**The fervor for DEI** was ramped in 2018 and even the AAAS was a heavy believer.    The focus being so much on quotas and bias forgot the clear distinction in how different boys and girls are even at an earlier age.  To overlook the early education and cultural factors with the interest of having more qualified applicants, in favor of bias hiring and admissions is doomed to fail in the end.

Klawe was hired in the early days and was intent on diversity first with gender and later with all minorities. Heather MacDonald goes deep into the biases and how they were intended to fix a series of problems by creating others.  Merit lost out in the process across the board, including STEM.  In the end you punish the society and the participant in STEM, from research to new companies in order to have some diversity/equity for what reason?  It makes no sense, and HMC was the prisoner in this process.

[Publication Search - Harvey Mudd College - Acalog ACMS™ (hmc.edu)](https://catalog.hmc.edu/search_advanced.php?cur_cat_oid=18&search_database=Search&search_db=Search&cpage=1&ecpage=1&ppage=1&spage=1&tpage=1&location=33&filter%5Bkeyword%5D=HMC+2020+Society) is the result of HMC 2020 Society

The goal of this “HMC 2020 Society” was to re-make HMC into “a gathering ground for individuals passionate about both science and social justice”

The number of Deans, Assoc/Asst Deans, VPs, Asst VPs, Directors, Assoc/Asst Directors, and Managers in the Dept of Student Affairs is greater than the number of professors in five of the seven academic departments. The Department of Humanities, Social Sciences, and the Arts (HSA) is larger than at least half of the STEM departments. Why?

Several other statements in this 2006 “Breaking the Mudd Bubble” tract are also interesting. It ostensibly rejected “the concept of a politically or religiously affiliated HMC”. Religiously affiliated?  It also affirmed that “no actions should be taken to coerce currently apathetic students to act on the ideals of social responsibility and global engagement”.  So much for viewpoint diversity.  So much for students thinking for themselves. **In fairness, Klawe apparently brought in outside diversity/social justice experts and advocates to help make her case with trustees, faculty, staff, students, and alumni - in the end earning support for her policies and priorities.**

[Identity Politics Is Harming the Sciences | Water Downed Requirements (city-journal.org)](https://www.city-journal.org/html/how-identity-politics-harming-sciences-15826.html) Heather MacDonald

**I**dentity politics has engulfed the humanities and social sciences on American campuses; now it is taking over the hard sciences. The STEM fields—science, technology, engineering, and math—are under attack for being insufficiently “diverse.” The pressure to increase the representation of females, blacks, and Hispanics comes from the federal government, university administrators, and scientific societies themselves. That pressure is changing how science is taught and how scientific qualifications are evaluated. The results will be disastrous for scientific innovation and for American competitiveness.

**A** scientist at UCLA reports: “All across the country the big question now in STEM is: how can we promote more women and minorities by ‘changing’ (i.e., lowering) the requirements we had previously set for graduate level study?” Mathematical problem-solving is being deemphasized in favor of more qualitative group projects; the pace of undergraduate physics education is being slowed down so that no one gets left behind.

The National Science Foundation (NSF), a federal agency that funds university research, is consumed by diversity ideology. Progress in science, it argues, requires a “diverse STEM workforce.” Programs to boost diversity in STEM pour forth from its coffers in wild abundance. The NSF jump-started the implicit-bias industry in the 1990s by underwriting the development of the implicit association test (IAT). (The IAT purports to reveal a subject’s unconscious biases by measuring the speed with which he associates minority faces with positive or negative words; see “[Are We All Unconscious Racists?](https://www.city-journal.org/html/are-we-all-unconscious-racists-15487.html),” Autumn 2017.)  Since then, the NSF has continued to dump millions of dollars into implicit-bias activism.  In July 2017, it awarded $1 million to the University of New Hampshire and two other institutions to develop a “bias-awareness intervention tool.”  Another $2 million that same month went to the Department of Aerospace Engineering at Texas A&M University to “remediate microaggressions and implicit biases” in engineering classrooms.

