

Juanita A. Hall, Ed.D
Coordinator,
Campus Diversity
Initiative
Mail Code 6400

Phone: (805) 493-3951
Fax: (805) 493-3088
E-mail:
jahall@callutheran.edu

CAMPUS DIVERSITY INITIATIVE

–YEAR END REPORT

California Lutheran University, 2007/2008 Progress Report

This end of year report details the steps taken, the progress made, and the recommendations for future campus diversity efforts. It is organized to provide a brief overview of key efforts. Appendices are included to provide more in depth information.

PRESIDENT'S DIVERSITY COUNCIL

COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP & CHARGE

The President's Diversity Council met consistently on the second and fourth Thursday of every month (excluding holidays) from 3:45pm – 5pm in E-8. By the start of the spring 2008 semester, members included, Juanita Hall (chair), 6 faculty members: Pam Brubaker (sabbatical), Jonathan Cordero, Greg Freeland, Haco Hoang, Ken Kambara, and Jose Marichal; 5 administrators: Susan Arias, Sergio Galvez, Della Greenlee, Melissa Maxwell-Doherty, and Angela Naginey; 2 students: Blythe Cherney and Juan Ortiz. Joan Griffin, Dean of Arts and Sciences, although not an official Council member, attended nearly every meeting.

The following is former President Sladek's charge to the Council:

"In the spirit of my approach to diversity, the new charge to the President's Diversity Council is to gather information about these goals, analyze the data, disseminate the findings, and make recommendations to the President. In addition, I charge the President's Diversity Council to put together a yearly diversity summit and to help promote the intrinsic benefits of a diverse community of scholars to the entire CLU family".

This charge was re-affirmed by Howard Wennes when he assumed the role of Interim President in fall 2007. The Council is prepared to continue with this charge next year unless President Kimball revises it or issues a new charge. Following the recommendations of the Council to add additional members, former President Wennes appointed the newest members, Melissa Maxwell Doherty, Angela Naginey, Susan Arias, and Ken Kambara to the Council this spring.

PROGRESS REPORT

On September 27, 2007, the Council fulfilled part of its charge by hosting the President's Diversity Summit in the Lundring Events Center. A program for the event is provided in **Appendix A**. Although a programmatic success, attendance was low compared to previous years because Vice Presidents and Directors had not given their staff explicit permission to attend. Additionally, classes were not cancelled and a limited number of faculty brought their classes or encouraged them to attend.

In early spring 2008, the Council initiated and approved faculty development mini-grants for up to \$1,000 for professional development projects and up to \$500 for faculty sponsored programs. The purpose of each mini-grant was to enhance the understanding and appreciation of multiculturalism, diversity and/or the global society at Cal Lutheran. **Appendix B** provides a breakdown of the faculty who were awarded mini-grants based on Council review, discussion and majority vote.

At the February 14, 2008 meeting, the Council approved the Diversity Improvement Process Model created and presented by Juanita Hall. During the March 13, 2008 meeting, the Council worked on developing a schedule for assessing and evaluating diversity efforts as presented in the Model. Council members are continuing to work on this schedule. The Model and a tentative schedule are presented in **Appendix C**.

The Council continues to fulfill its charge to analyze data collected regarding diversity. This year, the Council analyzed student demographic data, the data from the “How are you doing?” survey, the data from the Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey, the student learning outcomes and action plan from the Diversity Leadership Retreat, results from information collected on retention and financial aid, and demographic data on the participation of ethnically diverse students in study abroad. The Council also considered the rationale for diversity, reviewed the WASC Recommendations on diversity, and discussed the probable positive impact of new financial aid policies. Additionally, at the request of President Kimball, the Council compiled a list of recommendations for additional members. The final Council meeting, held on May 8, 2008, was dedicated to recommending new members and evaluating the ways we collect and analyze data. In addition, we developed a proposed agenda item for 2008/2009 that fits within the new strategic plan.

