not talk a great deal about inhospitable white campuses during the interviews, perhaps because we have had these discussions in the past, which have ended with both of us shaking our heads sadly. But

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Shelley's convictions, rooted in his collegiate and professional experiences, are long standing and deeply held. He does not mince words.

The difficulties were apparent as he searched the literature for guidance in starting support programs and services.

> In searching the many, many books which discuss the relevant aspects of student life, campus culture and all that those discussions imply, I found very little on the black student on the white campus.... The most obvious reason is that the black student on the white campus is not recognized as being different from the white student or having special problems, needs, strengths and weaknesses...Another reason is that even where such differences are acknowledged, they are not considered important or relevant enough to warrant serious consideration. (Clarence Shelley, 1969a, p. 1)

Shelley was a panelist at the American Personnel and Guidance Association Convention in Las Vegas, Nevada in April 1969. His prepared remarks were titled "Campus Adjustment for the Disadvantaged Student." This speech is instructive in our understanding of his view of the black experience on a white campus.

> One of the big differences between this college generation and mine on the white campus is that we had to (or thought we had to) control our rage and try to convert it to intellectual energy—that was campus adjustment. More and more students today are unwilling or unable to do so, nor do they understand why we did or why they should. Certainly the easiest way to do so was to accept whatever definition of you as person and student the white campus chose to assign to you. And this definition varied from day to day, or place to place, and situation to situation. It was the constant reacting to all kinds of white people that left so many of us with wounds that are slow in healing and scars too wide to hide. To continue to adjust and readjust to the white campus would keep you alive, but it resulted too often in either the internal and intellectual destruction of the black student or the production of a curious mutation that was neither black nor white—unable to fully function in the black culture which he had to reject or the white culture to which could he never have total access. This is the terror with which the black student still has to deal.
>
> And terror is only a part of the subject of my story. The rest is about higher education. And the two themes are not so very exclusive.
>
> There is much written and spoken about the disadvantaged student. There has recently been much written about the poor, the underclass, and the various impacted sub-cultures extant in America. The enormity of this whole hoax is that America pretends that it has just discovered these people. And the hoax is part of American social and educational history. That is-that having gone to great effort and expense to exclude the black and the poor and the whole underclass from higher education and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> from history-American is now making all kinds of spurious and illegitimate efforts to undo this or at least to give the appearance of undoing...
>
> Historically, the function of the University has been the perpetuation of the culture. The University has been the official museum for the atrophying of the culture and the training place for not only America's future leaders and intellects but also its racists, bullies, psychopaths, fools and educators....
>
> And I have heard and seen the evidence of the contempt which the college community has for these kids. Perhaps too much of our time is spent in trying to get the students ready for the campus instead of trying to prepare the campus for the students. I am convinced that we take the former approach because we know or feel the immensity and hopelessness of the latter... (Shelley, 1969b, pp. 2-5)

In the same speech, Shelley talks about the burden unfairly placed on minority students at white universities.

> The survival of underclass students and black students on a white campus depends on many factors, most of which are beyond their immediate control....Those students who for whatever reasons are unable to make the transitions are considered unworthy, unfit or unremediable. It is true, however, that whatever happens to the disadvantaged student, he is made to believe at all levels of the college experience that he is responsible and he alone for whatever difficulty he has on the campus. (Shelley, 1969b, p. 4)

Again in 1969, Shelley spoke at the American College Personnel Association about the nature of the white university and the minority student's place in it:

> Perhaps we need to remind ourselves as the students are asking, to reconsider the function of the university system in particular and higher education, generally...The universities are no longer the insulated, antiseptic purely collegiate cultures of the past, and this certainly isn't a bad thing. Again, the university like the total education system has as one of its many responsibilities—but its main responsibility, the perpetuation of the culture or those aspects of its culture which it considers worthy of perpetuating.
>
> And because the university for so long has been defined and manipulated by forces outside it, as an institution it has chosen to do its thing by defining and manipulating its students on the basis of what it believes to be its purpose. It is this definition of its purpose that threatens many universities and public and private education as well.....The collegiate culture assumes many things but most important is that out of this experience will come a "well-rounded man," educated, articulate, adjusted, highly moral, intellectual, loyal to school, home and country—but perhaps most important—employable.
>
> If this be true—if any of this be true—the university then has certain ethical as well as educational objectives to fulfill. In many crucial ways, it has failed to do this as far as the black student on the white campus is concerned. The college pretends to prepare the student to function in a culture, to contribute to it and make it better; but all

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> this time the white campus, because it knows nothing of the black culture in America and cannot prepare the black student for the white culture, has historically prepared him for neither. (Shelley, 1969a, pp. 2-3)

Nor did Shelley see much evidence that white institutions were serious about making needed changes. In 1971 at Dennison University, Shelley said, "the major difficulties were the results of our failure to do anything to prepare the campus and the total university community. And it says some important things about the human condition-that people need to be prepared to receive other people" Shelley, 1971a, p. 7). He concludes his speech by saying "In short, the university should not be like America-but in real ways different from America....White students must somehow see black students as peers and co-citizens if the campus adjustment of either is to be creative" (Shelley, 1971a, pp. 7-8).

Neither did he see any evidence of meaningful support for minority students in higher education:

> In my view, there has not been in this country-any significant-long range or statutory commitment to black or minority students, not by any institution, any government agency or foundation, and damned few people. If there had been, we wouldn't have to gather here—one more time and say one more time, what everybody already knows and further endanger our fast fading credibility among our students. What I am suggesting—no what I am saying—is that boards of trustees and regents and governors, boards of higher education have not assigned to these efforts the same urgency nor priorities that we have assigned to other matters. (Shelley, 1971b, p. 2)

By 1977 Shelley had not changed his mind about the black experience on the white campus. Speaking at the Blacks in Higher Education Second National Conference of the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education, Shelley said:

> And this came to me at Hampton last week. It is dysfunctional for a black student to hope for a black experience at a white campus. It is not realistic for a black student to hope for close, personal or humane faculty staff interactions at a white multiversity, nor is it realistic for black students to be confounded by the highly competitive and pressurized classroom where the student bodies are becoming increasingly more selective and the campus cultures increasingly more vocational. (Shelley, 1977a, p. 4)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

He has a sense that minority students are different today than they were in 1968. Unlike their predecessors who presented the campus with a list of demands titled "We expect nothing; we demand everything," the current students, in Shelley's view "expect everything and demand nothing." He also mentions that the African American students being recruited to UIUC from Chicago today come from private, parochial or public magnet schools which draw off the most talented inner city students. Shelley says the early SEOP graduates are very unhappy that the University does not recruit in their high schools (King, Crane, DuSable) but "you need a minimum of 18 on the ACT to get in here and at those schools they score 12 on the ACT so what's the point? The only students from King who come here are basketball players."

Situating in History

> We should understand how we relate to that [educational opportunity] history and recognize our place in that pattern. (Clarence Shelley, 1976b, p 3)

Shelley repeatedly placed higher education within its broader historical context. While clearly aware of the federal government's role in creating various educational opportunity programs, he views the programs of the 1960's as an extension of earlier decisions. Thus, in 1976 he said:

> Clearly, the federal government has been in the business of opening higher education to new or different constituents for years, through both the support of new identifications and definitions as well as providing financial support to those constituencies. Beginning with the Morrill Land-Grant College Act of 1862 and the establishment of the Department of Health Education and Welfare in 1867 and through the Higher Education Act of 1965, there is evidence of federal encouragement of compensatory education—broadly defined. (Shelley, 1976a, p. 5)

With his awareness of the broader political context in which higher education operates, Shelley was, in 1971, predicting a retrenchment of resources for disadvantaged students and hoping to be "proved a failure as a prophet." In his speech

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

he outlined some reasons for a growing reluctance to participate in special educational opportunity programs:

> There aren't enough "qualified" black (minority-disadvantaged) students available to be admitted. The college does not have space for the available qualified students. The college cannot (will not, dare not) pre-empt spaces for these students. The college does not have available funds to finance such programs including instructional, student aid, and supportive service costs. The college does not wish to compromise its intellectual and academic integrity or lower its standards. (You figure out what that means.) The college will need "more time" to evaluate its available resources so as to assure a successful program. The college already has existing committees which are considering these matters. (I trust we all know what university committees are about.) (Shelley, 1971a, p. 2)

Shelley viewed any failures as temporary setbacks because he saw democratization of education as "halting but constant." The new schools and new curriculum that emerged in the land grant colleges he saw as a continuation of manifest destiny and the common man movement. Thus he viewed the contemporary enlargement of the curriculum as part of an historical continuum and Black Studies as integral, not ancillary to the academy (Shelley, 1971a). While he believed universities were not agents of change, he did believe in education as a change agent. During a 1988 speech when he described the university as a "community of strangers" he also said "the reason I consider the cultural and ethnic literacy of our students so pressing is because this may be the last chance anyone has to influence these young adults on these matters before they leave and return to the cultural isolation of their home and families" (Shelley, 1988, p. 3).

The challenges to higher education continued unabated throughout Shelley's career. He believes the naysayers have been given too much credence and that "pedagogical pimps" were "getting rich and famous assaulting the academy." But, in the end, he views continued

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

democratization as consistent with the corporate liberal tradition universities have subscribed to for over a century.

Playing the (Political) Game

> I have abandoned as a position the search for answers – the most important thing we can do is identify the questions and state them as precisely as possible. If we ask the right questions – the answers and solutions will come – they will come. (Clarence Shelley, 1969d, p. 1)

While Shelley was unfamiliar with the politics of a complex university in 1968, he did not lack political astuteness. He had finished his interviews and was working out details for starting the temporary position when he was asked to complete one more interview. When he asked why, he learned the Black Student Association (BSA) wanted to interview him prior to his being offered the job. Shelley refused, saying it was inappropriate because the BSA was not interviewing physics professors or athletic coaches; "I wanted to establish my own bona fides." Nevertheless, he was careful to ask that BSA be notified he was "glad they were on the case." After he arrived, he did meet with BSA, and at that initial meeting some BSA members had pointed questions and challenged his beliefs. At the retirement reception, Daniel Dixon, a UIUC and BSA alumnus, recalled that first BSA meeting with Shelley, who, when asked "'who do you work for?'" first "gave that famous blank look of his and said 'what was the question? I don't understand the question.'" Finally, after the students said "You know - who do you work for, us or the man?" Shelley said "'I work for whoever's name is on the check.'"

Perhaps more importantly, Shelley was also astute enough to "use the Assistant to the Chancellor card – I used it a lot" whenever he ran into difficulties in the early days of SEOP. He says he was able to use this card because Chancellor Peltason said, "we will do whatever it takes to make this work." Shelley says Peltason "was very firm about the program – so firm that critics did not surface until after he left."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The UIUC campus is part of the three-campus University system headed by the president. Power and authority on the UIUC campus officially rests with the chancellor, who is the chief executive officer. Responsibility for staff, faculty, academic and non-academic issues as well as operations and maintenance and the University Police is divided among four vice-chancellors who report directly to the chancellor. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA), the first among equals, is responsible for the budget, academic staff, and all academic issues. Faculty power is particularly strong at the department level. The Faculty Senate is concerned with faculty governance issues, the curriculum, and student discipline. The Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs (VCSA) is responsible for students' co-curricular life, including housing, financial aid, recreation, and programming. (Shelley reported to the VCSA from 1970 until his retirement.)

Shelley describes the politics of the institution as stemming from the president and chancellor. (During Shelley's career, the University had four presidents and the campus had seven chancellors.) He says that when the University had strong presidents such as Dr. Henry, Dr. Corbally and Dr. Ikenberry, they could tell the Board of Trustees what was happening and could "maneuver with the folks in Springfield [state capital]." These strong presidents made it possible for administrators such as Shelley to do their work without worrying much about external scrutiny. Similarly, chancellors who were "spear-carriers," such as Peltason, or admired and respected like Cribbet and Weir, made it possible for Shelley and others to get their work done. Strong chancellors and presidents always exuded an "I'm strong and I'm in control" message.

When Stan Levy was the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Shelley felt isolated or perhaps protected from campus politics; "Levy always interpreted the campus politics for us."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

He says the hardest part of his job was trying to explain things to staff that he did not understand; "I was given information and instructions to pass along, often with little explanation." Shelley says Levy was very "up front" with his "need to know" messages, which may have contributed to misgivings about his administrative style.

Shelley says the last time he was involved in campus politics was when there was a search for an Assistant Dean of Students for Native American Affairs in the mid-1990s. The search for a new position was conducted largely in response to an increasing (although miniscule) Native American enrollment and protests against the Division of Intercollegiate Athletic's use of "Chief Illiniwek" in half-time ceremonies. (Chief Illiniwek has been named an "honored symbol" as a matter of policy by the Board of Trustees but is called a "racist mascot" by opponents. The controversy is continuing.) After candidates had been interviewed by the search committee, staff, dean, and students, an upper administration decision was made to stop the search. The official reason for the cancellation was lack of funds, and the dean was directed to tell the students. Shelley is not convinced that the decision was political (there was some speculation that members of the Board of Trustees had intervened to influence the search), seeing it as inappropriate involvement in campus prerogatives. Shelley shakes his head and says, "as if the students would believe that." Shelley says of "all the distasteful things that have happened, this was among the most odious."

Shelley muses about the current Board of Trustees, one of whom never attended college. Historically, the members of the Board of Trustees were elected on a statewide basis and ran on party tickets. Recent legislative changes resulted in members being appointed by the governor. Shelley wonders about the current Board members who "have little experience in university governance" but are "reaching down and concerning themselves with the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

appointments of assistant deans and faculty and worrying about granting tenure to particular people and punishing others." He sees little diversity among the members and believes they share a similar worldview which may lead to greater politicization ahead.

Shelley says understanding the institutional philosophy or policy is a prerequisite for predicting institutional behavior. He says he has never been sure what the UIUC educational or institutional philosophy is, so he found it difficult to create a strategy for affecting it. Instead, "I decided to get to know as many people as possible and try to elicit their support for what I was trying to do." He says he realized he would have to spend lots of time outside the office in face-to-face meetings with people "who would have input in or influence on the work I was doing." He chuckles as he mentions a colleague's referring to this practice as "management by walking around." Shelley says he was more concerned about the behavior of people who would have direct contact with students than with institutional philosophy; "I realized or believed there was no institutional ethic here."

Shelley says he never thought UIUC policies mattered much since he saw them "so often ignored or violated." He can recall very few things that were gotten or not gotten done that were directly influenced by what the policy says, and cites administrative leave and financial aid policies as examples. Shelley says there is "no policy we have I can think of that we could not easily ignore – a case in point of course is affirmative action. No office is going to challenge a decision by the president or the chancellor." Policies often seem to Shelley to be used when there is a challenge of some kind or when someone is trying to do something that someone else does not want done. Policies at UIUC seem to prevent things from happening rather than facilitate things happening. As to his efforts, Shelley says "I could influence people, but it was often on a very personal level because many things in my work here have happened

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

because the alternative to doing nothing was distasteful. That always seemed to me like a shaky way of doing policy, but it's a good way to get things done."