The major scientific societies push the idea that implicit bias is impeding the careers of otherwise competitive scientists. In February 2018, **Erin Cech presented preliminary findings from the NSF intersectionality study at the American Association for the Advancement of Science annual meeting; naturally, those results showed “systemic anti-LGBTQ bias within STEM industry and academia.” Another AAAS session addressed how the “hierarchical nature” of science exacerbates gender bias and stereotypes and called for the “equal representation of women” across STEM.**

“Diversity” is now an explicit job qualification in the STEM fields. A current job listing for a lecturer in biology at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst announces that because diversity is “critical to the university’s goals of achieving excellence in all areas,” the biology department “holistically” assesses applicants and “favorably considers experiences overcoming barriers”—experiences assumed to be universal among URMs. The University of California at San Diego physics department advertised an assistant-professor position several years ago with a “specific emphasis on contributions to diversity,” such as a candidate’s “awareness of inequities faced by underrepresented groups.” Social-justice concerns apparently trump the quest to solve the mystery of dark energy. All five candidates on UC San Diego’s short list were females, leading one male candidate with a specialty in extragalactic physics to wonder why the school had even solicited applications from Asian and white men.

A network of so-called **teaching and learning centers at universities across the country is seeking to make science classrooms more “inclusive” by changing pedagogy and expectations for student learning.** The STEM faculty is too white, male, and heteronormative, according to these centers, making it hard for females, blacks, Hispanics, and the LGBTQ population to learn. Lecturing and objective exams should be de- emphasized in favor of “culturally sensitive pedagogies that play close attention to students’ social identities,” in the words of the Association of American Colleges and Universities. STEM teaching should be more “open- than closed-ended,” more “reflective than prescriptive,” according to the association. At the University of Michigan, the Women in Science and Engineering (WISE) program collaborates with the Center for Learning and Teaching to develop “deliberately inclusive and equitable approaches to syllabus design, writing assignments, grading, and discussion.” Yale has created a special undergraduate laboratory course, with funding from the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, that aims to enhance URM students’ “feelings of identifying as a scientist.” It does so by being “non-prescriptive” in what students’ research; they develop their own research questions. But “feelings” are only going to get you so far without mastery of the building blocks of scientific knowledge.

Grading on a curve is another vilified practice for those interested in building “inclusive” STEM classrooms. The only surprising aspect of that vilification is that it acknowledges one of the most self-defeating aspects of black and Hispanic culture: the stigma against “acting white.

When it comes to URMs, math deficits show up at the earliest ages. It is only there where the achievement gap can be overcome, through more rigorous, structured classrooms and through a change in family culture to put a high premium on academic achievement. The institutional response to the achievement gap, however, is racial preferences.

Traditionally, individuals who score well in both the math and verbal domains are less likely to pursue a STEM career. Moreover, females on average are more interested in people-centered rather than abstract work, which helps explain why females account for 75 percent of health-care-related workers but only 14 percent of engineering workers and 25 percent of computer workers.

Editor: These events in 2017 began much earlier.  I wonder what drove them to hire Klawe?  Simply put her path led to the 2017 uprising and the watering down the need for excellence.   She was hired in 2006, and what happened by 2017 12 years later was a push down of the need to recruit students passionate about STEM.  Instead, they had an overabundance of student activists who were not that passionate about STEM to some level.  If one is intense about STEM and excellence then gender does not matter.   It would seem that early in 2000 that model was given up in favor of a diversity model.  Breaking the Mudd bubble as Bob put it. The article below was given as proof that the transition had been underway for some time.

Editor: Are there any alums from that period of 2010 to 2017 that could offer insights?     It strikes me that having achieved gender parity, Klawe was intent on doing the full minority equity model.  Interesting enough that this timing is common in various places from USD to Boise State.

Even Harvey Mudd, a Math and Science College, Has Surrendered to the Social Justice Movement

by [Alice B. Lloyd, Staff Writer](https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/author/alice-b-lloyd)

 | April 20, 2017 10:35 AM

[Even Harvey Mudd, a Math and Science College, Has Surrendered to the Social Justice Movement | Washington Examiner](https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/weekly-standard/even-harvey-mudd-a-math-and-science-college-has-surrendered-to-the-social-justice-movement)

An excerpt:

There are those who thrill at the thought of Harvey Mudd's tripping over itself in a rush to diversify the student body, noting that the original model, made "for white men," worked just fine for a happy half century—until it had to be altered, to accommodate the unqualified. But to mourn the patriarchy is to overlook an even more modern catalyst for students' current freakout than the overdue fallout from counting by race and sex. In the leaked report, professors complain of "coddled" students not impelled by a passion for science but staring out dead-eyed awaiting instruction. One said, "There's a question about ability vs. motivation. The demographics of our students have changed over time. I feel like our students are not as sold on a discipline in college. They come here and say, 'I'll do what they tell me.' They're not interested in science body and soul, and they don't want to immerse themselves." Math and science for math and science's sake do not grip them as they once did: These kids need a higher, socially-engaged reason to conduct whatever project.