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE COUNCIL

1. The Council recommends replacing the two student members of the Council who will not be returning. We would also recommend the addition of one new student member: a graduate student or an international student. The following are students recommended by the Council for membership for 2008/2009: Chris Kajtor (grad student); Lulit Gizaw (international undergrad); Cheyanne Anderson (undergrad). Alternatives include: Sergio Salazar (undergrad); Manshi Kothari (international grad); and Patricia Mutyaba (international undergrad).
2. Following President Kimball’s lead, the Council recommends the addition of faculty and administrators from areas of the campus that are not currently represented. The following are Council recommendations for 2008/2009: Cynthia Jew (School of

Education); Michael Pearce (Fine Arts); and ask Dan Kuntz to recommend someone from Athletics.

3. The Council recommends that the President's Diversity Summit continues to be held each fall, but with a change. We recommend that a "mini" Summit be held every other year, beginning this fall 2008. The Council recommends that vice presidents, department heads, and student leaders attend a half day event this fall and have the full campus-wide summit in fall 2009. At the mini-Summit, Council members can present the results of their analysis and recommendations to an audience with the ability to discuss and respond to needed changes, leaving the campus-wide Summit to inspire, acknowledge, and celebrate our progress.
4. The Council recommends the addition of diversity items on the faculty evaluation forms that students use to evaluate their professors. Currently, the University does not ask students to evaluate faculty on their respect for student diversity in the classroom nor do they evaluate faculty on their inclusion of or attention to diverse issues in appropriate ways in a course.
5. The Council concurs with the recommendation of WASC and the James Irvine Foundation for the addition of a permanent senior level administrator to coordinate and oversee campus diversity efforts.
6. The Council recommends that the charge of the Council for the immediate future should include establishing key indicators and recommending strategies for the recruitment and retention of diverse faculty, students, and staff as set forth in the new Strategic Plan.

STRUCTURAL DIVERSITY – DEMOGRAPHICS

The stated objective in the 2003 Campus Diversity Initiative was to "Increase diversity and internationalization within the student body, faculty, staff, and governing board." This is in line with the newly adopted strategic plan that includes the recruitment and retention of a diverse student body, faculty, and staff. Notable progress has been made since 2003 in the diversification of the student body, faculty, and staff. One continuing effort post-grant has been in the recruitment and retention of underrepresented students through the InCLUusive Overnight Program (previously called the Multicultural Overnight). This spring, 68% of the 53 students who attended the InCLUusive Overnight Program deposited (36 students). Please note that several retention efforts will be addressed later in this report.

Student Body: This year the campus experienced its largest influx of international students, both undergraduate and graduate, further moving the campus toward greater

diversity within the student body. In 2003, undergraduate international students numbered 42 (2.5%). This year that number is 66 (3.5%). The largest increase is in international graduate students who number more than 100 this year, up from 27 students in fall 2004. Since the start of the Campus Diversity Initiative in 2003, the overall undergraduate student body has also grown more diverse from 25% in 2003 to 35% this year. One of our goals was to increase the representation of African American undergraduates on campus from only 34 students (2%) in 2003. For fall 2007 that number reached 62 (3.3%). The number of Asian American students also grew from 57 students (3.4%) in 2003 to 90 students (4.8%) in fall 2007. The number of Hispanic students experienced overall growth from 224 students in 2003 (13.3%) to 289 (15.4%) in fall 2007. The number of multiracial students also increased from 67 students (4%) in 2003 to 114 students (6.1%) in fall 2004. The percentage of Native American students remains at its 2003 level at 18 students (less than 1%) while Pacific Islander students decreased from 21 students (1.2%) in 2003 to only 11 students (.6%) in fall 2007. See **Appendix D** for historical details and a graphic representation of the change. With the exception of international graduate students, to date little attention has been given to the ethnic diversity of the graduate student population in so far as making a concerted effort to recruit and retain these students from historically underrepresented groups. Despite the lack of intentionality, the percentage of ethnically diverse students has increased from 21.5% in fall 2003 to 35% in fall 2007, in part because of the recruitment of international students.