Shelley believes UIUC has a public ethic of a residential campus and that "we glamorize the things we create like Homecoming, Dad's Day, and Mom's Day, all the collegiate firsts we're so proud of." However, Shelley believes the curriculum is largely vocational and the faculty are disconnected from the students outside the classroom. He views the living-learning communities in the residence halls as a challenge to institutional history. He is curious to see whether the emphasis will continue now that Chancellor Aiken has retired. He says the notion we can create small colleges here seems to him to be a dramatic departure from what this place has been all about forever, like asking faculty to be something different from they are used to being. Shelley says he "once described trying to change this institution as what it must be like to make love to an elephant because there seems to be no place to access the institution."

Shelley does not agree with many faculty and administrators in their approaches to students. While he recognizes that minority faculty often mentor minority students, he wonders why faculty, particularly faculty of color, "view students as apart from the curriculum." Shelley says he has never seen a Faculty Senate vote determined by a student position in all his years here. Similarly, he has never known a director of an ethnic studies program who was willing to acknowledge that the impetus for the creation of the program came from students until after the director's work is done. Shelley believes faculty see the lives of students and policy development "much more simply than we [Student Affairs] do. I think it has to do with their view of students' ability to function in a class or lab."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Shelley also wonders if senior administrators who believe they have "their finger on the pulse of the campus" because they talk to student leaders really know what's going on and concludes "I don't know but I don't think so." He also wonders about senior administrators who refuse to discuss possible strategies for responding to potential unwelcome student proposals or protests – "it's like 'if we discuss it, it will happen.'" Shelley chuckles as he recalls specific conversations and says "I said well when they come to the door it will be too late to talk about it." When I ask him if he thinks UIUC has always waited for people to come to the door, after a few seconds' thought he answers "yeah – for all those things that are often perceived as social action or affirmative action problems – for the most part, yes." He cites the University's dealing with the local African-American community as an example. He also tells an anecdote about a very hasty, reactive senior administration level decision made in response to a complaint to a local radio call-in show. When Shelley was contacted to take action he felt would inflame rather than solve the situation, he responded by "pretending I had irate faculty at my door talking about academic freedom. I asked "what should I do? and they said 'just talk to them' and the problem was solved."

Although he has held positions of authority, Shelley has always chosen to persuade by asking questions and challenging beliefs. He might, for example, begin a conversation with a statement such as "students say..I wonder why that is" and then wait for an answer. When the answer came, Shelley engaged in a dialogue. Even when he was not convinced, however, he would allow others' decisions to stand. At the retirement reception, Associate Dean of Students Willard Broom talked about Shelley's efforts to dissuade colleagues from taking certain actions and said "I learned that if you were determined to display your ignorance, Shelley would not stop you." Shelley also talked about his lengthy discussions with the staff of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the Office of Minority Student Affairs about their decision to hold a separate orientation for minority freshmen. He says "I was never convinced there should be something different for minority students, but in the end, I let them do it." But, while Shelley would permit others to carry out decisions he disapproved of, he was always there as a watchdog for his students and as the constant prick of conscience for those who had not yet seen the light (according to Shelley). His voice was quiet, polite, and non-argumentative, but the questions went to the heart of the issue.

Living the Dream

> I am hoping for what never has been in America—on or off the campus. I am hoping for what I am told by many can never be in America—on or off the campus...an awareness and acceptance of students who are different but not less valuable. (Clarence Shelley, 1969b, p. 6)

Shelley spoke often to groups about being a reformer on a crusade, "assaulting the balustrades of the academy with my black and brown armies." He spoke of this "academic holy war" to minority college students, identifying their role in the challenges ahead. He also said to those young men and women "You are responsible for what happens to you here. Racism is a fact of life and must never be used as an excuse for failure. You must control your life" (Shelley, 1979 p. 4). He says he never viewed the work here as affirmative action – it was what he did. "My point always was to find ways to integrate students into the fabric of the institution without any fanfare. They should make it on their own. They were responsible for their own success."

Finally, there is about Shelley the air of a man of purpose, with a mission, with, indeed, a crusade. This mission is best described in his own words. Speaking at a Champaign church in 1977, Shelley described his work:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

My mission was to move those young and not so young people through this system with as little pain to them as possible. My home in Detroit seemed light years away-my friends, my work. It was a lonely and terrible time which many of you shared with me. Often I asked myself, what madness had convinced me to accept this work which many cynics referred to as the impossible mission. It was believed by many and hoped by others that the whole effort would self destruct and I with it. Often I felt like Ruth as she stood in the field and asked, "How can we sing a song of Zion in a strange land?"

Perhaps the most terrifying, troubling aspect of our work was that the students were constantly dealing with a variety of tensions and were expected to study, to learn, to grow and mature and participate in the variety of activities that represent the university experience.

It was imperative that I remind them constantly that we had not come all this way to fail. These students were the [descendants] of strong black people who had accomplished an historical miracle-they had survived in America through the diaspora, the middle passage, the lash, the galley, scientific and institutional racism-and we could not and would not fail. And our work like the founding of this Church, in fact, became an act of faith, an act of pride and an act of hope. We understood the investments our parents and friends had made in us-and that there was work to be done. Perhaps the old men do dream dreams. Perhaps the young men do have vision. (Shelley, 1977b, p. 2)

Retirement

Clarence Shelley officially retired on October 1, 2001. By December 2001, he had started a part-time appointment as Assistant to the Chancellor from the new Chancellor, Dr. Nancy Cantor. On March 22, 2002, Clarence Shelley was awarded the Chancellor's Medallion "for his exemplary service to the UI and the Champaign-Urbana Community" (Green, 2002). In making the award (only the third ever), Dr. Cantor stated:

The Chancellor's Medallion honors the courage and leadership Clarence Shelley displayed during a critical period in Urbana-Champaign campus history... It also recognizes the decades of service he gave to Illinois students, encouraging them to believe in themselves and to retain their focus on earning a degree at a world-class university. He deserves the highest honor we can give him for his past service, but I'm also thrilled that he will continue to serve the university, its students and alumni. (Green, 2002).

Shelley continues his work on diversity and multi-cultural issues, addressing special assignments for the Chancellor.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER 5

FINDINGS: THE CAMPUS

Central Illinois, unlike the southern and far northern parts of the state, is flat as far as the eye can see. Because the soil is rich and fertile, the area is primarily agricultural, with corn and soybeans being the predominant crops. The vast fields are dotted with farm houses, barns, and silos, and interspersed with small towns every ten to fifteen miles. The grain elevators, located next to railroad tracks, reach high into the sky, dominating the landscape for miles around. A few country roads have curves, but most are straight and set in mile-square grids; some roads have "rises" of elevation, rarely more than twelve feet. When the interstate highways that bisect this part of the state were built, the dirt for the overpasses was taken from nearby fields, creating "borrow pits" that gradually filled with rainwater and today appear to be natural ponds. There are numerous small streams and a few rivers, but most of the lakes are man-made. Any forests were cleared in the nineteenth century when farmers settled in the area. Because there is nothing to stop the wind, it seems that it is always blowing; winter winds cause drifting snow across fields and highways, making travel dangerous to impossible.

In the middle of the corn and soybean fields are the twin communities of Champaign and Urbana, which have a total population of approximately 100,000. The twin cities are about two hours from Indianapolis, three hours from St. Louis, and two and a half hours from Chicago. To students, faculty, and staff more accustomed to metropolitan areas, Champaign-Urbana seems very rural. Nestled into west Urbana and east Champaign is the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC). Originally chartered as a land-grant college in 1867 and located in Urbana, the University of Illinois has expanded to include a campus in Chicago and a

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

campus in the state capital, Springfield, as well. UIUC is a large, residential, selective, intensive research university and is the state's flagship campus.

Champaign and Urbana are divided by Wright Street, a north-south street that runs through the middle of campus. The oldest campus buildings are in Urbana, although newer classroom buildings and several student residence halls are in both cities, with the newer ones built to accommodate the influx of baby boomer students in the 1960's. The more important street dividing the campus is Green Street (an east-west street) which divides the affluent engineering campus ("north of Green") from all other units. Several businesses line the three block area of Green Street known as "Campustown."

In 1968, there was just one quadrangle or "Quad" anchored on the north by the Illini Union and on the South by Foellinger Auditorium. The east and west sides of the Quad are lined with turn-of-the-century classroom buildings with wide stone steps, columns, and decorative building facades. Trees line the north-south sidewalks, surrounding the grassy areas in the middle. During warm months, the Quad is filled with people, mostly students, but also itinerant preachers, faculty, staff, children, and dogs. During the winter months, when the winds blow and the temperatures drop precipitously, people hurry across the Quad as quickly as they possibly can. By 2001 there were also large pedestrian areas on the engineering campus (north) and the agriculture campus (to the south). While these areas have wide sidewalks and large stretches of grass, neither is confused with the main Quad. Since 1960 the University has adopted a utilitarian brick box building style; only a few buildings, mostly those privately funded, are designed with more attractive features.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Governance

Although many people refer to the University of Illinois (U of I) and UIUC synonymously, the two are actually separate administrative units. The University administration concerns itself with budgets, personnel, and policy issues that pertain to all three campuses. The UIUC, Chicago, and Springfield campuses are each headed by their respective chancellors, who are the chief campus administrators and report to the University president. Like other American colleges and universities, the U of I is governed by a lay board of trustees, consisting of seven members appointed by the governor, plus three student trustees, only one of whom is a voting member of the board. The president heads the entire university and reports to the board of trustees. The president's main office and University-owned house are in Urbana, although there are also offices in Springfield and Chicago.

Research universities have a recognizable culture of shared governance that first emerged late in the nineteenth century. Veysey (1965) states that, during that time, increasingly complex universities were characterized by "phenomena such as increasing presidential authority, bureaucratic procedures of many sorts, the new functions of the deanship, the appearance of the academic department with its recognized chairman, and the creation of a calculated scale of faculty rank" (p. 268). Additionally, "faculties greatly expanded their influence over academic affairs during the nineteenth century" (Duryea, 1973/2000, p. 6). Faculty have authority over the curriculum, student admissions, and faculty hiring, promotion, and tenure. Duryea (1973/2000) argues that "the academic structure of the university coincided with the structure of knowledge" (p. 7). As enrollments expanded, the president became responsible for securing private and public financial support, and public relations, as well as internal management. By 1900, most universities had an office of the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

registrar, deans or heads of colleges or schools, and a dean for student affairs (Duryea, 1973/2000).

One measure of faculty influence was the establishment of faculty senates, which became the guiding force for academic policy at research universities. The UIUC senate, an elected body of one hundred faculty and fifty appointed students, has a significant role in campus governance; its standing committees include "academic freedom and tenure, admissions, budget, campus operations, conduct governance, continuing education and public service, educational policy, equal opportunity, faculty benefits, general University policy, honorary degrees, information technology, library, University Statutes, student discipline and student life" (Senate, 2001). The senate has regularly scheduled meetings, designated office space, and support staff for its officers and standing committees. The chancellor and provost/vice chancellor for academic affairs regularly consult with the senate leadership.

In addition to the chancellor and provost, UIUC has vice-chancellors for student affairs, administration, and research. The provost, the first among equals, is responsible for the faculty, curriculum, admissions, and campus budget. Most administrative units report to either the vice chancellor for student affairs or vice chancellor for administration. Although the vice chancellor for research is also the dean of the graduate college, all other college deans report directly to the provost. The faculty are divided by academic discipline into various departments. Department heads (who may have long-term assignments) report to the college deans, and are responsible for the activities of the department (teaching, research, budget, and personnel).

Despite the pyramidal organization chart, the chancellor rarely makes policy decisions until the senate, deans, department heads, ad hoc committees, task forces, or affected

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

constituencies have been consulted and made recommendations. Kuh and Whitt (1988/2000) argue that collaborative decision making is part of higher education culture which they define as "the collective, mutually shaping patterns of norms, values, practices, beliefs, and assumptions that guide the behavior of individuals and groups in an institute of higher education and provide a frame of reference within which to interpret the meaning of events and actions on and off campus" (p. 162). It was within this framework that Chancellor Peltason's unilateral spring 1968 decision to create a Special Educational Opportunities Program (SEOP), hire currently enrolled black students as recruiters, and admit 500 disadvantaged freshmen in the fall was made.

Special Educational Opportunities Program

History

Carpenter (1975) argues that despite the popular notion that black student activism was largely responsible for Peltason's decision, President Henry had stated in a 1964 letter to the faculty that he believed the University should begin to take positive steps to deal with racial and social inequality "by building psychological and special assistance 'ramps' for young people who need them" (p. 20). In summer 1965, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences offered eight weeks of college preparatory course to seventeen black students admitted for the 1965-66 academic years (Williamson, 1998). By 1966-67, the Office of Student Personnel (now Office of the Dean of Students) had begun an informal pilot program of support services for female black students which was repeated in 1967-68. Also in 1967-68, the University had reserved thirty spaces for disadvantaged students who were eligible for federal Educational Opportunity Grants (Carpenter, 1975). Additionally, the University Committee on Human

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Relations and Equal Opportunity recommended that UIUC achieve a gradual increase in the admission of black students to reach 600 per year by 1972, changes in admission and retention standards, and intensified counseling and tutoring programs and services. These recommendations were the foundation for the Special Educational Opportunities Program (Carpenter, 1975; Williamson, 1998).

On April 4, 1968, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. was assassinated. On May 2, 1968, Chancellor Peltason announced the implementation of a Special Educational Opportunities Program, with plans to admit 500 disadvantaged students for fall 1968 (hence the program's other name, "Project 500"). Peltason made this announcement without consultation with the faculty senate, although in June 1968 the senate adopted two resolutions approving the admission of larger numbers of disadvantaged students under alternative standards (Carpenter, 1975). Chancellor Peltason and the Black Student Association reached an agreement that an attempt would be made to enroll at least 500 disadvantaged students in the fall, that the Dean of SEOP would report directly to the Chancellor, that the Black Student Association would be consulted about SEOP services and programs, and that efforts would be made to recruit disadvantaged students from Champaign-Urbana (Carpenter, 1975).

Admissions

In spring 1968, the Office of Admissions and Records (OAR), which had previously done little recruiting, hired several currently enrolled black students to work as admissions recruiters, offering three training sessions prior to the end of the semester. Carpenter (1975) states black student recruiters were hired because "they were available, because many had recruited informally during the previous Christmas vacation, and because they were committed to the project. Additionally, it was felt that black recruiters could better relate to black

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

applicants, could describe the University as perceived by black people" (p. 35). Due in part to their limited training, some student recruiters made promises to prospective students, particularly regarding financial aid, the University was unable to keep. However, they successfully recruited nearly 600 disadvantaged, mostly black, students for the fall 1968 term (Carpenter, 1975; Williamson, 1998).

The SEOP students admitted in 1968 were often the first in their family to attend college. Nearly all the first SEOP students were admitted with an ACT score of 23 or below (many did not even take the ACT until they arrived on campus for orientation), while 80 percent of non-SEOP students had an ACT score of 24 or above (Williamson, 1998). Many SEOP applicants also did not meet the high school foreign language requirement, which meant their credentials had to be reviewed by the colleges and perhaps led to some officials resenting the admission of SEOP applicants with "less competitive credentials." The result was a slow admissions process, with OAR often not certain about the status of individual applications (Carpenter, 1975, pp. 40-41).

