New American

Written by **R. Cort Kirkwood** on April 22, 2024

Report: UCLA Med School DEI Chief Plagiarized Doctoral Thesis

The plagiarism plague has infected UCLA Medical School.

Yet again, a top diversity official has been revealed as a literary thief. This time, reported the *City Journal's* Christopher Rufo and Daily Wire's Luke Rosiak, the culprit is Natalie J. Perry, who leads the university's diversity, equity, and inclusion program called "Cultural North Star" at the med school.

The writers found that Perry plagiarized major portions of her doctoral dissertation.

jurgenfr/iStock/Getty Images Plus

The Plagiarism

Noting that med students "were subjected to lessons on 'Indigenous womxn' and 'two-spirits,'" and that "future doctors had to take a class on 'structural racism,'" the writers concluded that "Perry's academic career is based on fraud."

Their analysis of her dissertation, *Faculty Perceptions of Diversity at a Highly Selective Research-Intensive University*, showed it was riddled with "the worst sort of plagiarism, reproducing large swaths of text directly from several other authors, without proper citations."

The writers say the literary theft from 10 other papers suggests that Perry is unethical and incompetent.

"In key portions of her text, she copied almost every paragraph from other sources without attribution," they wrote. "She fails even to mention at least four of the ten plagiarized papers anywhere in her dissertation."

Perry's opening three pages "suggest that she did not even bother to read beyond the first page of papers from which she stole," Rufo and Rosiak wrote:

> Her dissertation's second sentence reproduces verbatim part of a sentence on the first page of a paper by Adrianna Kezar, Peter Eckel, Melissa Contreras-McGavin, and Stephen John Quaye. Her third paragraph, without citation, lifts more than 100 words from the first page of a paper by Angela Locks, Sylvia Hurtado, Nicholas Bowman, and Leticia Oseguera.

Perry pp. 1-3, with actual plagiarized sources identified to the right

Introduction

Diversity has been a buzzword in higher education for over 30 years (Chang, Witt, Jones & Hakuta, 2003).During this time, America's colleges and universities have made determined efforts to create diverse campuses in which individuals from different backgrounds (e.g., race, gender, socioeconomic status) can be successful.

Copied from: Adrianna Kezar; Peter Eckel; Melissa Contreras-McGavin; Stephen John Quaye, Creating a web of support: an important leadership strategy for advancing campus diversity (2007)

This is done in an effort to create an environment conducive to the cognitive, social, and developmental skills of its students, faculty, and staff. This effort is necessary so that all individuals feel comfortable when living and working in an increasingly diverse world–both at the university and beyond (Astin, 1993; Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Kezar, 2007).

To enhance our understanding of the outcomes of institutional diversity strategies, it is important to discuss the issues and concerns surrounding diversity in higher education, the importance of diversity in higher education, and the perceptions of these diversity strategies. To reduce the discrimination against individuals from different backgrounds, colleges and universities need to take affirmative steps in providing equal access to higher education (Gurin, 1999). Educators have argued that affirmative action policies were justified because they ensured the creation of the racially and ethnically diverse student bodies essential to providing the best possible educational environment for students, white and minority alike. These benefits were extensively debated in the court system. In the Regents of University of California v. Bakke [438 U.S. 265, (1978)] the court acknowledged that a racially diverse student body expanded and encouraged a range of viewpoints that would contribute to a robust educational environment.

However in June 2003, the U.S. Supreme Court's ruling in Gratz v. Bollinger struck down the mechanism the University of Michigan had used to achieve a diverse student body among undergraduates but supported the educative value of diversity in both this case and Grutter v. Bollinger. This case affirmed the importance of race in higher education and reinforced the expectation that elite institutions have a responsibility to train their students to become leaders across all segments of society. Most importantly, these rulings affirmed that the cadre of future leaders should be diverse and that institutional initiatives to educate a diverse student body should reflect the centrality of diversity to key educational goals and outcomes.