Faculty: There has been an increase in the ethnic representation of faculty on campus since fall 2002. In fall 2002 there were a total of 17 full-time faculty members from ethnic minority groups (14%). That number has increased to 24 full-time faculty members, representing 18% of the full-time faculty. The greatest jump in faculty hiring from underrepresented groups was during the grant period when concerted efforts were made including workshops on hiring diverse faculty and incentive programs. The number has been stable since fall 2005. See **Appendix D** for detailed demographic information.

Administration and Staff: There has been an increase of ethnic minorities on the administration and staff at CLU from 20% in fall 2003 to 29% in fall 2007. There was no percentage change from fall 2006 levels. The greatest increase was in minority female administrators and staff (from 33 in 2003 to 52 in 2007). The actual number of minority female administrators increased from 17 to 22 while the number of female staff increased from 16 to 30. The increase in female staff is largely the result of CLU hiring

former Sodexo housekeepers as a matter of economic justice. As female minority numbers increased, the number of Caucasian females holding administrative and staff positions has declined from 182 in 2003 to 144 this year. Of particular note is that the number of Caucasian males holding administrative and staff positions has remained pretty stable (77 in 2003 and 78 in 2007). While the number of minority males has increased since 2003, almost all of that increase was on the staff, with only one additional male being added to the university administrative pool. It is noteworthy, that in 2007 male staff members are no longer just Caucasian or Hispanic, like in 2003; there are 2 African Americans, 1 American Indian, 1 Asian/Pacific Islander, and 1 multi-racial employee.

The one area that has been a point of concern since the start of the grant and the WASC reaccreditation process in 2003 is the lack of ethnic and gender diversity on the Cabinet. This spring, two females were added to the Cabinet: the Campus Pastor and the Interim Provost. See **Appendix D** for details on all demographic data.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Continue the InCLUusive Overnight Program as the main strategy for recruiting ethnic minority students and now first generation students as well.
2. Increase the budget and personnel of the International Programs Office to adequately meet the needs of the increased number of international students.
3. Develop a strategy and key indicators to increase the ethnic diversity and retention among U.S. graduate students, faculty, administration, and staff.

CAMPUS CLIMATE

Creating and maintaining a welcoming campus climate is the responsibility of every campus member. Three ways we work to empower and enable campus members to help create and maintain a campus that visibly welcomes diversity is through our Ambassadors for Peace workshops, our Campus Diversity Mini-grant Program and the SAFE ZONE Ally Program. Additionally, several indicators are used to gage the campus climate. These include the Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey (given to sophomores and juniors) the “How are you doing?” survey, (given to new underrepresented students), and several items on the National Survey on Student Engagement (given to freshmen and seniors). Additionally, Human Resources has periodically held focus groups to determine the campus climate for diversity among

minority administration and staff. This spring Human Resources also surveyed staff and administrators on the topic of campus climate. Unfortunately, the survey did not address the campus climate for diversity, but rather it focused on other important personnel issues involving comfort levels. Additionally, the questionnaire did not ask for ethnic demographic data, making it impossible to determine whether minorities experience those aspects of their work climate differently than the majority population.

Ambassadors for Peace: This year there were 15 Ambassadors for a Peaceful Multicultural World. These Ambassadors facilitated a total of 16 workshops, primarily among freshmen in the freshmen seminar classes. The purpose of the program is to have students engage other students in discussions about diversity on campus and in the world. The purpose extends to creating an expectation among students that openness to interacting and learning from and about people from different backgrounds is a valued part of our campus learning community. Through these workshops, a clear message is sent to students that CLU values diversity. This past fall was the first time that Ambassadors conducted a massive mini-workshop as part of the new student orientation program, “The Real World”. The entire list of Ambassadors and of the 2007/2008 workshops is provided in **Appendix E**.