Financial Aid

Most SEOP students came from "disadvantaged" backgrounds and thus were reliant upon financial aid. UIUC federal Educational Opportunity Grant and National Direct Student Loan funds were the primary sources of financial aid available for the SEOP students. Many student recruiters had apparently told SEOP students that their financial need would be met, leaving many to conclude that a "free ride" was automatic (Carpenter, 1975). Chancellor Peltason had announced SEOP having only about $155,000 of the estimated $750,000 required for the first year (Carpenter, 1975, pp. 41-42). The University relied on fund-raising drives such as the Martin Luther King Fund (Carpenter, 1975; Williamson, 1998) to meet some

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

expenses. The primary source of funding, however, was federal financial aid funds; the University was successful in obtaining $340,000 in increased federal funding from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (Carpenter, 1975, pp. 43-44). Many applicants had not had their financial aid forms processed prior to their arrival on campus, which meant the applications had to be processed by hand at the Financial Aid Office, a slow process made more difficult by the necessity for supporting documentation (Carpenter, 1975).

Curriculum

In addition to revised admission standards for SEOP students, there were suggestions that a separate curriculum be created for the specially admitted students. Chancellor Peltason "ruled out from the start any separate or easier program for disadvantaged students; he wanted them to be integrated into existing programs, with each college determining how it could best support its SEOP students" (Carpenter, 1975, p. 33). Further, the Chancellor decided to retain all administrative functions such as admissions, financial aid, and housing within established UIUC offices and to incorporate SEOP into the Office of Student Personnel rather than creating a parallel structure within SEOP (Carpenter, 1975).

However, based on their experience with the special summer 1967 program for disadvantaged students, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences knew that revisions were necessary for some introductory courses. Faculty in mathematics, psychology, and freshman rhetoric created new courses for SEOP students. SEOP students enrolled in the College of Education were enrolled in an Alternative Teacher Education Program, which placed them in the schools during their first rather than their fourth year. Many departments, however, either did little or poorly designed revision to courses (Williamson, 1998, pp. 85-88).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Housing

The UIUC Housing Office initially reserved five hundred spaces in the dormitories for SEOP students, planning to house no more than five or six SEOP students on a floor. By August 7, 1968, only fifty-four of the 167 SEOP applicants then approved for admission had made dormitory reservations, leading the Housing Director to suggest that reserved spaces be reduced by over one-half. Although the reserved spaces were not actually reduced prior to August 21, 1968, the Housing Office was unprepared for the 565 students who actually registered (Carpenter, 1975, pp. 48-49). In spite of the unexpected influx of students, the Housing Office managed to find housing for all the SEOP students, although some were assigned to temporary spaces in lounges. The Housing Office had a long tradition of over-assigning rooms because many students with room assignments failed to register; generally the stay in lounges was very short (Carpenter, 1975, pp. 55-57). However, the SEOP students had been housed in Illinois Street Residence Hall (ISR), then a new dormitory, for orientation week. Permanent room assignments were made to smaller spaces in older dormitories, which compared unfavorably to the brochures recruiters had used and to ISR. The dissatisfaction of some female SEOP students with their housing assignments led to the Illini Union protest on September 9, 1968 (Carpenter, 1975; Williamson, 1998).

The Protest and Arrests

On September 8, dissatisfied female students met with Housing staff to discuss the women's complaints and a list of demands, including the right to choose a roommate. Although other students who had been assigned to ISR had arrived on campus, UIUC administrators decided to allow nineteen black women to remain in the rooms they had been assigned for SEOP orientation that night. On September 9, Clarence Shelley, the Director of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

SEOP, Housing staff, and the women met to discuss the complaints further and to find rooms for the women. Yolanda Smith, a student, announced that she and the other women would unpack and remain in ISR for the remainder of the year. Before they left the meeting, the students were informed that if they did not vacate ISR by 2:00 p.m. the next day, they would be subject to University disciplinary action. The women met with several other black students, including members of the Black Student Association. By approximately 9:00 p.m. on September 9, the group had moved to the Illini Union where they were joined by other black students and community members (Carpenter, 1975; Williamson, 1998).

The group in the Union demanded that the Chancellor come to the Union to talk with them. Although University administrators had decided to make no effort to remove the students if they remained peaceful, they advised the Chancellor against going to the Union because he could not satisfy demands, and it might be better for him to serve as a reconciler the next day. Instead, a delegation of other administrators went to the Union where they met with members of the Black Student Association (Carpenter, 1975, pp. 65-67). Closing time at the Union was midnight, when all outside doors were locked. After 12:30 a.m., some protesters damaged paintings, a chandelier, and furniture in the Union. About 2:00 a.m., after consulting with several deans, the Chancellor decided to have the protesters arrested and removed. Over 200 students were arrested. During the 1968-69 academic year, the arrested students were subject to University disciplinary hearings, although eventually a judge dismissed all legal charges (Carpenter, 1975; Williamson, 1998). Student participants interviewed nearly thirty years later characterized the arrests as a defining moment for themselves and SEOP (Williamson, 1998).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Aftermath

After 1968, UIUC maintained its commitment to the recruitment and retention of minority students. Since 1968, UIUC has adopted a variety of programs and services for minority students designed to retain undergraduates and encourage them to pursue graduate or professional study. Peer tutoring and mentoring programs initiated in 1968 had achieved an air of permanence in 2001.

Admissions Policies

Current UIUC undergraduate admissions policies differ significantly from earlier admissions policies. True to its land-grant beginnings, the University first admitted students from all socioeconomic classes. Veysey (1965) states "President Andrew S. Draper of the University of Illinois declared in 1907: "The universities that would thrive must put away all exclusiveness and dedicate themselves to universal public service. They must not try to keep people out; they must help all who are worthy to get in"" (pp. 63-64). Most students who attended the University were Illinois residents, whose families were already contributing to the state's tax base. University enrollments had grown from 278 in 1870 to 3281 undergraduates in 1910, rising by approximately 3,200 every ten years to 11,370 in 1940. Between 1960 and 1967, however, undergraduate enrollment increased from 17,003 to 22,017 as the post-World War II "Baby Boomers" entered higher education in record numbers (UIUC historical enrollment figures, 1999).

As student demand increased beyond the University's capacity for admission, UIUC had instituted selection criteria to differentiate among applicants. These admissions criteria included standardized test scores and high school grade point average, which were combined to create a "selection index" or predicted first semester UIUC grade point average. Additionally,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

applicants were evaluated on the kinds of courses they had taken in high school, to determine if their course distribution met college requirements (Carpenter, 1975; Williamson, 1998). Although UIUC admissions policy, like that of other universities, is determined by the faculty, UIUC is fairly unique in the decentralization of its admissions process; each undergraduate college and graduate department determines which applicants will be admitted to its programs. Enrollment requirements differ among the colleges rather than being the same throughout the University (M. Moore, personal communication, April 2, 2002).

After 1968, the Office of Admissions and Records began more systematic recruiting efforts throughout Illinois. OAR established a Chicago satellite office in 1983, which now has five full-time staff who recruit students from the Chicago public schools and the City of Chicago community colleges. Since 1968, OAR minority student recruitment has followed the migration of middle class minorities south and west of the city into suburban high schools (M. Moore, personal communication, April 2, 2002). The Admissions Office has recently begun some systematic out-of-state recruiting as well in response to the campus decision to increase out-of-state enrollment. There is no targeted recruiting in the south where potential black students could be found. Those out of state black students who do come to UIUC "find their way on their own" (M. Moore, personal communication, April 2, 2002).

In 1983, the University Board of Trustees set a policy permitting up to ten percent of freshmen to be "special admits," i.e., admitted despite their not meeting all the normal admissions criteria (M. Moore, personal communication, April 2, 2002). The special admissions policy permits colleges to admit student athletes and other promising students who might otherwise not be admissible. Some minority students fall under these special admission criteria. Minority students with a 24 ACT may be admitted under the President's Award

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Program. The President's Award Program (PAP) was created by University President Stanley O. Ikenberry in 1987 as part of UIUC's systematic efforts to recruit talented minority students. Black, Hispanic, and Native American students are eligible for the PAP monetary award, part of which is merit-based and part of which is based on financial need. PAP students are offered support through the Office of Minority Student Affairs. The program has resulted in increased numbers of lower middle class students (M. Moore, personal communication, April 2, 2002). Black student enrollment has increased from approximately one percent in 1967 (Carpenter, 1975; Williamson, 1998) to a little over eight percent in 2000 (Admissions and Records, 2000).

Each UIUC undergraduate college has an admissions committee composed of an OAR member and deans from the college. Approximately 20-25 percent of applicants have such high credentials (selection index of 3.2 or higher) that their applications are "rolled through" after their coursework distribution is checked. All other applications are reviewed individually by each college's admissions committee. The committees review personal statements, letters of recommendation, and coursework distribution to determine which students should be admitted. Minority students not admitted to the College of Engineering are referred to the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (LAS). LAS reviews disadvantaged student applications for special admission under the Educational Opportunities Program, the LAS Transition Program (maximum of 100), or the LAS Bridge Transition Program (maximum of 50 students, including 15 athletes) . All special admission students must meet the minimum 2.0 selection index. Students admitted to these programs are offered tutoring and mentoring support to enable them to be successful students (M. Moore, personal communication, 2002).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Programs and Services

UIUC has substantially increased its programs for underrepresented students since the inauguration of SEOP in 1968. For fiscal year 1998, the UIUC Office of Equal Opportunity and Access reports minority students received services from the Office of Minority Student Affairs, La Casa Cultural Latina, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the African-American Cultural Program, the Latino/Latina Studies Program, the Afro-American Studies and Research Program, the Office of Women's Programs, and several colleges. Additionally, students received scholarship and/or mentoring assistance from the American Indian Fellowship, the McNair Program, President's Award Program, Packard Fellowship, Summer Research Opportunities Program, and the Young Scholars in Agriculture Program (UIUC Equal Opportunity and Access, 1999).

In 1972, the Special Educational Opportunities Program was replaced by the Office of Minority Student Affairs (OMSA), a unit of Student Affairs. OMSA continues many of the services initiated by SEOP, including tutorials and graduate counselors. In 1995-96, OMSA reported that supplemental instruction was offered for key freshman courses in mathematics, psychology, and economics, resulting in higher course grades for participants, with up to 81 percent earning a grade of C or better. OMSA provided 4385 tutorial sessions in 1995-96 compared to 551 in 1972-73. Additionally, OMSA graduate counselors reported over 22,000 contacts with undergraduate minority students during 1995-96 (Jeffries, 1996).

OMSA also sponsors several programs to enhance African American, Latino/a, and Native American cultural and social activities. At the 1995-96 Minority Organization Expo, sixty five local minority businesses and student organizations were represented. Nearly

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

seventy students attended a Minority Student Leadership Institute which focused on enhancing students' ability to "utilize and leverage university resources" (Jeffries, 1996).

During the summer, UIUC holds a two day orientation session for incoming freshman students. Minority students who attend summer orientation are invited to attend a third day sponsored by OMSA. OMSA invites several other units to participate in the minority student orientation, designed to enhance information offered to all students during the two day session (Jeffries, 1996).

OMSA also encourages students to prepare for graduate school, actively participating in the McNair Scholars Program. During the summer, thirty four UIUC students completed the summer research program, which "consisted of full-time work for eight weeks with a faculty mentor, and culminated in oral presentation of research and a publication-quality paper" (Jeffries, 1996, p. 5). OMSA also sponsored workshops designed to inform students about graduate schools as well as trips for students to six intensive research institutions. Many UIUC McNair alumni have enrolled in graduate school at UIUC, Michigan, Pennsylvania State, Duke, MIT, Indiana, and the University of Chicago (Jeffries, 1996).

Summary

In 1968, UIUC was a white campus. In 2001, UIUC can still be described as a predominantly white campus with a predominantly white faculty. However, the admission of over 600 disadvantaged, mostly black undergraduates in 1968 laid the groundwork for the continued admission of increasing numbers of minority students, as well as the development of programs and services specifically designed to meet minority students' needs.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER 6

REFLECTIONS

Lawrence-Lightfoot and Davis (1997) state that a researcher uses her experiences, insights and perspectives or autobiographical voice as a resource for understanding and connecting with an actor. This requires the researcher to engage in self-reflection during the data collection process. Further, the researcher listens *for* a story, an active engagement in identifying and selecting the themes that comprise the story. This chapter articulates my voice as I reflect on themes in the interview and document data Clarence Shelley shared with me. Some themes were anticipated and some were not. For example, I was not surprised by Shelley's focus on "the work" rather than on himself or by his emphasis on relationships. On the other hand, the document analysis revealed an eloquence and sense of history for which I was unprepared. My observations of and interactions with Shelley during the last twenty years of his UIUC career also inform my reflections.

My voice and reflections are cognizant of the epistemological considerations of race and studying across differences. Every effort has been made to use Shelley's voice to reflect his actual experiences and to recognize that the experiences of an African-American male are not those of a Euro-American female. While Shelley's childhood was spent in poverty and mine was not, our economic status as adults has been more similar. I recognize, however, that my early class and continued white skin privilege required me to pay close attention to faithfully employing Shelley's voice rather than mine in the narrative. I entered into this research project holding Shelley in high esteem and regard. I learned nothing to lessen my regard and much to elevate the esteem in which I hold him. I deliberately did not ask Shelley specifically about change until our fourth interview, listening instead for uninvited references

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

to change. To ensure that my voice would not intrude on his in the narrative, I reserved the discussion of his invited remarks about change to this chapter. Understanding Shelley's beliefs about change required me to distinguish between change as "difference" and as "transformation" (change in nature or function). Shelley does not see difference and transformation as synonymous.

The Expected

Guarded Privacy

> Lives are not stories. A day, a month, a year, or a lifetime has no plot....We turn our lives into stories, and in doing so, we can stop them where we choose. (Richard White, 1998, p. 292)

> He must be cautious...[His] armor...guards against real danger. (William Grier & Price Cobbs, 1968, p. 37)

> [I see] two separate *me's*: the outward me with a deep involvement in the world of affairs, and the inward me—the essential person as viewed from the inside...(Robert Greenleaf, 1998, p. 107)

During our first interview, it was obvious that Shelley had been thinking about how he would respond if I asked him questions he anticipated. Everything he said flowed smoothly, chronologically, and highlighted biographical information. It's the kind of response I think he would have given to an interviewer he didn't know and had not yet decided to trust. As I reviewed the transcript of this initial interview, I realized, however, that I had learned more about his pre-UIUC days than I had previously known. Shelley does not talk much, if at all, about his childhood experiences. This is evidenced by the many colleagues, some of whom have been acquainted with Shelley for many years, who feel they don't really know him. I, for example, had no idea he came from a large family; I only knew he came from Detroit. I knew he had played football because I saw a photograph taken of him in uniform. (He is smiling in

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

this photo. If he were playing today, I am sure he would be scowling or wearing his "game face" like the current players whenever they are photographed individually in their uniforms.)