Copied from: Locks, Angela M; Hurtado, Sylvia; Bowman, Nicholas A; Oseguera, Leticia, Extending Notions of Campus Climate and Diversity to Students' Transition to College (2008)

Researchers have identified the following educational benefits associated with diversity in higher education: higher levels of interaction among students from different backgrounds, the development of a greater range of ideas and exposure to new viewpoints, increased self-confidence, emerging new areas of research and scholarship, greater cultural awareness, innovative curriculum, increased commitment to racial equality, higher civic engagement, and the use of diverse approaches to learning (Smith & Associates, 1997; Gurin, 1999: Antonio, 2001, 2004: AASCU & NASULGC, 2005). Because these benefits are so closely linked to the mission of higher education, many colleges and universities continue to pursue these benefits by creating and implementing programs, task forces, committees, campus policies, and units that are directly concerned with diversity (Levine & Cureton, 1998; William & Wade-Golden, 2007). Unfortunately, several of these institutions fall short of reaping the benefits that diversity brings to the college environment, and they continue to fail in their attempt to achieve this goal, despite the fact that considerable progress in terms of expanding access for underrepresented groups has taken place in the last decades (Levine & Cureton, 1998; Chang, & Antonio, 2005). Diversity policies that are implemented often fail because of the misalignment between institutional policy and the commitment from individuals within the university (Brown, 2004). Problem Statement Many institutions have struggled to diversify their faculty and students, some with limited success. To signify their commitment, institutions enhance their strategic plans and diversity action plans.

The goal of these plans is institutionalization of strategies that increase access and retention of historically underrepresented populations, improve campus climate and inter-group relations, incorporate diversity into the curriculum, and utilize diversity as a resource for an enriched and engaged academic environment (Hurtado, 1992; Ibarra, 2001; Smith & Schonfeld, 2000).

Copied from: Iverson, Susan V., Capitalizing on Change: The Discursive Framing of Diversity in U.S. Land-Grant Universities (2008)

The attempts to make higher education institutions more adaptive to diversity, however, have had unfavorable outcomes for diversity itself. In particular, they have resulted in competing definitions of diversity in higher education. For example, Bunzel (2001) notes that the word "'diversity' has been used in so many different ways it now means whatever one wants it to mean…. The elasticity of the [word] 'diversity' has masked many kinds of questionable conduct" (pp. 494-495). Some examples of questionable conduct associated with higher education's use of the word diversity are window-dressing approaches that aim to co-opt diversity to create an artificial image that welcomes racial and ethnic minorities to the institution, diversity training programs that aim to alter individual's biases but not organizational biases against minorities, curricular changes that use racial and ethnic minorities as subjects for study but not as contributors to the knowledge base in academia, and diversity recruitment efforts that do not change the dominant group's perception that minorities are academic inferiors who are pushing their way into higher education at the expense of dominant group members (Bernard, 2005; Bollag, 2005; Munoz, Jasis, Young, and McLaren, 2004; Williams, Nakashima, Kich, and Reginald, 1996).

Copied from: Adalberto Aguirre Jr. and Ruben O. Martinez, Diversity in Higher Education: Perceptions, Opinions, and Views (2006)

Locks, Angela M; Hurtado, Sylvia; Bowman, Nicholas A; Oseguera, Leticia	Natalie J. Perry's Paper
In June 2003, the U.S. Supreme Court's ruling in Gratz v. Bollinger struck down the mechanism the University of Michigan had used to achieve a diverse student body among undergraduates but supported the educative value of diversity in both this case and Grutter v. Bollinger. The Court affirmed the importance of diversity in higher education and reinforced the expectation that elite institutions have a responsibility to train their students to become leaders across all segments of society. Most importantly, these rulings affirmed that the cadre of future leaders should be diverse and that institutional initiatives to educate a diverse student body should reflect the centrality of diversity to key educational goals and outcomes.	However in June 2003, the U.S. Supreme Court's ruling in Gratz v. Bollinger struck down the mechanism the University of Michigan had used to achieve a diverse student body among undergraduates but supported the educative value of diversity in both this case and Grutter v. Bollinger. This case affirmed the importance of race in higher education and reinforced the expectation that elite institutions have a responsibility to train their students to become leaders across all segments of society. Most importantly, these rulings affirmed that the cadre of future leaders should be diverse and that institutional initiatives to educate a diverse student body should reflect the centrality of diversity to key educational goals and outcomes.

DAILY WIRE +

Perry's work didn't improve from there, not surprisingly.

In summarizing the work of scholars Robert Quinn and John Rohrbaugh, instead of quoting them directly, "she cribbed summaries from other academics." Thus did she steal without citation "almost all of a nearly thousand-word passage from a [paper](#) by Chad Hartnell, Amy Yi Ou, and Angelo Kinicki,

without quoting the authors," Rufo and Rosiak wrote.