We continued to collect student reflections immediately following the workshops. These will be analyzed along with the reflections collected in the 2008/2009 academic year and reported on at the close of the 2008/2009 academic year. The previous three years of data was presented at the Assessment Symposium last May.

New this year, we collected qualitative data from 2006/2007 returning Ambassadors at the beginning of their first day of training in the summer of 2007. We wanted to learn how the program could be improved and more importantly, we wanted to learn what the Ambassadors gained (if anything) from the program. Six of the returning Ambassadors were each given a set of six index cards. At the top of each card students were asked to describe a specific aspect of their experience with the program in writing. The following are the six prompts: 1) What went well?; 2) What did you learn?; 3) What needs improvement?; 4) Describe any areas of personal development; 5) What is your most difficult challenge as a facilitator?; and 6) What brought you back for another year? The results of this qualitative assessment revealed that students who participate as Ambassadors learn how to constructively deal with opposing viewpoints. They improve their communication skills in front of groups, and they have a sense of personal growth while helping others. See **Appendix E** to read all six responses to each of the prompts.

Campus Diversity Mini-grant Program: Members of the campus community are invited to apply for \$500 mini-grants for projects that meet one or more of the following criteria: a) improve cultural awareness and appreciation for diversity at CLU; b) enhance communication, understanding and respect among and between diverse members of the CLU community; c) increase the level of student interaction between cultures; 4) provide for the needs of CLU underrepresented groups; and 5) encourage inter-group contact. It should be noted that the publication, “The Word” began as a mini-grant project in 2006 and is now a permanent addition to the campus community, receiving the bulk of its funding from student fees through ASCLU-G and Multicultural Programs.

This year, mini-grants were awarded to faculty members and student groups for a variety of projects and programs. The mini-grants gave us the flexibility to include creative ideas of campus members (eg: Culture Shock) and to accommodate the cultural programming needs of new demographic groups on campus. The increase in international students, specifically from Taiwan and India brought a wealth of new cultural experiences to campus. These included the addition of two popular Indian Festivals and a large Chinese New Years celebration. Each event was funded by Campus Diversity Mini-grants and not only allowed these students to share their rich cultural heritage, but each was well attended by CLU campus members as well as members of the surrounding community. For a complete list of mini-grants awarded this year, please see **Appendix F**.

Safe Zone Alley Program: In its second year, the Safe Zone program trained a large group of faculty and administrators to be Safe Zone Allies in both the fall and spring semesters. I worked with the program coordinator, Dr. Alan Goodwin, from Student Counseling to develop an end of year report to help track both the frequency and the nature of the contacts. The “How are you doing?” survey revealed a greater need to advertize the program next year. I met with Dr. Goodwin about the finding and we agreed to increase publicity for the program utilizing the ECHO. A copy of the evaluation of the spring 2008 Safe Zone training as well as a list of the current Safe Zone Allies is presented in **Appendix G**.

Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey: In general, the news was good and showed improvement, however, it is evident that students of color continue to experience the campus less positively, although the difference between majority and minority students is decreasing. Comparing the spring 2007 Noel Levitz data to that from spring 2004 and fall 2002, the level of student satisfaction on key diversity

indicators steadily increased (including among ethnic minorities) and the gap between what students viewed as important and their satisfaction with each indicator also decreased (which is positive). For example, on a scale of 1-7 (with 7 indicating the highest level of satisfaction), in 2002, students rated CLU a 5.01 on our strong commitment to racial harmony on campus. That level increased to 5.13 in 2004 and was 5.58 in 2007. Additionally, the gap decreased from .78 in 2002 to .70 in 2007. Among ethnic minority students, the mean was lower on the racial harmony item at 5.39, however, it is significantly higher than it was in 2004 when the mean was only 4.94. All surveyed students rated racial harmony as increasingly more important each year. Not surprisingly, it was slightly more important to students of color each year and the gap between importance and satisfaction for them in 2007 was also higher (.99 compared to .55 for Caucasian students).