However, Shelley's reticence seems understandable given the nature of his childhood, which he described in 1999 as a "poor household filled variously though consistently with equal portions of absence, anger, and hunger. I learned early – perhaps before I learned anything else – that life was not just unfair, but it was often dangerous" (Shelley, 1999, p. 1). The memories of his father's anger and violence are not the kind of memories one wishes to think or talk about often. Shelley said that as an adult, he has come to understand something about his father's rage at the unfairness of his life. However, Shelley's father died when Shelley was stationed in Germany and the two of them were still estranged. Shelley had left home after a confrontation with his father and had never returned while his father was alive. His father's early death robbed them of any chance at reconciliation as adults. I can understand how difficult this could be for Shelley. I too was in my twenties when my father died very suddenly, and we too had had some difficult moments, although we were reconciling. The stories I tell of my father rarely include the difficult moments and are told only to family or trusted friends. As White (1998) says, "we tell different stories at different times in our lives. Our angle of vision changes. Our experience reveals consequences we had not imagined…We edit our memories. We choose to forget. We forge the same memories into different stories" (pp. 91-92). Shelley found it far easier to talk about being chased through the halls by Big Daddy Lipscomb or exposing a ticket scalping scheme than to talk about his father.

Media stereotypes perpetuate an image of men from poor, minority families and neighborhoods as violent and uneducated, a stereotype that does not fit Shelley. In fact, I suspect that many who first met Shelly at UIUC (myself included) assumed he came from a

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

middle-class, educated family rather than a poor neighborhood in Detroit. Shelley's parents, each of whom had a grade school education, valued education sufficiently to want their children to finish high school. But his father saw no value in postponing income to pursue a college education; instead he expected his children to find jobs as soon as they finished high school. Grier and Cobbs (1968) argue that "education has never offered a significant solution to the black man's dilemma in America. In the eyes of policy makers, education has always been meant to serve the pragmatic function of training people for work…The point is that [blacks] continue to be regarded as a class of illiterate laborers…" (p. 135). Shelley's father apparently could not imagine that higher education would permit his children to have a life significantly different from his own. A love of reading and words began Shelley's transformation from lackluster student to teacher to university administrator and a life unlike his father's.

Shelley was a voracious reader as a child and continues to be today. Consequently he is knowledgeable about a broad, eclectic range of topics, including ancient scholars, higher education research, and hip hop music. In this way, Shelley reminds me of my father, who also grew up poor, loved books, earned a college scholarship, read constantly and widely, and created for himself a professional persona that disguised his youthful impoverishment. As long as he did not talk about his origins, my father had the luxury of being judged solely on his merit. This is not a luxury afforded to blacks, whose credentials are often questioned. Carter (1991) argues that black professionals are "assumed to have earned [their] position not by being the best available but by being among the best available blacks" (p. 55). Shelley began his career at UIUC insisting he be judged on his credentials the same as other staff, refusing to submit to being interviewed by students since other staff were not.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

In our second interview, I asked Shelley to elaborate on some information he had shared during the first interview, to talk more about the early experiences that made the man. This was a question he had not anticipated. However, he became more open, detailed, and willing to talk about his feelings. He followed trains of thought instead of stopping short, remarking occasionally that he "hadn't thought about that for years." The pattern for subsequent interviews was typically the same; I often had to ask questions a second time to get details. This was a departure from our collegial relationship; Shelley has always been the one asking questions. However, we both adapted well.

Some of Shelley's anecdotes had particular resonance for me. Despite our differences in age, ethnicity, and gender, Shelley and I both come from large families. I understand very well why he liked to go to the library to escape the otherwise unavoidable chaos created by numerous siblings; I too escaped by reading. And I understand how very difficult it is to attain privacy as a child in a large family, and how, as a result, privacy is a valuable commodity that is treasured and guarded in one's adult years. In fact, privacy for children in large families is really limited; what isn't verbalized is all that is truly one's own. Perhaps it is my own desire for privacy amidst the noise of my relationships that makes me cautious about sharing everything Shelley told me. After long reflection, however, I conclude that those few moments I feel least comfortable relating are not essential to others' understanding Shelley. Indeed, I am not convinced another interviewer, previously unknown to him, would even have heard some comments. I do not believe Shelley would have made them to others and do not feel compelled to violate his trust.

Relationships

> [He] formulates [his] life as a set of relationships. [His] stories are not an autobiography: not a classic account of self. ...[He] sees [his] life as one among many.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> [His] narratives turn away from [him]self because [he] considers [his] life so entwined with others that [he] could never stand alone. [He] has lived, and continues to live, in a world dense with people. (Richard White, 1998, p. 5)

No one who has had any continued contact with Shelley has any doubt about his centering on relationships. The interview and document analysis confirmed observations that Shelley is an observant, thoughtful, introspective man who puts relationships at the core and center of his life. The mentoring from Mr. Kinnard changed his life, and it is clear that Shelley has a very fond and high regard for him. Shelley has consciously emulated Mr. Kinnard throughout his career. Like Mr. Kinnard, Shelley mentored high school students, worked to give them as many opportunities as possible, encouraged them to go to college, and identified college scholarships. Shelley's poetry indicates a concern that borders on grief about young high school students who appear beyond his reach. Continuing his mentoring at UIUC, Shelley has spent hours with students, going out to dinner to celebrate birthdays, playing basketball, going to programs or concerts, or seeking students out if he had any inkling they were troubled. One of the benefits of his being out and about the campus is his ability to appear somewhere without his presence seeming anything other than happenstance. Students seem unaware that a "chance meeting" with Shelley is often a planned event. Indeed, Shelley may visit with several other students before approaching the student he wanted to see. Servant-leaders identify others who "have broken spirits and have suffered from a variety of emotional hurts. Although this is a part of being human, servant-leaders recognize that they have an opportunity to 'help make whole' those with whom they come in contact" (Spears, 1998, p. 6).

Shelley has spent countless hours trying to help troubled students. I remember an African-American undergraduate who came to me to complain about unfair treatment in his dormitory. We managed to achieve a temporary solution to his problem, at which point Shelley

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

became involved, and he spent the next three years listening to and counseling this young man, who failed a required class during his final semester (having refused to get a tutor or talk to the instructor) and did not graduate. Similarly, I remember a white female graduate student who struggled and struggled to succeed in a department where she suffered recurring instances of discrimination. After the discrimination was addressed by the department, the student decided to continue her studies. Shelley listened, advocated, and listened some more during the rest of her studies.

The servant-leader strives to "understand and empathize with others ...accept[ing] and recogniz[ing] their special and unique spirits..."(Spears, 1998, p. 5). Shelley spent hours with Native American students who risked their emotional and physical safety to protest against the athletic symbol/mascot Chief Illiniwek. On a campus that is to all intents and purposes devoid of Native Americans, Shelley became a trusted ally for students who felt demeaned in what they perceived was a hostile environment. Shelley has also become knowledgeable about and friendly with disabled, gay, lesbian, and bisexual students and staff. He learns by asking questions, listening, observing, and reading. At the same time, he interacts regularly with white, Asian-American, Latina/o, and African-American leaders of student organizations, offering advice and counsel on campus and organizational politics. Shelley has been "accepting of the people involved in these experiences, and [he] seek[s] to understand what moves them," employing a liberating vision of diversity (Greenleaf, 1998, p. 58).

Shelley's ties to Detroit and to the people who are important in his life are obvious in the interviews as well as observations. When asked where he is from, Shelley responds that Detroit is home although he has lived in Champaign for over thirty years. Grier and Cobbs (1968) state that for blacks home is "where 'one's people' are. However long one lives away

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

from home, the roots reach back to one's people…In this world of strangers black men make a home wherever they are" (pp. 103-104). Shelley has made a home in Champaign, remaining there after his retirement, but as he said in a speech, "Detroit is my home, my only home" (Shelley, 1990, p. 1). During our interviews, Shelley talked little about what his extended family is doing, but he told me about what his classmates who worked on the high school paper with him were doing. And I have often heard him talk about former UIUC students, prefaced with "do you know [name]?" followed by a rendition of what the person did in college and is doing now. He seems less interested in talking about himself than in talking about others. At times during the interviews, Shelley would interrupt his narrative about himself to talk about an acquaintance. If the acquaintance was unknown to me, Shelley told me briefly about the person, when he or she first appeared in Shelley's life, and then told me what that person is doing now. Shelley seems to be at the center of numerous orbits, many of which overlap but others have no connection other than Shelley. An endearingly modest man, Shelley seems unaware he is at the center of a complex and intricate web of relationships. A genealogist who wanted to focus on the people Shelley has touched in one way or another would have a formidable, likely impossible, task.

A colleague who was a student at UIUC once told me, "Shelley has his ways of knowing about you wherever you are." He believes that current students who do not know Shelley have a less rich college experience than he did, and are unaware of what they are missing. Shelley also has his "ways of knowing" about his colleagues, whether they are living elsewhere, retired, or still on campus. His network is vast and encompassing. He is as willing to listen to faculty and staff as students, and because he does, he is a treasure trove of information. He tends to gather his information in bits and pieces, rarely spending a long time

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

with any one individual. However, he develops a complete and accurate picture of the practices, policies and problems in various offices. It was not unusual to sit in a meeting and hear Shelley say "staff in [office] believe..." His information was always current and always correct. Over the past thirty years, Shelley has developed into what Greenleaf (1998) calls a servant of the institution, a man who knows his way around and whose judgment and integrity are respected.

Those who work in offices Shelley frequents come to know him and to be known by him. I remember when I began my career in Student Affairs and realized that Shelley was someone I'd seen frequently in the building. When a colleague told me his name, she assured me that eventually I would become acquainted with him because "that's Shelley's way; he knows who *everyone* in the building is, including the secretaries." And she was right. First he started by saying "hello" to me and then one day when I said "hello, Mr. Shelley" to him, he responded "Broga." It was at that point I felt I belonged. He calls everyone by their last name, although some people he may refer to by title only (i.e., "the chancellor" or "the dean"). I also remember when my mother was terminally ill for many months and every so often Shelley would check to see how I was doing – quietly and unobtrusively, but with great care and compassion. The burden was lifted, even if only for a few minutes. Shelley's arms go figuratively, if not literally, around lots of people. Being in Shelley's circle is a privilege and gift not to be taken lightly. Even though he has officially retired, Shelley is still out and about the campus, touching base with his colleagues and finding out what's happening. His calendar is filled with lunch dates and he has at least two meetings a week. He seems to magically appear where the most interesting events are occurring, possibly because of his part-time

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

appointment in the Chancellor's office, but more likely because that's what he's done for years. Shelley is free now to set his own schedule, but his ties to the campus are still strong.

The Unexpected

Eloquence and Passion

> The "Word" is the sum total of our lived experiences (real, vicarious, and intellectual) translated into useful lessons of empowerment. The "Word" is the seed for liberation, emancipation, and education. The "Word" is the key that unlocks the mental and cognitive shackles of human potential. The "Word" is the thing that says to poor children that they can be economically stable. The "Word" is the thing that says to black and brown children that their skin is not the entirety of their humanity or their possibilities. I know about the "Word." (M. Christopher Brown, II, 2000, p. 225)

> All great and lasting work begins as an act of faith in some single person saying, I can—and I will. (Clarence Shelley, 1977b, p. 3)

As I read Shelley's speeches, I discovered an eloquence and passion I'd never heard before. Neither is immediately obvious in his daily conversations, although careful listeners can detect similes that include historical references or perceptive insights. While his conversations may include anecdotes or observations about current campus events, most are liberally sprinkled with questions. Shelley is primarily an observer and a listener, and while people can later repeat one of Shelley's anecdotes or comments, it is not unusual for them to realize it wasn't Shelley doing most of the talking during a conversation. It's not just that he makes no effort to let you know how eloquent and passionate he is –it's that he almost makes an effort *not* to let you know.

Shelley has a quiet persona – he doesn't shift around a lot in a chair or cross and uncross his legs, fuss with papers, or doodle. He makes notes when he hears something that interests him or he needs to remember. He has a tendency to put his fingertips together in front of his face, or incline his head, but otherwise he is remarkably free of mannerisms. Shelley's

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

quietness masks an alertness that is rarely noticed, at least by many of his white colleagues. In fact, Shelley is remarkably skilled at hiding his own feelings, which according to Grier and Cobbs (1968), is an adaptive technique blacks must employ for their own safety in white society. The laughter or questions that intersperse Shelley's silences disguise his continuous attention to what is happening around him. While Shelley will listen to others, he is a man who draws his own conclusions after sufficient first-hand observations. If he feels a question does not merit a response, he puts on what Daniel Dixon referred to as "that blank look" and says, "what was the question?" or "I don't understand the question." Then he waits to hear the question explained and re-explained before giving a pithy but dismissive answer. And if he has concluded that someone does not warrant an investment of his time, the object of his disdain is seldom, if ever, aware of Shelley's opinion. All of this gives the illusion that Shelley is a man who does not hold strong opinions. Nothing could be further from the truth as the document analysis revealed.

Repeated analysis of the interview transcripts confirms that Shelley's feelings are deeply held but carefully disguised in his daily conversations. Grier and Cobbs (1968) argue that black men who work in white environments cannot succeed without drive and determination. However, they must devote significant energy to disguising their drive, ambition, and opinions from whites to achieve and maintain their success (pp. 66-67). In an undated speech to Asian-American students, Shelley described an incident at a clothing store that angered him so intensely he "was becoming light headed with rage and felt the immobilizing power of anger. I remembered once again the truth of the phrase: to be angry is to avenge the faults of other on ourselves. Do nothing in furious passion" (Shelley, n.d., p. 1). The speeches that appear to be directed at white audiences contain some references to black

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

rage, but the references are always to others; Shelley does not identify the rage as his. Based on the presumed composition of the audience, it was a surprise to learn he became so angry at a conference of guidance counselors that he abandoned his prepared remarks, told the entire audience they were crazy, did not deserve to work with his beautiful children, and walked out. But at UIUC, where Shelley was often dependent upon the good-will of whites to achieve his goals, his rage seems to have been carefully and consciously muted. Even though Shelley said in a 1990 Martin Luther King Day speech that he had believed in the 1960's that protests were the only effective means to change (an opinion he no longer held), he seems to have been very careful to appear moderate rather than militant throughout his UIUC career. In the words of Grier and Cobbs (1968), Shelley "carries on his daily life without a hint of rage" (p. 147).

Shelley does, however, harbor anger that at times verges on despair, about the inequitable treatment of black students at UIUC. Grier and Cobbs (1968) state that there is "a sadness and intimacy with misery that has become a characteristic of black Americans" (p. 178). While he believes the arrests at the Illini Union were a defining moment for the program, the precipitating complaints were a result of inadequate preparation for the SEOP students. Carpenter (1975) argues that the University decision to call the police can be traced in part to knowledge of a destructive student riot at Cornell University the previous spring (pp. 78-79). Shelley has always been concerned about the effects of the arrests on the students. He believes that things never calmed down for the first group (perhaps partly because of the anti-war protests as well) and that they paid a great emotional price for enrolling here. His anger at the uninformed and racist comments of UIUC faculty and staff is carefully modulated but still evident thirty years later. Shelley's rage, at least in conversation with me over the past twenty years, while occasionally acknowledged, appears to be carefully contained. Perhaps this is due

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

to the belief he expressed in 1970 that blacks assume a risk of being misunderstood or not understood when they talk to whites about anything important (Shelley, 1970a). Andersen (1993) argues that researchers and subjects can talk across differences because researcher standpoints are achieved, not inherent; nonetheless, talking across some differences is not something Shelley is quick to do.