For instance, Perry plagiarized all but the seven bold, italicized words in the following text:

> The CVF is widely used in organizational literature (Ostroff et al., 2003). Measures of organizational culture that directly or indirectly assess the CVF have been administered in over 10,000 organizations globally (Cameron et al., 2006) within the following academic disciplines: management, marketing, supply-chain management, accounting, social services, hospitality, and health care. Further, the reliability and content validity of Cameron and Ettington's (1988) measure of the CVF has been empirically supported in studies utilizing multitrait-multimethod analysis (Quinn & Spreitzer, 1991), multidimensional scaling (Howard, 1998), and structural equation modeling (Kalliath, Bluedorn, & Gillespie, 1999). Surprisingly, ***prior to 2011, there had been limited*** assessment of the theoretical foundation of the CVF despite its reported content validity and widespread use in research and practice.

Continued Rufo and Rosiak, "the rest of Perry's analysis of Quinn and Rohrbaugh's work is largely copied, unquoted and unattributed, from a 2003 paper by John Smart."

In one section of her dissertation, she copied "almost every sentence" from other authors without credit.

Adalberto Aguirre Jr. & Rubén O. Martinez

The attempts to make higher education institutions more adaptive to diversity, however, have had unfavorable outcomes for diversity itself. In particular, they have resulted in competing definitions of diversity in higher education. For example, Bunzel (2001) notes that the word "'diversity' has been used in so many different ways it now means whatever one wants it to mean…. The elasticity of the [word] 'diversity' has masked many kinds of questionable conduct" (pp. 494–495). Some **types** of questionable conduct associated with higher education's use of the word diversity are window-dressing approaches that aim to co-opt diversity to create an artificial image that welcomes racial and ethnic minorities to the institution, diversity training programs that aim to alter individual's biases but not organizational biases against minorities, curricular changes that use racial and ethnic minorities as subjects for study but not as contributors to the knowledge base in academia, and diversity recruitment efforts that do not change the dominant group's perception that minorities are academic inferiors who are pushing their way into higher education at the expense of dominant group members *(Bernard, 2005; Bollag, 2005; Munoz, Jasis, Young, and McLaren, 2004; Williams, Nakashima, Kich, and Reginald, 1996).*

Natalie J. Perry's Paper

The attempts to make higher education institutions more adaptive to diversity, however, have had unfavorable outcomes for diversity itself. In particular, they have resulted in competing definitions of diversity in higher education. For example, Bunzel (2001) notes that the word "'diversity' has been used in so many different ways it now means whatever one wants it to mean … The elasticity of the [word] 'diversity' has masked many kinds of questionable conduct" (pp. 494–495). Some **examples** of questionable conduct associated with higher education's use of the word diversity are window-dressing approaches that aim to co-opt diversity to create an artificial image that welcomes racial and ethnic minorities to the institution, diversity training programs that aim to alter individual's biases but not organizational biases against minorities, curricular changes that use racial and ethnic minorities as subjects for study but not as contributors to the knowledge base in academia, and diversity recruitment efforts that do not change the dominant group's perception that minorities are academic inferiors who are pushing their way into higher education at the expense of dominant group members *(Bernard, 2005; Bollag, 2005; Munoz, Jasis, Young, and McLaren, 2004; Williams, Nakashima, Kich, and Reginald, 1996).*

DAILY WIRE+

Perry pp. 19-21, with actual plagiarized sources identified to the right

Positioning Diversity Leadership in Higher Education Centrality of diversity in planning process.

Large-scale institutional changes often result from top down initiatives stemming from the president or other leaders in positions of authority.

One of the preeminent best practices regarding diversity leadership is the establishment of a chief diversity officer position reporting to the president or provost and holding significant institutional rank such as vice president or vice provost. A national study of these positions identifies three organizational archetypes for the chief diversity officer: a collaborative officer with little formal power in terms of staff or direct supervision; a unit-based model with greater vertical authority; and a portfolio divisional model that integrates the diversity leadership structure for multiple units under a single unit (Williams and Wade-Golden, 2007a). To expand institutional capacity for diversity, chief diversity officers can assist in a number of core areas such as interfacing with institutional accountability processes, building diversity infrastructure, infusing diversity in the curriculum, and elevating the visibility and credibility of diversity efforts (Williams and Wade-Golden, 2007b).