In each year, our aggregated gap was below the level that indicates concern and actually reached its smallest gap levels in 2007 for the diversity items. In fact, in 2007, in the aggregate, there were no “red flag” gaps in the diversity data, indicating an acceptable level of student satisfaction in relationship to the importance placed on each diversity item. However, among minority students there are three areas where the gap is below acceptable levels. These include three survey items: 1) There is a significant amount of respect for people of different ethnic and racial backgrounds (gap 1.27; for Caucasian students the gap is only .57); 2) Achieving campus diversity is viewed as an educational necessity at CLU (gap 1.33; for Caucasian students the gap is only .46); and 3) There is a significant level of exposure to diverse cultures at CLU (gap 1.68; for Caucasian students the gap is only .70). Although the gaps are high, the level of satisfaction on items 1 and 3 which were reported on in 2004 improved. The mean among minority students on the item dealing with respect for people of different ethnic and racial backgrounds increased from 4.94 to 5.22 and the mean addressing the level of exposure to diverse cultures increased from 4.10 to 4.70. Although we can see improvement, the data indicates that ethnic minorities and Caucasian students continue to experience this campus differently.

Despite this reality, there is other good news. We can take pride in the significant increase in the mean for the item that speaks to students feeling a sense of belonging here. In 2004 the mean for ethnic minorities was only 4.66. This year that mean is 5.53, just slightly below that of Caucasian students (5.54). The picture was very different in 2004 when the means were much farther apart (4.66 compared to 5.35). Additionally, another source of pride is the dramatically higher mean on the item that says, “It is an enjoyable experience to be student on campus” from a low 4.97 to 6.00 among ethnic minorities. The difference between the means of minority and Caucasian students also

decreased. The 2004 mean for Caucasian students was 5.48 and the 2007 mean was 6.11. It is clear that both groups of students reported an increase in feelings of enjoyment about being a student here, but that increase was higher among ethnic minorities. And finally, students of color reported a huge increase in the sense of pride they feel about their campus since 2004. In 2004, that mean was 4.66, but in 2007 it shot up to 5.85, slightly higher than their Caucasian peers (5.82). Once again, both groups reported a higher sense of pride, but the pride among students of color grew dramatically.

We can also take some degree of pride that our data indicates a higher level of satisfaction on the three diversity indicators that are common to other four-year private institutions that took part in the survey. It must be noted, that significantly fewer students completed the survey in 2007 (24% response rate) than in previous years (49% in 2005 and 50% in 2002). See **Appendix H** for detailed survey results on diversity indicators.

“How are you doing?” Survey: Confirming the Noel Levitz data that we have made progress in the area of campus climate, the results of the “How are you doing?” survey provided additional evidence that new underrepresented students in fall 2007 have a more positive feeling about the campus climate than those in fall 2004, although the sense that faculty and staff are very accepting of diversity has declined slightly since 2004. Please refer to the full report, pages 2 -9 for a detailed account of the findings on campus climate. Details of the post-survey action planning from my meetings with various departments this spring are provided in **Appendix Q**.

National Survey on Student Engagement (NSSE): There are four items on the NSSE that we disaggregated into majority and ethnic minority groups to determine students’ perspectives on the quality of their relationship with faculty and administration as well as their perception of the level of academic and social support they receive on campus. The data from the 2001 and 2005 surveys confirm the findings from Noel Levitz and the ‘How are you doing?’ survey that there remains some work to be done and that students of color do experience the campus climate less positively than their Caucasian peers on some measures. When it comes to minority students’ perception of their relationship with faculty (from unfriendly/unsupportive = 1 to friendly/supportive = 7), the mean increased from 5.59 in 2001 to 5.63 in 2005. For Caucasian students the mean was higher both years than for minority students, but it actually declined in 2005 to 5.77 from 5.81 in 2001. But the picture is different when it comes to students’ relationship with administration. Of concern is that the mean for

both minority and majority students declined on this measure from 5.43 to 5.25 for minority students and 5.16 to 4.83 for majority. Note that the mean for majority students is lower than minority students for both years.