As I reflected upon the unexpectedness of Shelley's eloquence and passion, I eventually realized that I am not really surprised by either. Although the eloquence was initially a surprise, I remembered that I have long known that Shelley is a thoughtful, insightful, and perceptive man. I do not know when I learned Shelley had once been a high school English teacher, but I have known that for quite awhile and it is not unreasonable to expect he would have a talent with words. Contributing to my surprise was observation of Shelley over the past several years. For example, Shelley convened monthly meetings of Student Affairs staff and generally spoke at least briefly at each. And it was those little talks that fooled me; Shelley rarely had notes, often appeared to have given scant thought to his comments, and gave no hint that he can be a polished and dramatic speaker. I cannot help but wonder why he hid these talents from his colleagues; why wasn't it safe for him to let us know how talented he is? Or if it wasn't a matter of safety, then why did he choose not to share his gifts with his colleagues?

As I further reflected on the passion in Shelley's speeches, I realized that for many years I had believed that students were Shelley's primary passion. While it is true that Shelley feels passionately about students, his passion is about much more. His passion is for what he calls "the work." Greenleaf (1998) states servant-leaders find "work in which [they] are engaged that is uniquely [them]" (p. 65). Shelley says he never thought of the work as being affirmative action. The work is directed at creating a safe and welcoming campus and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

community for all people of color, particularly students. And the work is demanding, consuming, exhausting, and continuing. It requires Shelley to give time and attention to students, either individually or in groups; students need time and attention all hours of the day, not just between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. There have been no "banker's hours" for Shelley. The work requires Shelley to encourage, to listen carefully, to play, to challenge, to argue, to preach academics, to chastise, to advocate, and to model behavior. Shelley has no anonymity on campus; people may not know his name but they can describe him if they've seen him. He does not have the luxury afforded his white colleagues who can walk unobtrusively on campus and not be recognized. To never have the luxury of privacy on campus requires a passion I had overlooked.

To do the work also has required Shelley to spend countless hours with faculty and administrators in an effort to persuade them of their responsibility for making the campus a safe place for all students. In 1968, many were openly hostile and critical of the work Shelley came to UIUC to do and could easily impede efforts due to the decentralized bureaucracy and power structure. Carpenter (1975) states that Chancellor Peltason had publicly committed to the creation of SEOP without first consulting the Faculty Senate or having sufficient funds in place to support the program. Further, there was no early coordination and little communication between the Offices of Admissions, Financial Aid, and Housing which resulted in isolated, often contradictory decisions. Others were people who meant well and worked hard to transform classes and create support structures to help SEOP students succeed. Some were people of good-will who may initially have responded out of white guilt but came to view the work as important and necessary and supported students as best they could. Greenleaf (1998) states that a servant-leader stands "as the advocate of persuasion in human affairs" and goes

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ahead to show the way others follow" because they are persuaded that the leader's path is right (p. 44). But the faculty and staff changed so Shelley would have to start all over again. Shelley believes the societal backlash against affirmative action is reflected in hostility, disdain, lack of concern, and thoughtlessness on campus. Carter (1991) states that blacks have faced the "qualification" question over the past twenty years (p. 12). Shelley needed a strong passion to combat such questions for over thirty years. I should not have been surprised by it.

History

> "The true leader has a sense of history. The true leader sees the whole and also has vision to foresee what might happen. The true leader is action-oriented, realistic, and has superb communication skills..." (R. A. Vanourek, 1995, p. 299)

I was surprised by Shelley's sense of history revealed in the document analysis. In our collegial interactions, Shelley always framed comments about past events or decisions in the context of the individuals who had somehow been involved. I always thought that Shelley really was talking about the people, not the events. I was not prepared to find Shelley's repeated references to the land grant movement and the democratization of education. Johnson (1997) believes the land grant movement eventually resulted in diversification of the student body while Veysey (1965) and Geiger (1986) credit the growth of the research university as the most significant contribution to curriculum broadening and increasing student enrollments. Levine (1986), on the other hand, argues that student diversification was due primarily to a culture of aspiration among parents who viewed college as the means to ensuring their children's upward social mobility. Concomitant with the increasing student diversification was the decision of private colleges to exclude the socially undesirable, specifically Jews and blacks. The World War II veterans who took advantage of the G.I. Bill further diversified

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

college campuses after the war, surprising many who predicted they would not succeed in college. The 1950's and 1960's represented a final assault on the tradition of exclusion.

The document analysis also revealed Shelley's repeated reminders to African-American students to learn and understand their history. He referred often to "our people surviving the diaspora, the middle passage, and the lash" as he exhorted them to remember where they came from while they forged ahead. Anderson (1988) describes the history of self-reliance of ex-slaves in their determination to "control and sustain schools for themselves and their children" (p. 5). This self-reliance was demonstrated in the creation of "Sabbath schools" and private schools started in the south during the Civil War. Despite the support of northern whites "[blacks'] determination has escaped the attention of all but a few historians" (p. 15).

Grier and Cobbs (1968) argue that "education was said to be 'something no one can ever take away from you.' It was, therefore, one of the very few areas of accomplishment where a level of success could be attained within a special Jim Crow arena of competition" (p. 139). They also argue that for blacks "to have maintained a fervent interest in education and a belief in the rewards of learning required a major act of faith" (Grier & Cobbs, 1968, p. 141). Shelley, who knows the historic struggle of blacks for education, does not want the students whose experiences he perceives as different from his to forget that history. While analyzing the documents, I discovered that Shelley, unsurprisingly, talks differently to a predominantly African-American audience than he does to a predominantly white audience. He has no need to remind white Americans of their history.

Upon further reflection, I came to realize that Shelley's interest is not solely historical. Shelley really likes to understand people, ideas, and events; so do I. We have had many conversations that began with his asking me what I think about a particular idea or why I think

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

an event happened the way it did. As we try together to unravel the puzzle, we find relationships between ideas, people, or events that we analyze. We often reach no conclusions during our conversation, yet days or months later may resume our discussion because one of us has thought of something we hadn't considered previously. Shelley, it seems to me, tends to reach conclusions he modifies on the basis of new information.

Shelley's view of history as a continuum and marking a place for himself along that continuum seems to reflect his sense of purpose. And Shelley's work at UIUC has been purposeful and intentional. His intent has always been to effect change on the white campus. To see oneself as part of a broader movement helps give meaning to the work.

Change

> So what have I learned – worth knowing? The colleagues of the late 60's and early 70's were convinced that the institutions would have to change drastically if our students were to be successful. Well, guess what: 'they are, and it didn't.' (Clarence Shelley, 1999, p. 4)

Alumni who return to campus to visit are quick to notice changes-new buildings, different restaurants, younger-looking students, and services that were not available when they were in school. Using such criteria, it is difficult to argue that the campus was not different in 2001 than it was in September 1968. There are new buildings all over campus, the campus boundaries have expanded, businesses and restaurants have changed, streets have changed, and new services, programs, and academic options abound. The SEOP students who returned to campus in 1998 for a thirty year anniversary could meet in the African-American Cultural Program House, which did not exist when they arrived. They could visit the Afro-American Studies Program which also was not in existence in 1968. These same alumni could look across the street from the African-American Cultural Program and see LaCasa Cultural Latina,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the student center for Latina/o students. Today's entering freshmen find a Central Black Student Union as an integral part of University residence hall programming. Today's freshmen can compete for the President's Award Program, a scholarship program initiated by President Ikenberry in 1987. Approximately 22 percent of current undergraduate students self-identify as non-white. The numbers of minority faculty and staff have increased noticeably since 1968. The campus has an African-American vice chancellor and an African-American chief of police. It is easy to say that UIUC has changed.

Shelley, however, believes that the campus has not been meaningfully transformed since his arrival. He believes he has changed and he perceives that the students have changed. Yet, he believes that UIUC "has done nothing that would require a redefinition of its mission as a highly selective research institution." He argues that UIUC is willing to allow atypical students to enroll but is unwilling to admit that these students need any help. He says his proposal for a learning assistance center, patterned after those at Harvard and Stanford, was halted because administrators were more interested in preserving the campus image than helping students. Instead, not many years after he arrived, Shelley began to hear faculty and administrators say that UIUC is not for everyone.

Today Shelley says he is more accepting of the slowness of change than he was when he came. He said when he first came, if Chancellor Peltason said something, Shelley believed a change had occurred. At one time he used to believe that department heads would discuss such pronouncements with the faculty, but he has come to understand that is not the case. Now, he says he believes that presidents and chancellors issue well-crafted announcements that few read and no two people agree on. He understands that decentralization can be an impediment to change.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Shelley does not know whether he has become more realistic, more cynical, or both. He no longer sees change as an event, saying at first that he is not sure what it is, but concluding that change is a process. He does see one difference among some administrators he wasn't aware of as it happened: an increased aversion to conflict, a fear of evaluation, fear of perceptions, and a massaging of information. Shelley also believes some administrators fear bad news, which he believes is unfortunate because in his view all accurate news is good news.

Shelley does not believe that the rationale for policies and procedures is carefully evaluated or challenged by faculty or administrators. Instead, offices are moved, duties are reassigned, and administrators believe change has been accomplished. Shelley muses and reflects on the question of institutional change for a long time before he finally says, "there must be some profound changes over thirty years, but I can't think of any."

Shelley does, however, believe the currently enrolled minority students at UIUC are different than the students who enrolled in 1968. Today's minority students attend different high schools, are more like their white peers, dress more poorly, and tend to identify with their college instead of other blacks. In 1981, he said "our students were brighter and tougher than we believed," a statement he still believes today (Shelley, 1981, p. 2). But he also believes that today's students, who are typically more affluent than the first SEOP students, "expect everything and demand nothing." He worries that he "never in my wildest imaginings ever thought in those early days that I would meet black college students whose lack of knowledge or interest in Black History is exceeded only by their arrogance." He worries that current students feel they are better than other blacks because they have more toys. These black students who seem to have adopted elitist notions common among affluent whites are a puzzle

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

to Shelley. He cannot identify the source of their arrogance. Much as he dislikes their arrogance, I suspect Shelley is more bothered by his inability to understand it.

Shelley was still worried at the end of his career about the well-being of students of color on the campus, and about the cumulative racial aggressions the students endure, such as invisibility in the classroom, stereotyping, and being treated as a spokesperson for the group (Feagin, 1992, pp. 552-554). He believes faculty continue to ignore undergraduate students outside the classroom and should be more involved in students' lives. He worries about the increasing numbers of students who are victims of abuse or have significant mental health problems. He hears alumni complain that their children are being treated as badly by faculty and staff as the alumni were when they were students. While he believes racism still exists in subtle forms, he is no longer aware of the kind of blatant racism that made the first SEOP students so uncomfortable in classes, restaurants, and theaters; it "was like the sun rising in the west." He does not want students to accept mediocrity rather than their absolute best. Speaking about mediocrity, he said "we are surrounded by it—we are drowning in it—we are choking in the stench of it—and our fear is that this mediocrity is presumed to be the natural order of things by college students who were born to compete—and lead—and indeed make a new nation" (Shelley, 1981, p. 2). For a man driven to excel, the acceptance of mediocrity is anathema.

Although he concedes one would not reach this conclusion if one looked just at the cafeteria, Shelley sees more inter-racial friendships among students on the UIUC campus. He says he cannot identify when this change occurred and that it is almost too subtle to observe. This anecdotal information supports research findings on other large campuses (Antonio, 1999; Gurin, 1998).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

For two years, I have contemplated Shelley's offhand comment to me that nothing has changed during his career here. I had deliberately refrained from asking him any questions about that comment between the time he made it and our final interview. I had seriously considered the possibility that he had made the comment on a bad day and upon reflection would conclude he had indeed witnessed significant changes. The comment may have been off-handed, but his sentiment has not changed.

There appears to be little question that the first SEOP students were different than many minority students currently attending the University. Today, most minority students are admitted with credentials that meet or exceed those of white applicants (M. Moore, personal communication, April 2, 2002). Two major differences, according to Shelley, are the University's investment in systematic recruitment efforts at largely minority high schools (which now tend to be magnet schools) and financial aid awards for the most talented minority students inaugurated by President Ikenberry as it became evident to University administrators that the most talented minority students were being lured elsewhere. While these recruitment efforts do not target economically disadvantaged students who may well have latent innate ability but test poorly, the University is currently recruiting students it did not consider before 1968.

UIUC administrators also have offered incentives to academic departments to hire women and minorities, thereby encouraging the diversification of the faculty. Chancellor Aiken published annual reports that identified hiring patterns compared to the potential pool of women and minority scholars. Nonetheless, the decentralized nature of the campus can result in differential treatment of women and minority faculty once they are hired. It is still possible

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

for an undergraduate to complete a baccalaureate degree and never encounter a faculty member or teaching assistant who is not a white male. The "progress" is at best mixed.

It is in the hiring of Student Affairs professionals that Shelley and I are more knowledgeable, having served jointly on the Equal Employment Opportunity Committee, which was responsible for reviewing the search procedures for every professional, non-Civil Service position. Even starting with an assumption that the members of search committees were committed to fairness, it was repeatedly evident that they and the hiring officer had not seriously discussed their interpretation of "fairness." Individuals who had not examined their conscious and unconscious biases had difficulty understanding the flaws in the procedures they used. A common response to questions about the number of minority applicants was "there are no minorities in this field." These same people seemed to feel no obligation to look beyond their narrow definition of "qualified" or to encourage students of color to enter their field. Too often, I fear, Shelley's perception is correct: many of the currently employed faculty and staff at UIUC perceive themselves as gate-keepers who must keep the unworthy out. This appears to be especially true among some senior faculty who readily admit they would not have been granted tenure today based on their scholarship as junior faculty. It is the lack of commitment on the part of so many to opening the academy's doors that leaves me in agreement with Shelley that there is no evidence of substantial transformation in the past thirty years.

Shelley's experiences in the classroom ended many years ago. Mine concluded a year ago. Based on my experience as a student, I am much more hopeful about students than I would be otherwise. While I may be particularly fortunate, I discovered classes with a wide diversity of students who were willing to share their perspectives and challenge mine. Racial issues were the subject of only one of my undergraduate classes (concluded long ago), but were

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

frequently a topic in my graduate classes. Faculty who facilitated a discussion of ideas made it easier for students to talk about emotionally charged topics as an intellectual exercise. Like Shelley, however, I was often amazed at younger students' lack of knowledge of history; they know about the Civil Rights Movement or the Women's Movement, but they have little knowledge of the history that preceded case law and statutory changes in the latter half of the twentieth century. When I wonder how this is possible, I remember that what I learned about World War II in high school was quite limited. I learned about German concentration camps but it was not until I had a Japanese-American floor mate in my college dormitory that I learned about the American internment camps, for example. Perhaps we need to be nearly a generation removed from events before we address them in our public schools.