Copied from: Edna Chun, Alvin Evans, The Changing Landscape and the Compelling Need for Diversity (2009)

While leadership has been demonstrated to be particularly important, few studies have delved into the challenges that leaders face as they take on what can be perceived, on many campuses, as a controversial topic. Research has provided leaders with a variety of strategies to help move a diversity agenda forward and to overcome common barriers, but there is limited exploration of the politics surrounding the issue (Davis, 2002; Hale, 2004; Milem, Chang, & Antonio, 2005; Musil et al., 1999; Smith, 1989). Other literature documents the political landscape and dynamics that leaders face but offers no suggestions for addressing the politics (Beckham, 2000; Bensimon, 1992; Humphreys, 1997; Rhoads, 1998). This often leaves leaders in a precarious position: They know strategies that have worked to create change and some strategies for overcoming barriers (such as role modeling or rewards), but they face major challenges when faced with significant political resistance.

Copied from: Adrianna Kezar, Understanding Leadership Strategies for Addressing the Politics of Diversity (2008)

The establishment of diversity councils, committees, and task forces are prevalent methods for pursuing diversity that further embodies structural approaches (Davis 2002; Ford 1999; Hale 2004; Hurtado et al. 1999; Yang 1998). By assigning the pursuit of diversity to specific campus groups who are qualified and committed to these efforts, leaders secure the stability of their diversity efforts and goals (Kee and Mahoney 1995). Such committees and task forces are charged with identifying areas where diversity is lacking and monitoring the progress of previously established initiatives. These groups are particularly important in setting the tone and climate of institutions. Campuses with such committees tend to be more diverse and welcoming of difference because there is a built-in organizational component constantly present to ensure the progress of diversity and address challenges and problems related to diversity when they arise (Davis 2002; Hale 2004).

Copied from: Adrianna Kezar; Peter Eckel; Melissa Contreras-McGavin; Stephen John Quaye, Creating a web of support: an important leadership strategy for advancing campus diversity (2007)

Leadership that addresses diversity issues and concerns in higher education is highly multidimensional and complex. Substantively, it is much more than a simple response or adaptation to demographic representation—it is about the intergroup dynamics that characterize colleges and universities in both structure and culture. Leadership that addresses diversity issues and concerns in higher education is identified as diversity leadership. Diversity leadership primarily uses organizational values such as competition and success to incorporate diverse people or groups and enhance the organizational success in a changing environment (Winston, 2001).

Copied from: Adalberto Aguirre Jr. and Ruben O. Martinez, Diversity in Higher Education: Perceptions, Opinions, and Views (2008)

CITY JOURNAL

[Rufo and Rosiak also revealed](#) the gibberish Perry produced when she couldn't plagiarize and had to

write her own material:

> The positionality of the participants informed the perspective on the origins of the commission. /in response to the needs of the varios [sic] stakeholders within the university, the commission addressed issues of diversity on the faculty, undergraduate, graduate, and university level.

"Entrepreneur Mark Cuban recently argued that DEI policies don't necessarily lower an organization's expectations," the two wrote:

> But for Harvard, UVA, and UCLA Medical School — where Perry earned her master's, Ph.D., and DEI position, respectively — this is evidently not the case. These institutions have dramatically lowered expectations for favored groups and pushed a cohort of "scholars" through the system without enforcing basic standards of academic integrity.

Harvard Link

Perry's link to Harvard is not surprising.

Rufo and others have uncovered four major cases of literary theft at what was once the nation's most prestigious university.

The latest case, for instance, was sociology professor Christina Cross, whose doctoral thesis includes "verbatim plagiarism, mosaic plagiarism, uncited paraphrasing, and uncited quotations from other sources."

And, as with Perry's case, the plagiarizers were in some way involved in the DEI scam that universities run to promote unqualified minorities into positions of power.

Another plagiarist at the disgraced university is Shirley Greene, Title IX Resource Coordinator for Students in the Office for Gender Equity. Riffing off Harvard's *Crimson* newspaper, Rufo noted that a complaint revealed that Greene copied "more than 40 passages" in her dissertation about diversity in 2008.

A 37-page complaint revealed plagiarism in the doctoral dissertation of Harvard's DEI chief, Sherri Anne Charleston, too.

And, most famously, Claudine Gay was forced out as president after Rufo, the Washington Free Beacon, and the *New York Post* revealed plagiarism in her doctoral thesis and other academic writings.

In a related case, last month, a federal judge fingered a Harvard med school professor, Dipak Panigrahy, for plagiarizing his expert testimony in a class-action lawsuit against defense contractor Lockheed Martin.

Harvard's website shows that all the plagiarists are still employed.

Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative,
non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.