On the measures of social support to thrive academically and socially (scale 1 = very little and 4 = very much), the means on the item for academic support for minority students in both years (3.19 in 2001 and 3.14 in 2005) are only slightly lower than their Caucasian peers (3.22 in 2001 and 3.18 in 2005). Notice that the means for both student populations dropped slightly from 2001 to 2005.

The opposite trend is evident in the social support to thrive socially measure in that the means for both groups (although lower than academic support, ranging from 2.27 – 2.57) both increased. It is also important to note that the means among minority students are lower than their majority peers. Complete tables for these measures are provided in **Appendix K**. The data from the fall 2007 will be available this summer and will hopefully show improvement.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Provide better advertisement of the Safe Zone Ally program since few students in the “How are you doing?” survey knew the program existed.
2. Continue to disaggregate the data from the Noel Levitz survey by ethnicity to compare to previous years.
3. Conduct another “Campus Climate” focus group for faculty and staff to ensure the campus climate for diversity is welcoming to faculty and staff from underrepresented groups. This time, utilize the services of a facilitator from an underrepresented group so that a higher level of trust can be established for open communication.
4. Continue the Ambassador for Peace workshops with 12-16 Ambassadors.
5. Include the Ambassador workshops in as many freshman seminars as possible.
6. Continue to fund the campus mini-grant program.
7. Provide another diversity training workshop for faculty and staff. The last campus wide workshop offered (not SAFE ZONE Ally training) was during the grant in 2006 and was facilitated by the Anti-Defamation League with about 100 participants.

STUDENT INTERACTIONS

Several programs focused on bringing students together to interact across difference. These included the Ambassador led diversity workshops (previously addressed), the Diversity Leadership Retreat, and the Deep Diversity Dialogues. Key indicators for our progress in this area include NSSE data, Ambassador workshop reflections, Retreat evaluations and diversity plan, and the end of year assessment from the Deep Diversity Dialogues.

Diversity Leadership Retreat: The Diversity Leadership Retreat took place on Saturday, October 20th at Moorpark College. The theme of the Retreat was “Extreme Makeover: Leadership Edition”. Resident Assistants, Student Government, and Multicultural Club leaders as well as any aspiring student leaders were encouraged to attend. In all, 45 students attended and by the end of the day, these students were able to fulfill the main purpose of the Retreat which was to develop a plan to build a strong campus community. This year the plan began with a commitment to being willing to ask and answer the difficult questions across difference. The entire plan was made into a poster for leaders to display. The complete report for the Retreat is presented in *Appendix I*.

Deep Diversity Dialogues: There were two Deep Diversity Dialogue Groups. The fall 2007 group, lead by Juanita Hall had 14 student participants, and spring 2008 group, lead by Linda Boberg who interned in our office for her graduate program in Counseling and Guidance had nine students. The purpose of the groups was to bring a diverse group of students together weekly for in-depth and sustained conversations about issues of diversity that affect them as students and as citizens of the world. Each group was truly diverse in ethnicity, nationality, religion, sexual orientation, gender, and major. Following each term, participants were sent an on-line assessment of 17 questions (3 qualitative) to learn what students gained by participating in the group and how the program could be improved. In general, students were pretty comfortable sharing with their peers and 14 of the 15 students responded that their understanding of some diversity issues increased because of the group. All 15 students who responded to the questionnaire said that they learned something about other cultures, both domestic and

international, as a result of the group. They all reported learning something about themselves in relation to others as well. Twelve of the 15 students said that some of their opinions were challenged during the discussions. A summary of the assessment is presented in **Appendix J**.