Despite the external and internal arguments about the "canon," scholarly interest in previously silenced voices and issues of equity continues to attract faculty and students. While many students take only enough non-Western courses to meet their graduation requirements, others are able to explore histories that did not exist when Shelley was a student. Though I believe too many faculty ignore important diversity issues, I remind Shelley that Veysey (1965) argues that new knowledge results in specialization at research universities and a continued broadening of the curriculum.

All in all, I am probably less worried than Shelley about the students (although in the course of my regular duties, I see too many victims of abuse and emotionally disturbed students to be sanguine). There are still too many instances of students of color coming into our office to complain about differential treatment from faculty. Many of these students have ignored (at least to outward appearances) small slights, innuendos, and the minutiae of daily racism but finally draw the line at overt acts of bigotry that threaten to harm their academic records. Their

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

complaints nearly always prove to be legitimate and we are forced to negotiate remedies with the instructor or the department head in order to make things right. The University's reluctance to severely sanction faculty who behave in a discriminatory manner sometimes makes resolution difficult, if not impossible. The students who come to us are not willing to be treated differently because of their skin color and they expect something to be done. It is unfair that they carry this burden, but I see them as keepers of the flame. I remind Shelley that so long as students complain, all hope is not lost.

My reflection leads me to conclude that I agree in large part with Shelley's observation that there is little evidence outside the classroom to believe the institution has transformed its fundamental practices and policies (although perhaps the new chancellor will be successful in changing some practices). The difficulty comes in trying to determine why it seems nothing has changed when the numbers of minority students, faculty, and staff have increased and most academic and administrative units have diverse staffs. Perhaps part of the explanation lies with the age of senior administrators, deans, and department heads, most of whom are white males. Anyone over the age of fifty came of age in an era when white men had the power of the law to validate their notions of superiority and discriminatory treatment of women and all racial minorities as unequal and subordinate. While many white men no longer subscribe to those beliefs, there are many public figures who believe white, northwestern European males are the norm against which all others should be judged and are found lacking. Or perhaps it is the notion that those who are already here are among the elite and therefore must maintain "standards," whatever those may be. If I suggested these theories to Shelley, he would say to me, "hmmm, I wonder." There is no simple answer and these seem too facile.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Shelley believes that transformation is evolutionary and is evidenced by the variety and types of work faculty and staff of color engage in, the increased visibility of students, faculty and staff of color, and the influence of faculty and staff of color. He believes that for the most part the novelty of color has pretty well worn off, although he thinks the support staff from the small surrounding towns still have difficulty relating to people of color. Shelley believes that the transformation he hoped for when he came and worked for throughout his career will have occurred when "it is a matter of supreme indifference what color skin someone has."

Race

> Public and private worlds are never fully separate. Private joys and public tragedies not only intermingle, they are sometimes indistinguishable….The very things about which [he] had no choice created the contexts in which [he] made choices. (Richard White, 1998, p. 230)

Shelley's choices have always been dictated by race. Like White (1998), Grier and Cobbs (1968) believe that context controls choices. In U.S. society, a central theme of manhood is prerogative and privilege, and men are expected to be assertive and engage life. Economic wealth and status are interwoven with manhood. Power is defined as the ability to control and direct one's own and others' lives. However, "the ultimate power is the freedom to understand and alter one's life. It is this power, both individually and collectively, which has been denied the black man" (Grier & Cobbs, 1968, pp. 59-60). Shelley managed to strike a sensitive nerve (white guilt) with someone in the Army and stay out of Korea, but at the cost of spending an additional year in uniform. He had clearly found his passion when he worked on the high school and college newspapers, even winning a journalism scholarship. But despite his aptitude and avocation, his doubtless well-meaning college advisor convinced him to change his major because there were few jobs for African-American journalists. Shelley is a

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

born storyteller with a gift for words, a flair for phrases, a keen intelligence, a sense of rightness, and an intuition for honesty. While it is arguable that he is also a gifted teacher and counselor who has influenced countless young people, the fact remains his profession was largely dictated by the color of his skin. We have no way of knowing what kind of a career he might have had as a journalist or how many thousands, if not millions, he might have influenced. But it is not unreasonable to conclude that had he been white with the same talents, he would have been a journalist.

Shelley enjoyed his college years because he liked football and his English classes and had good friends. He said he could never get over the need to excel, a need that he might have felt regardless but arguably might not have felt had he not been the only black in all his classes. In a 1970 speech, he talked about the psychic toll paid by African-Americans who had to constantly adapt and re-adapt to white campus culture. He said the wounds and scars were deep and long-lasting. Current students experience a similar psychic toll. Solorzano, Ceja and Yosso (2001) state that black students often have a "sense of discouragement, frustration, and exhaustion" resulting from racial micro-aggressions in the classroom (p. 69).

Grier and Cobbs (1968) also state that young black students learn about discrimination quickly in schools, where unlike white students, they are given "busy work" rather than being trained for the world of work. In 1999, Shelley wrote that as a child he "learned, like James Baldwin, 'that ...to be black in America was to be in a constant state of rage.' Throughout all of my formative educational experiences, I never felt that school – like much of my world – was a safe place; a place that welcomed me and meant me good." And again, I am struck by the differences in our experiences. I loved school and I felt safe there.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Even though Shelley does no more than allude to these experiences when talking to his white colleagues (if the subject somehow arises), the price he paid is evident in his continued concerns about the emotional as well as physical safety of the UIUC campus for students of color. It is evident in his continued efforts to ensure necessary academic and social support services and non-discriminatory classrooms but otherwise allow the students to be treated like all other students. Research supports Shelley's insistence that white faulty and administrators treat black students as individuals (Feagin, 1992). Shelley has always focused on the differences in experience and preparation as separate from skin color and innate ability. And in 1998, when he complained during a television program that today's students have no sense of history, he was reminded by the former Black Student Association president that students paid a price in 1968 so today's students would not have to. This is a reasonable argument. However, when I encounter young women students who absolutely expect their gender not to be an issue or concern, I wonder how they can know so little history. Perhaps it is hard for those who fought so hard for change to recognize that young people perceive there is no longer a need to attack what the older generation believes is left undone.

Shelley is, I think, a fighter who many people do not recognize as such. Shelley clearly perceives his not carrying his staff identification card and forcing the campus bus drivers to call the police if they doubted his right to board as an act of defiance. Many people who know him (particularly whites), however, would characterize this as one of Shelley's charming idiosyncrasies. Shelley disarms people because he is generally in a good mood, likely to laugh, quick to note absurdities, share an anecdote, and exit a room leaving people chuckling. Consequently, Euro-Americans tend to view him as "safe" or as Kelley (1995) says, "a 'nice Negro' [which] has a lot to do with gender, and [his] peculiar form of 'left-feminist-funny-guy'

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

masculinity" (p. 301). A further dilemma of the "nice Negro" is that whites often feel free to tell jokes, make statements, or ask questions they would not dare mention to other blacks (Kelley, 1995). Grier and Cobbs (1968) argue that "the white community sees him as 'different' from his darker brothers and capable of being viewed as one of their own when such meets their convenience. The net effect is an alienation from his roots with no substitute available. He cannot go forward and he cannot go back" (pp. 151-152).

Being "safe" or "nice" does not keep Shelley from routinely challenging biased ideas or premises, no matter how tired he must get fighting the same battle over and over and over again. His great talent is his subtle ability to expose foolishness and ignorance for exactly what they are, quietly but pointedly. Shelley has spent most of his career working in a research university dominated by "neutral" language and "scientific inquiry." Stanfield (1993) argues that such claims to neutrality are the unacknowledged bias of the dominant language. I suspect Shelley is tired of such language and is rarely interested in talking about it, certainly not when he has no anonymity. Obviously the statements and questions have been memorable at times or he wouldn't recall conversations so clearly many years later. Shelley may not dwell on those conversations but they are one of the continuing prices he pays for being perceived as "safe," a price that his white colleagues never even think about or consider.

One of Shelley's ways of handling potentially uncomfortable discussions is to ask questions, a strategy he had adopted by 1969. It is not unusual for Shelley to ask someone "why do you say that?" or "what does that mean?" Nor is it unusual for him to comment "[Name] says....." and ask "what do you think of that idea?" Then he engages in a dialogue that is often punctuated by more questions and gets closer and closer to the heart of the matter. Sometimes his questions seem impossible to answer and eventually it becomes easier to answer

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Shelley that racism is the answer. I have fallen into that trap more than once. But he always shakes his head and responds "hmmm, I wonder." When he said during an interview that he has always rejected racism as an answer, preferring to think that people just are not bright, I finally came to realize that racism (or any other "ism") may indeed be a correct answer but is often too facile. Shelley, Feagin (1992), Grier and Cobbs (1968), Solorazano, Ceja and Yosso (2001), and Stanfield (1993, 1994) see racism as an expression of power rather than prejudice. Whites, on the other hand, who enjoy but often fail to acknowledge their privilege and power, are much quicker to define racism as prejudice.

Shelley does not suffer fools gladly. If someone asks him a stupid question about race, he is likely to respond with an equally outrageous remark that all but the truly naïve or bigoted recognize as an in-kind response to the question just asked. While his focus is always on the idea, not on the person, he seems, like most of us, to have an internal system for identifying people he is willing to spend time and energy on and those he does little more than acknowledge. I remember a colleague, who desperately wanted to be included in Shelley's inner circle, making repeated efforts to ingratiate himself with Shelley and realizing that this colleague had no idea that his efforts were in vain. Shelley is a master at putting on a blank expression that gives others no clue as to what he is thinking. Grier and Cobbs (1968) argue that blacks in the U.S. have always had to suppress any visible expression of their feelings as a matter of safety.

While we never talked explicitly about race, race was always implicitly present in our conversations. This failure to talk explicitly about race does not come as a surprise to me, based on my observation of Shelley. During our joint tenure on two committees, we talked together often of individuals who we perceived could "talk the talk" about diversity and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

multiculturalism but did not "walk the walk" in their actions. We often remarked that well-meaning people had not truly examined their notions of fairness or their (largely) unconscious biases. We deplored the application of different standards to women and minority job applicants that was apparent to us but rarely to a search committee. We lamented the use of the "qualified" as an adjective for women and minorities and the implication that all white males are qualified by virtue of their ethnicity and gender. As Shelley says, in this world "different" means "less than." And we talked about what whether it was possible to design programs that would help these same people critically examine their attitudes, their everyday speech, and their action. Generally, we ended by shaking our heads and agreeing that our task seemed hopeless. These discussions did not occur until after we had attended many meetings together and we each had passed the other's litmus test. Our conclusion was that it is difficult for people, even people of goodwill, to talk about race, especially across differences and that trust is a necessary precondition. Despite our mutual trust, however, Shelley and I have never talked about how race affects each of us. I do not know if this is because of our differences; I only know we have agreed it is a difficult topic.

But race is always there, even if we don't talk about it. And race always matters, even if we don't talk about it. During the interview and document analysis, I was reminded repeatedly how different our experiences have been, just because of the difference in skin color. These differences are evident when Shelley says folks did not leave his neighborhood because there was nowhere to go. The people I knew were free to move wherever they could afford to live. I recall the first African-American teacher in my school district, Taylor Thomas, who finally bought a house out in the country because he and his wife could not find an acceptable neighborhood to move into in town. I remember how unjust that situation seemed to me and my

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

friends. We knew our teacher well and respected him a great deal; we could not imagine anyone being unwilling to live in the same neighborhood. (Apparently none of us thought to confront our parents about these difficulties, however.)

Shelley gave me an article a journalism student who interviewed him wrote for a class assignment. In that article, the student wrote that Shelley recalled working on the cruise ships and being kept out of sight of the white customers (Klein, 1994). The crew quarters on those ships were cramped, dark, and uncomfortable. When Shelley learned last summer that I was taking a cruise (my first), he told me he would never get on a cruise ship again. I remember wondering about the mostly Indonesian and Filipino crew on the cruise ship I was on, whose qualifications appeared to be fluency in English and a willingness to sign a multi-year contract that permits visits home once a year. I noticed that the less fluent English speakers had the jobs that did not bring them into contact with the passengers. I toured the kitchen with its pristine stainless steel, and saw the kitchen crew that rarely saw the light of day. When I asked our waiter about the crew's quarters, I learned they are small, cramped, have no natural light but are "not too bad." I wonder what those who never see the light of day think. The crew works long hours with only short breaks so that the passengers can be well-fed and cared for; I could not help thinking about the human cost that ensured my enjoyment. I do not know a single colleague who even knew Shelley ever had a job on a cruise ship. The memories obviously are not good ones.

Although there were few African-Americans in my community, and only our junior high and high schools were integrated when I was a student, I saw, but rarely interacted with, African-Americans when I was a child. My parents were careful to teach my siblings and me to be respectful of and courteous to everyone and "the n-word" was as forbidden as any

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

profanity. Still, I remember traveling to Florida once as a child to visit a dying relative and being shocked beyond words and terribly, terribly upset to see the "whites only" and "colored only" signs on the drinking fountains and restroom doors and asking my parents why they were there. Their only answer was "that's the way it is here and there's nothing we can do" as they steered us towards the correct facilities. I wanted them to do something about it.

Shelley, like two of his predecessors as Dean of Students, Thomas Arkle Clark and Fred H. Turner, is part of the UIUC Student Affairs history and myths. While a few "old-timers" can still tell stories from personal experience with Dean Turner, Dean Clark is a note in histories of higher education. But Shelley is part of our current history, a history that is "before my time" for many of our younger colleagues and "old news" for many of our older colleagues. Over and over again, I have heard people say "Shelley did important work" as if his work was in 1968 but not 2001. It is as if the admission of 500 students in 1968 transformed the campus. This construction reflects the always implicit, and at times explicit, assumption that the case law and statutory changes of the 1950's and 1960's were a panacea. Those who hold such views absolve themselves of any responsibility for examining their own biases, their own privilege, and their supposedly race-neutral policies while they talk about multiculturalism and diversity. Believing themselves to be enlightened, they view Shelley as one of "us" although in fundamental ways, he, of course, is not "one of us."

Conclusion

Like Shelley, my reflections took me in directions I did not expect; nor did I expect the soul-searching that has accompanied writing this chapter. I am reminded once again how much Shelley reminds me of Taylor Thomas, the first (and only) African-American teacher I had in public school. Mr. Thomas was hired just before I started eighth grade, and my mother always

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

believed my friend Betsy and I had been assigned to his English and social studies classes because my father and her mother were on the school board. Otherwise, she believed it inconceivable he would have been assigned to the "college prep" students. Mr. Thomas was a gifted teacher, just as I imagine Shelley was. He cared about students, made himself available, and worked hard to make the work as interesting as possible. Mr. Thomas was about the same height as Shelley, dressed as impeccably, and carried himself in the same dignified way. Like Shelley, he used to tease us a lot in correct English. He was the first African-American most of us had interacted with and he appeared to be very willing to answer our questions. He had been raised in Champaign, attended and graduated from the University of Illinois with his teacher certification, and could not find a job. For two years he worked as a waiter in a sorority house and lived with his parents while he looked for a teaching job. Eighth grade was the year we learned that he and his wife could not find a house in either Champaign or Urbana. My friends and I had been largely shielded from the blatant racism then existing on campus and in the community so we were quite shocked and surprised. Even then, we subscribed to the notion that merit is its own reward without understanding that some people are never seen to have merit.

My parents were in the habit of inviting our teachers to dinner and I suggested we invite Mr. and Mrs. Thomas. My father, who was instrumental in hiring Mr. Thomas, certainly had a vested interest in finding out more about him. Although it didn't occur to me at the time, I am sure his coming to our house was not a secret, and indeed, sent a message my father must have wanted sent. Mr. Thomas was retained the following year and I went off to high school.

By my sophomore year in high school, Mr. Thomas had been transferred to the high school, and I was again enrolled in his classes. The Civil Rights Movement was gaining

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

momentum when I was in high school and Mr. Thomas was the only teacher who ever talked to us about it, but only if we raised the issue. Of course we had no idea how vulnerable a position we routinely put Mr. Thomas in with our questions. By then he was tenured, but Champaign-Urbana was still deeply entrenched in segregated schools and residential areas. In our senior year, Mr. Thomas was unanimously selected our class sponsor and we dedicated the yearbook to him. He was our special teacher. I do not believe we discounted the differences; I think we had learned to look beyond them and to understand that many of the stereotypes we had learned earlier did not apply to Mr. Thomas and probably didn't apply to lots of other blacks either.

Mr. Thomas and I were great friends until his death. I still remember vividly the evening we were having dinner together in a restaurant to celebrate his finally being promoted to assistant superintendent. He talked that night of his conviction that had he been white, the promotion would have come years earlier as he had always held more credentials than were necessary. Mr. Thomas also told me I was responsible for his success in the Urbana schools. I remember being dumbfounded and asking why in the world he would say that since I attributed his success to his extraordinary talent. He told me I was mistaken, that it was because I and a few other leaders had simply accepted him and treated him the same way we treated all our white teachers that he succeeded. I remember being stunned and overwhelmed and saying that no girl of 14 should ever have that kind of power over an adult's life. It was my first lesson about unearned privilege and one I have never forgotten.

Perhaps it was the superficial similarities between Shelley and Mr. Thomas that first interested me about Shelley. As I reflect on our interactions and interviews, I realize that the similarities are more than superficial. First and foremost, it seems likely that had Chancellor Peltason and President Henry not been very public in their support of Shelley and the work he

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

was doing, Shelley might well have stayed at UIUC only for the initial two year assignment. The Faculty Senate's opposition and skepticism was public. The detractors at the University included faculty who believed their research demonstrated whites' genetic racial superiority. Shelley had formidable foes, as well as some good allies among the faculty and staff.

Although Shelley's primary focus has always been on students of color, particularly African-American students, he, like Mr. Thomas, mentored white students as well. (Doubtless Mr. Thomas mentored the few black students in my high school, but that was not something I ever knew about.) It is Shelley's ability and willingness to work across race, to model acceptance of others for what they are, to demonstrate an ethic of caring, respect and high standards, that I feel has the most influential impact on white students. It is not possible for whites to have had a close relationship with a Clarence Shelley or Taylor Thomas and view every person of color stereotypically. Indeed, I am convinced that it is positive relationships that predispose white students to seek out other positive inter-racial relationships, a conclusion supported by research (Antonio, 1999; Gurin, 1998, Humphreys, 1998).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER 7

A LEGACY

Clarence Shelley was hired by UIUC in response to the Civil Rights Movement, the chancellor's commitment to change, and the assassination of Reverend Martin Luther King Jr. These events, combined with increasing societal willingness and commitment to provide equity in college access, led to Chancellor Peltason's commitment to admit 500 disadvantaged and minority students in fall 1968. UIUC, however, had few programs and services in place to assist and support the 586 SEOP students, whose high school preparation was deemed insufficient to assure their collegiate success. To prepare the campus for this group of latently talented students, the University hired Shelley shortly after the chancellor announced his plans. Apparently neither the University administration nor Shelley accurately assessed the enormity of the task that lay ahead. Shelley believed he would accomplish what needed to be done in two years and return to Detroit. Instead, in 1970 he resigned his position with the Detroit School Board, remaining at UIUC for the duration of his career. Although Shelley was assigned administrative positions with increased responsibility during his career, he is less interested in his titles than in his work - bringing about the transformation of the campus. Operating in a large, decentralized university, Shelley, the servant-leader, depended on persuasion and personal relationships to influence faculty and administrators who were often resistant to change.

Change

The interview and document analysis revealed that Shelley has two distinctive definitions for change: "different" and "transformation." This distinction is critical to the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

implications of this study. If change is defined as different, then change can be viewed as an event. The evidence seems clear that the UIUC campus has changed between 1968 and 2001. Alternatively, if change is defined as transformation, then change must be viewed as a process rather than an event. Since the transformation he hoped for in 1968 has not yet been achieved, Shelley's belief that "nothing has changed" is substantiated.

SEOP alumni returning to the UIUC campus in 1998 noted several differences after thirty years. Williamson (1998) identified the following changes which she attributes to the influence of 1960's and 1970's black student activism: the African-American Cultural Program, the Afro-American Studies program, the Central Black Student Union, the Congratulatory Ceremony, the Black Chorus and black student events at Homecoming and during Moms Weekend (p. 186). Additionally, the percentage of black faculty and students has risen since 1968, and the University has systematic student recruitment efforts and has committed to minority faculty recruitment and retention. The Office of Minority Student Affairs has a large staff that is actively involved in orientation, personal and academic counseling, assisting with the financial aid process, and other retention efforts.

Although he acknowledges the differences, Shelley sees little evidence of campus transformation at the end of his career. When he was recruited to UIUC, Shelley was aware the campus had been making plans to increase the black student enrollment, but the program "conceived in hope and born in haste" was not universally accepted. Indeed, Shelley believes that selective universities, including UIUC, opened their doors to previously excluded students because of internal student and external societal pressures, not because the faculty believed it was the right thing to do. Despite the students' success, Shelley is not convinced the UIUC faculty have ever believed in special admissions. He is disheartened by what he perceives to be

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

a widespread assumption among Euro-Americans that minority students are admitted to UIUC solely because of affirmative action, a belief that is clearly contrary to fact. Research documents the persistence of this erroneous belief as well as its negative effect on students of color (Bowen & Bok, 1998; Feagin, 1992; Solerzano, Ceja & Yosso, 2001).

UIUC was not the only selective university to change its admissions policies in the late 1960's or early 1970's. However, at UIUC the Chancellor made a unilateral decision to implement a special admissions policy rather than following the more typical process of seeking a campus consensus on change. It is likely that other institutions changed their admissions policies as a result of student initiatives or faculty consensus. A comparative study would inform the discussion of how transformation is or is not achieved. Research into the efforts of UIUC Latino/a and Asian-American students to achieve change would supplement Mr. Shelley's perceptions as to the level of transformation of the UIUC campus.

Leadership

As critical as Chancellor Peltason's 1968 decision to admit 500 disadvantaged and minority students was his decision that a special assistant should be hired to provide leadership to the faculty and staff responsible for teaching and housing those students. Initially, both Peltason and Shelley believed Shelley's leadership would be necessary for two years. By 1970, however, it was clear to both the work was unfinished. Shelley's temporary position became permanent and he remained at UIUC, quietly serving the institution throughout his career.

Greenleaf (1998) argues that the servant-leader is a gradualist who uses persuasion rather than positional authority, and has an understanding of his place in the institution that is based on knowledge of its history and myths. Shelley's decision to build personal relationships

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

and use persuasion rather than coercion to influence change is fundamental to his leadership and his effectiveness. Hoping to render the campus more hospitable to students of color, he made a conscious decision to work "in the trenches" rather than the top down by focusing his efforts on staff and faculty who had direct student contact. Shelley believes his decision to begin his work "in the trenches" was critical to the success of the SEOP program and coalition building among faculty and staff. Cohen and March (1986/2000) argue that unobtrusive leaders have greater impact than visibility, affect many parts of the organization in small ways, and stay active without organizational attention (p. 26).

Yet Shelley had uncommon access to and personal contact with UIUC presidents and chancellors throughout his career. Again eschewing confrontation, argumentation, and coercion, Shelley relied on persuasion and personal relationships. Greenleaf (1998) argues that all institutions need able persuaders whose perspective, judgment, and integrity others in the institution come to trust over time. Shelley is modest about his influence and impact on faculty, staff, and students. However, those who spoke at Shelley's retirement reception left no doubt in listeners' minds that his influence has great depth and breadth.

To inform Shelley's beliefs about his leadership and impact, future researchers could interview the surviving chancellors and presidents under whom he served. A comparative study of Shelley and others who held similar positions at comparable institutions would also inform the discussion.

Continuing the Work

Contrary to his belief in 1968, Shelley now believes that change (transformation) is a process, not an event. In order to continue the transformation process at UIUC, senior campus

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

administrators must be visibly committed to the process. In a loosely coupled educational organization where actors' intentions and actions may differ (Weick, 1976/2000), administrators must identify deans and department heads who have successfully recruited and retained diverse faculty to serve as mentors for their colleagues. All administrators should be especially attentive to the experiences students, faculty and staff of color have in their units and remediate problems swiftly and effectively. While it continues its efforts to recruit outstanding students and faculty, the administration take active steps to counter the archaic notion that individuals of color are admitted or hired solely because of affirmative action. UIUC should be a leader in the efforts to rid itself of the vestiges of racism. At UIUC, it should be a "matter of supreme indifference" what color someone's skin is.

Lasting Influence

Seen within a historical context, the opening of selective colleges' doors to minorities and women in the 1960's and 1970's was the continuation of a pattern of constantly but erratically expanding access. Shelley's belief that his era represented a continuation of the land-grant tradition gave meaning to his often difficult and lonely work at UIUC. The history of American higher education is replete with backlash against the admission of previously excluded students, with commentators yearning for the "good old days" or "golden age" of college education. Thus far, the clock has not been turned backward. In a 1995 speech, former Chancellor Peltason (then President Emeritus, University of California) made the following remarks about change:

> We did make some revolutionary changes in the 1960s however, which in my judgment substantially strengthened our colleges and universities.
>
> We abandoned segregation in the South and all over the United States. Over the next three decades we started to put into place what came to be called affirmative

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> action. We concluded that after centuries of discrimination it was not enough merely to stop discrimination and to assume that minorities and women would be able to walk through the doors of opportunity.
>
> Programs such as Project 500 changed the character of our universities forever. Three decades later we may argue about which tools to use, but there is no argument about the need to act vigorously—or if you will affirmatively—to see to it that minorities are brought into the mainstream of higher education. (p. 19)

Although Shelley was instrumental in the success of the Special Educational Opportunities Program, he was reliant on the assistance and support of others. However, within the context of his relationships with students, faculty, and staff, Shelley's influence is unparalleled. His relationships are deep, long-lasting, and interconnected in ways most people just dream about. Faculty and staff who learned to open their minds, students who learned to appreciate themselves and others, community members who had a friend on campus, and all those who saw him regularly or irregularly remember Shelley. For Shelley is at heart a teacher and a teacher never knows how far his influence will reach.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

REFERENCES

Adarand Constructors v. Pena. 115 S. Ct. 2097 (1995)

Alger. J. R. (1997, January/February). The educational value of diversity. *Academe* [Electronic version]. Retrieved April 3, 2002 from http://www.aaup.org/Issues/AffirmativeAction/aadivart.htm

American Council on Education. (1999). *Making the case for affirmative action in higher education* [Electronic version]. Retrieved January 15, 2002 from http:/www.acenet.edu/bookstore/descriptions/making_the_case/legal/digest.html

Andersen, M. L. (1993). Studying across difference: Race. class. and gender in qualitative research. In John H. Stanfield II & Rutledge M. Dennis (Eds.). *Race and ethnicity in research methods* (pp. 39-52). Newbury Park. CA: SAGE Publications. Inc.

Anderson. J. D. (1988). *The education of blacks in the south. 1860-1935.* Chapel Hill. NC: The University of North Carolina Press.

Antonio, A. L. (1999). Racial diversity and friendship groups in college: What the research tells us. *Diversity Digest* [Electronic version]. Retrieved November 11. 2001 from http://www.diversityweb.org/Digest/Sm99/research.html

Astin. A. W. (1993). *What matters in college: Four critical years revisited.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Astin, A. W., Astin, H. S., Bayer. A. E. & Bisconti. A. S. (1975). *The power of protest.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bill would deny most federal aid to colleges that take affirmative action. (1998, March 20). *The Chronicle of Higher Education* [Electronic version]. Retrieved February 25. 2002 from http://chronicle.com/che-data/articles.dir/art-44.dir/issue-28.dir/ 28a03302.htm

Bowen. W. G., & Bok. D. (1998). *The shape of the river: Long-term consequences o considering race in college and university admissions.* Princeton. NJ: Princeton University Press.

Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka. Kansas. 347 U. S. 483 (1954)

Brown, M. C. II (2000). Prophets of power in the professoriate: A sermon for cultural workers. In M. Christopher Brown, II and James Earl Davis (Eds.), *Black sons to black mothers: Compliments, critiques, and challenges for cultural workers in education* (pp. 219-234). New York: Peter Lang.

Buchanan, P. J. (1998, May 29). *Spiro Agnew: Prophet without honor* [Electronic version]. Retrieved February 11, 2002 from http://www.buchana.org/pa-98-0529.html

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Caldwell, C. (Producer). (1998, September 9) *Thirty Year Anniversary of Project 500* [Television broadcast]. Urbana, IL: WILL Public Television.

Carpenter, J. J. (1975). *The Illini Union sit-in of September 9-10, 1968 and why it happened.* Unpublished master's thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana-Champaign, Illinois.

Carter, S. L. (1991). *Reflections of an affirmative action baby.* New York: BasicBooks.

Charmaz, K. & Mitchell, R. G., Jr. (1997). The myth of silent authorship: Self, substance, and style in ethnographic writing. In Rosanna Hertz (Ed.), *Reflexivity and voice* (pp. 193-215). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Cohen, M. D. & March, J. G. (2000). Leadership in an organized anarchy. In M. Christopher Brown II (Ed.), *Organization and governance in higher education* (pp. 36-49). Boston: Pearson Custom Publishing.

Corbin, J. & Strauss, A. (1990). Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons and evaluative criteria. *Qualitative Sociology*, 13 (1), 3-21.

Denzin, N. K. (1994). The art and politics of interpretation. In Norman K. Denzin & Yvonna S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Duryea, E. D. (2000). Evolution of university organization. In M. Christopher Brown II (Ed.), *Organization and governance in higher education* (pp. 182-202). Boston: Pearson Custom Publishing.

English, F. W. (2000). A critical analysis of Sara Lawrence-Lightfoot's *portraiture* as a method of educational research. *Educational Researcher*, 29 (7), 21-26.

Facio, E. (1993). Ethnography as personal experience. In John H. Stanfield II & Rutledge M. Dennis (Eds.), *Race and ethnicity in research methods* (pp. 75-91). Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Feagin, J. R. (1992). Discrimination against black students in white colleges. *Journal of Black Studies*, 22 (4), 546-578.