National Student Survey on Engagement Data (NSSE): The NSSE data provided us with some key indicators of how students (freshmen and seniors) perceived their level of interaction across difference. Key indicators include responses to the following: How often have you had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity than your own? The responses from 2001 and 2005 showed a slight increase from both freshmen and seniors. However, the opposite was true on the question, “How often have you had serious conversations with students who differ from you in terms of their religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values?” The results from the 2001 and 2005 data show a slight decrease in the responses for both freshmen and seniors. Finally, on the question of the extent to which experiences at CLU contributed to the students’ “understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds”, gains were made for both freshmen and seniors from 2001 to 2005. For tables of the results, see **Appendix K**. The new data from the fall 2007 survey will be available this summer and will be analyzed by the President’s Diversity Council next year.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Continue the leadership retreat, but hold for only a half-day on campus and connect to service mission of the institution.
2. Strongly recommend attendance at the leadership retreat as pre-requisite for becoming a resident assistant, peer advisor, student government officer, or Multicultural Club president.
3. Continue the Deep Diversity Dialogue Groups in the Fall and Spring semesters, eventually offering as a 1-unit course.
4. Continue collecting and analyzing data from the NSSE and Noel Levitz surveys. Order disaggregated reports from the beginning--not as an afterthought.

CURRICULUM AND PEDAGOGY

One objective of our campus diversity initiative is to “expand and deepen the treatment of various cultures of the world and the United States in the context of academic scholarship and study.” CLU has recognized that as our campus becomes increasingly diverse, faculty members must be prepared to deal with diversity in the classroom and to meet the demands for a more diversified curriculum that not only addresses the needs of an increasingly diverse student body, but a curriculum that is educationally relevant for an increasingly diverse society and globalized world.

The Center for Equality and Justice (CEJ) became a permanent addition to the campus academic landscape largely through the efforts of dedicated faculty and in part because of funding from the Irvine Grant. \$20,000 went into the start of the Center. The CEJ includes working groups across a variety of disciplines with faculty and student interests around issues of diversity and social justice in Ventura County and beyond. The CEJ sponsors such events as World Aids Day, Economic Justice Forums, and a host of other highly visible forums, programs, speakers, and events on campus and in the community. Valuable research addressing the needs of the County and involving students is well underway. The Campus Diversity Initiative continues to provide funding (through remaining grant funds) as well as administrative support to the Center.

Last year, about 11 faculty members attended a workshop designed to help faculty address issues of diversity in the classroom. This year, the focus was on providing faculty support for their personal development or for curriculum development in the area of diversity. Two distinct programs were implemented. The first program provided faculty with instructional aids needed to effectively deal with diverse issues in the classroom or to aid in their own development around diverse issues. The second was a mini-grant program designed by faculty members on the President’s Diversity Council for professional development projects or for faculty-sponsored diversity programs. Both programs were a success in that many faculty members across disciplines and schools took advantage of the programs.

A key strategy to encourage faculty to pay attention to issues of diversity in the classroom has been to invite graduating seniors to nominate and select a “Diversity Professor of the Year”.

Key indicators that help gage how diversity is dealt with in the classroom are the NSSE and the How are you doing? survey. Some data from the How are you doing? survey indicate that international students would like faculty to be more sensitive to

their needs as international students. From conversations with faculty and students, the difficulties appear to be around issues of language, particularly with regard to writing.

Instructional Aids: Faculty members were sent a letter inviting them to apply for books or videos or other instructional aids that would aid them in their classroom instruction or their personal development around issues of multiculturalism and globalization. Completed forms were returned to Juanita Hall for purchase on a first come first served basis so long as the items requested met with the objective of the program. Fifteen faculty members across multiple disciplines took advantage of the program and we purchased a total of 61 books, 35 videos, 1 software program, and a few other items. A complete list of faculty members who applied for and received instructional aids and a copy of the application form is provided in **Appendix L**. Next year, we will send each faculty member a questionnaire to determine how the aids were used.

Faculty Diversity Mini-Grants: Faculty members of the President's Diversity Council developed criteria for faculty mini-grants. As noted previously, a list of recipients for these grants is provided in **Appendix B**.

This fall, faculty members who were awarded mini-grants will be asked to provide details on how the mini-grants were utilized for faculty development or diversity programming.