Florida ex rel. Hawkins v. Board of Control, 350 U. S. 413 (1956)

Gabelnick, F. (2002). *Leading institutional transformation: The architecture of change.* Manuscript in preparation.

Geertz, C. (1988). *Works and lives: The anthropologist as author.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Geiger, R. L. (1986). *To advance knowledge: The growth of American research universities, 1900-1940.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Gladieux, L. E. and Hauptman, A. M. (1995). *The college aid quandary: Access, quality, and the federal role.* Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution/The College Board.

Gose, B. (2002, March 8). Civil-rights nominee faces tough grilling in Senate confirmation hearing. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.*

Gratz et al. v. Bollinger et al., 309 F.3d 329 (2001).

Green, K. (2002, March 21). Shelley honored with Chancellor's Medallion. *Inside Illinois.*

Greenleaf, R. K. (1998). Education and maturity. In Larry C. Spears [Ed.], *The power of servant-leadership* (pp. 61-76). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1998). Have you a dream deferred? In Larry C. Spears [Ed.], *The power of servant-leadership* (pp. 93-110). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1998). The leadership crisis. In Larry C. Spears [Ed.], *The power of servant-leadership* (pp. 77-92). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1998). My debt to E.B. White. In Larry C. Spears [Ed.], *The power of servant-leadership* (pp. 235-262). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1998). Old age: The ultimate test of spirit. In Larry C. Spears [Ed.], *The power of servant-leadership* (pp.263-278). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1998). Servant: Retrospect and prospect. The ultimate test of spirit. In Larry C. Spears [Ed.], *The power of servant-leadership* (pp.17-60). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Grier, W. H. & Cobbs, P. M. (1968). *Black Rage.* New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Grutter et al. v. Bollinger et al., 288 F.3d 732 (2002)

Gurin, P. (1999). Expert report. *Gratz et al. v. Bollinger et al; Grutter et al. v. Bollinger et al.* [Electronic version]. Retrieved November 8, 2001 from http://www.umich.edu/~urel/admissions/legal/expert/gurintoc.html

Healy, P. (1996, March 15). House panel agrees to ban federal affirmative action [Electronic version]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Article 27a03402. Retrieved February 25, 2002 from http://chronicle.com/che-data/articles/dir/art-42.dir/issue-27.dir/27a03402.htm

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Hertz, R. (1997). Introduction: Reflexivity and voice. In Rosanna Hertz (Ed.), *Reflexivity and voice* (pp. vii-xviii). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Hopwood v. Texas, 78 F.3d 932 (5th Cir. 1996)

Horowitz, H. L. (1987). *Campus life: Undergraduate cultures from the end of the eighteenth century to the present.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Humphreys, D. (1998). *Campus diversity and student self-segregation: separating myths from facts* [Electronic version]. Retrieved November 1, 2001 from http://www.diversityweb.org/Leadersguide/SED/studeseg.html

Hurtado, S. (2000). The campus racial climate: Contexts of conflict. In M. Christopher Brown II (Ed.). *Organization and governance in higher education* (pp. 182-202). Boston: Pearson Custom Publishing.

Jaschik, S. (1995, June 2). "No" on black scholarships: U.S. supreme court won't review ruling that struck down race-exclusive awards [Electronic version]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* Article 38a02501. Retrieved February 25, 2002 from http:// chronicle.com/che-data/articles.dir/art-41.dir/issue-38.38a02501.htm

Jeffries, M. (1996). *Annual report 1995-1996: Office of Minority Student Affairs, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.*

Johnson v. Board of Regents, 263 F.3d 1234 (2001)

Johnson, E. L. (1997). Misconceptions about early land-grant colleges. In Lester F. Goodchild & Harold S. Wechsler (Eds.). *The history of higher education* (2nd Ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster Custom Publishing.

Johnson, L. B. (1964, May 22). *The Great Society* [Electronic version]. Retrieved February 11, 2002 from http://www.tamu.edu/scom/pres/speeches/lbjgreat.html

Kaplin, W. A. & Lee, B. A. (1997). *A legal guide for student affairs professionals: Adapted from the law of higher education (3rd ed.).* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Kelley, R. D. G. (1995). Confessions of a nice Negro, or why I shaved my head. In Don Belton (Ed.). *Speak my name: Black men on masculinity and the American dream* (pp. 21-26).

Kennedy, J. F. (1963, June 11). *Civil rights message* [Electronic version]. Retrieved February 15, 2002 from http://www.tamu.edu/scom/pres/speeches/jfkcivil.html

Klein, J. (1994). Shelley. Unpublished manuscript.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Kuh, G. D. & Whitt, E. J. (2000). Culture in American colleges and universities. In M. Christopher Brown II (Ed.). *Organization and governance in higher education* (pp. 160-169). Boston: Pearson Custom Publishing.

Lawrence-Lightfoot, S. & Davis, J. H. (1997). *The art and science of portraiture.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Levin, S. (1999). Social psychological evidence on race and racism. In Mitchell Chang, Daria Witt, James Jones & Kenji Hakuta (Eds.). *A report of the AERA panel on racial dynamics in colleges and universities* [Electronic version]. Retrieved March 15, 2002 from http://www.stanford.edu/~hakuta/Race in Higher Education.html

Levine, D. O. (1986). *The American college and the culture of aspiration, 1915-1940.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Lucas, C. J. (1994). *American higher education: A history.* New York: St. Martin's Griffin.

Lugg, C. A. (1996). *For God and country: Conservatism and American school policy.* New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

McLaurin v. Oklahoma, 339 U.S. 637 (1950)

Milem, J. F. (1999). The educational benefits of diversity: evidence from multiple sectors. In Mitchell Chang, Daria Witt, James Jones & Kenji Hakuta (Eds.). *A report of the AERA panel on racial dynamics in colleges and universities* [Electronic version]. Retrieved March 15, 2002 from http://www.stanford.edu/~hakuta/Race in Higher Education.html

Mishler, E. G. (1986). *Research interviewing: Context and narrative.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Neal, M. A. (2002, March 8). Soul babies on ice. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.*

Peltason, J. W. (1995). Reactionary thoughts of a revolutionary. *Seventeenth David Dodds Henry Lecture.* Urbana-Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Peterson, M.W. & Spencer, M. G. (2000). Understanding academic culture and climate. In M. Christopher Brown II (Ed.). *Organization and governance in higher education* (pp. 170-181). Boston: Pearson Custom Publishing.

Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 U.S. 537 (1896)

Podbersky v. Kirwan, 38 F.3d 147 (4th Cir. 1994)

Regents of the University of California v. Bakke, 438 U.S. 265 (1978)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Schmidt, P. (1998, March 13). State legislatures show little enthusiasm for measures to end racial preferences. *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* Article 27a04401. Retrieved February 25, 2002 from http://chronicle.com/che-data/articles.dir/art-44.dir/issue-27.dir/27a04401.htm

Schmidt, P. (2001, November 2). Full appeals court will consider U. of Michigan affirmative-action case [Electronic version]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* Article 10a03201. Retrieved February 25, 2002 from http://chronicle.com/weekly/ v48/i10/10a03201.htm

Shelley, C. (1968). *Commencement Address.* Northeastern High School, Detroit, MI.

Shelley, C. (1969). *The Black Student on the White Campus: His On-Campus Culture.* Paper presented at the Consultation Workshops on Student Personnel Work and Response to Cultural Difference sponsored by The American College Personnel Association, San Francisco, CA and Atlanta, GA

Shelley, C. (1969). *Campus Adjustment for the Disadvantaged Student.* Paper presented at the American Personnel and Guidance Association Convention: Las Vegas, NV.

Shelley, C. (1969). *A Crown Don't Make No King.* Paper presented at the Conference of College Composition and Communication of the National Council of Teachers of English, Miami, FL.

Shelley, C. (1969). *A Focus for Urban Studies.* Paper presented at the Seminar on Urban Studies at Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.

Shelley, C. (1969). *Implementing Special Educational Programs at Selective Universities.* Unpublished manuscript.

Shelley, C. (1969). *Life Between a Rock and a Hard Place or Confessions of a Nigger in Residence.* Paper presented at the Illinois Association of College Admissions Counselors Model Summer Institute of Guiding the College Bound Student at Bradley University, Peoria, IL.

Shelley, C. (1970). *Academic Integrity in Times of Change.* Paper presented at the University of Illinois Women's Club, Urbana-Champaign, IL.

Shelley, C. (1970). *A Realistic Look at the Past Two Years' Experience.* Paper presented at the Higher Education Executive Associates Institute on Counseling and Student Development Programs for Directors and Counselors in Black Student Programs, Detroit, MI.

Shelley, C. (1971). *Higher Education and the Black Student.* Paper presented at the Black Studies Symposium at Denison University, Granville, OH.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Shelley, C. (1971). *Student Personnel Services and Institutional Reform: Implications for Minority Students in Higher Education*. Paper presented at the Conference on Financing Higher Education for Minority Students at Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.

Shelley, C. (1971). *The University: Must Everyone be the Same*. Paper presented at the YMCA-YWCA Friday Forum at University YMCA, Champaign, IL.

Shelley, C. (1973). *Educational Opportunities Programs: A Reevaluation*. Paper presented at the Educational Testing Service, Princeton, NJ.

Shelley, C. (1973). *The Use of Minority Students as Counselor Helpers*. American Personnel and Guidance Association Midwest Regional Convention, St. Louis, MO.

Shelley, C. (1976). *Current Research on the Characteristics of Non-Traditional Students and the Implications for Financial Aids Administrators*. Paper presented at the Spring Retreat, Indiana Association of Financial Aid Administrators, Marshall, IN.

Shelley, C. (1976). *An Historical Survey of TRIO Programs*. Paper presented at the Mid-America Association of Educational Opportunities Program Personnel, Lake Geneva, WI.

Shelley, C. (1977). *Assessing the Social, Psychological and Academic Needs of Black Students.* Paper presented at the Blacks in Higher Education Second National Conference, National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education, Washington, DC.

Shelley, C. (1977). *Presentation at the Third Pastoral Anniversary Banquet Honoring the Reverend Larry C. Simmons, Monument of Hope Church*. Paper presented at the Monument of Hope Church Anniversary Banquet, Urbana, IL.

Shelley, C. (1979). *A Bible, a Mirror and a Bottle of Hot Sauce*. Paper presented at the Minority Student Orientation Program, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO.

Shelley, C. (1981). *Robert A. Waller Scholarship Banquet* Paper presented at the Waller Scholarship Banquet, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, IL.

Shelley, C. (1984). *Serving Two Masters*. Paper presented at the Midwest Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, Dearborn, MI.

Shelley, C. (1988). *Untitled*. Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, IL.

Shelley, C. (1999). *Untitled*.

Shelley, C. (n.d.). *Untitled*.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Sidel, R. (1994). *Battling bias: The struggle for identity and community on college campuses.* New York: Viking.

Smith v. University of Washington, 194 F.3d 1045 (1999); 233 f. ed 1188 (2000)

Solomon, B. M. (1985). *In the company of educated women: A history of women and higher education in America.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Solorzano, D., Ceja, M. & Yosso, T. (2001). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate: The experiences of African American college students. *Journal of Negro Education,* 69 (1/2) pp. 60-73.

Spears, L. C. (1998). Introduction. In Larry C. Spears [Ed.]. *The power of servant-leadership* (pp.1-16). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Stanfield, J. H. II (1993). Epistemological considerations. In John H. Stanfield II & Rutledge M. Dennis (Eds.), *Race and ethnicity in research methods* (pp. 16-38). Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Stanfield, J. H. II (1993). Methodological reflections: an introduction. In John H. Stanfield II & Rutledge M. Dennis (Eds.), *Race and ethnicity in research methods* (pp. 3-15). Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Stanfield, J. H. II (1994). Ethnic modeling in qualitative research. In Norman K. Denzin & Yvonna S. Lincoln (Eds.). *Handbook of qualitative research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Steele, C. (1999). Expert Report. *Gratz et al. v. Bollinger et al; Grutter et al. v. Bollinger et al.* [Electronic version]. Retrieved February 1, 2002 from http://www.umich.edu/~urel/admissions/legal/expert/steele.html

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1994). Grounded theory methodology: an overview. In Norman K. Denzin & Yvonna S. Lincoln (Eds.). *Handbook of qualitative research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Student Affairs (Producer). (2002). *A Celebration of Clarence Shelley: Retirement reception* [Videotape]. (Available from Student Affairs, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Swanlund Administration Building, 601 East John Street, Champaign, IL 61820)

Sweatt v. Painter, 399 U.S. 629 (1950)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Trent, W. T. (1991). Student affirmative action in higher education: Addressing underrepresentation. In Philip G. Altbach and Kofi Lomotey (Eds.), *The racial crisis in American higher education* (pp. 107-134). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

University of Illinois Office of Admissions (2000). *Fall 2000 final enrollment figures.* Urbana-Champaign, IL: University of Illinois.

University of Illinois Office of Equal Opportunity and Access (2002). *A report on the participation and success of underrepresented students and staff, 09/99.* Retrieved April 2, 2002 from http://www.eoa.uiuc.edu/admin_section.html

University of Illinois Office of Admissions (2000). *Historical Enrollment Figures.* Urbana-Champaign, IL: University of Illinois.

University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign Senate (2002). *The senate.* Retrieved April 2,2002 from http://www.uiuc.edu/providers/senate

Vanourek, R. A. (1995). Servant-leadership and the future. In Larry Spears (Ed.), *Reflections on leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's theory of servant-leadership influenced today's top management thinkers* (pp. 298-307). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Veysey, L. R. (1965). *The emergence of the American university.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Weick, K. E. (2000). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. In M. Christopher Brown, II (Ed.). *Organizaiton and governance in higher education* (pp. 36-49). Boston: Pearson Custom Publishing.

White, R. (1998). *Remembering Anagran: Storytelling in a family's past.* New York: Hill and Wang.

Wightman, L. F. (1999). Standardized testing and equal access: A tutorial. In Mitchell Chang, Daria Witt, James Jones & Kenji Hakuta (Eds.). *A report of the AERA panel on racial dynamics in colleges and universities* [Electronic version]. Retrieved March 15, 2002 from http://www.stanford.edu/~hakuta/Race in Higher Education.html

Williams, P. L. Jr. (2000). *A study of the desegregation plan of Urbana School District 116 elementary schools: From the beginning of implementation to the present.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana-Champaign, Illinois.

Williamson, J. A. (1998). *"We hope for nothing: We demand everything:" Black students at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1965-1975.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana-Champaign, Illinois.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

VITA

Abigail Brookens Broga, a native of Illinois, attended Knox College for three years and later transferred to the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC) where she earned a bachelor's degree in social studies education in 1972. After substitute teaching, she became a full-time research assistant investigating infant visual memory. She and her family spent two years in New Jersey where she worked at the County College of Morris. Following their return to Illinois, she began a second career at UIUC in Student Affairs.

In June 1990, she joined the Office of the Dean of Students, where she serves as an Assistant Dean. She earned a master's degree from UIUC in educational policy studies in 1995. Her duties include counseling students, serving as an on-call Emergency Dean, and coordinating office communications and web pages. She plans to continue her administrative career for several more years and hopes to obtain an adjunct faculty appointment.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.