Diversity Professor of the Year: A highly coveted recognition for faculty has become the Diversity Professor of the Year award. Until this year, only a handful of about 15 faculty members were nominated for this award. This year, a record 79 faculty members were nominated by graduating seniors. Seniors are asked to nominate and then ultimately to vote for "a CLU faculty member whose curriculum, teaching style, and role modeling has furthered your understanding and appreciation for cultural diversity." To justify their nomination, students are asked to comment on the reason for their nomination. The winner of the award for the second year in a row was Michael Brint. Second, was Russell Stockard. Other finalist included Haco Hoang, Jonathan Cordero, and Adina Nack. The complete list of faculty members nominated for the award this year is provided in **Appendix M**.

National Survey on Student Engagement (NSSE): Several items on the NSSE addressed our interest in student engagement across difference. Data for the 2001 and 2005 surveys indicated an increase in institutional encouragement for student contact

among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds. However, no comparison data is available yet for the 2005 question that addresses the inclusion of diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.) in class discussions or writing assignments. But comparison data is available for our peers and nationwide. When we compare how we did against our selected peers and the nationwide sample, both our seniors and freshmen rated us slightly higher on this item. It will be interesting to compare our data from the fall 2007 NSSE when it is available this summer. See **Appendix K** for current data.

How are you doing? survey: As previously mentioned, international students would like faculty to be more sensitive to their international status. Beyond this issue, the survey respondents found faculty to be very accepting of diversity (65%), more so than their peers (57%) and staff (64%). Additionally, faculty were perceived as valuable academic and personal support for students. For more information, please consult the complete report on the “How are you doing?” survey, pages 3 and 7. See **Appendix Q** for post-survey action plan.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Provide another workshop for faculty on dealing with diversity in the classroom, particularly sharing information I brought back from the Christians and Diversity in Higher Education Conference where I attended a “Writing Across Borders” workshop. Since the conference, I have purchased the video presentation of “Writing Across Borders” to aid faculty members in their understanding of how international students experience writing in a second language (English).
2. Continue with the Diversity Professor of the Year award, but possibly revise the criteria to raise the bar higher.
3. Continue with faculty development mini-grants.
4. Continue to collect and disaggregate data from the NSSE
5. Add items addressing diversity in the classroom to faculty evaluations
6. Continue to support the Center for Equality and Justice through University funds as grant funds diminish and with administrative support.

RETENTION AND SUCCESS

When it comes to retention and success, we continue to track five key indicators. These include: 1) year to year retention; 2) graduation rates; 3) participation in internships; 4) participation in study abroad; and 5) participation in student leadership. Our ultimate goal is for everyone to succeed at high levels and our diversity goal is the absence of discernable differences between majority and minority populations.

To reach this goal, we have implemented several programs designed to increase the likelihood of retention and success among underrepresented student populations. These include the Student Support Services Program (SSS) with SOAR (their summer bridge program), the FOCUS Mentoring Program, and the encouragement and collection of data on student participation in internships, study abroad and student leadership.

Retention & Graduation: The data on retention suggests that students who participate in SSS and SOAR, and/or the FOCUS Mentoring program have higher first to second year retention rates than their Caucasian peers (74%). For students participating in the FOCUS Mentoring program in 2006/2007, 84% returned for their sophomore year. Among underrepresented SSS students that percentage was also higher at 79.2%. The 4 year average retention rate for SSS underrepresented students is also higher than Caucasian students (80.3% compared to 79%). Until now, we have not tracked the retention of FOCUS participants beyond the first to second year.

Since the start of the Campus Diversity Initiative in 2003, the 4th year retention rate among students of color as a whole have surpassed that of their Caucasian peers, and the difference is particularly pronounced among students (ethnic minority or not) who participated in SSS. Of the entering students in fall 2003, the first year of the grant, 72% of students of color were retained to their 4th year while only 65.5% of Caucasian students were retained. Of all students participating in SSS, 83.3% were retained (76.5% of the students of color in SSS). This graduating class will be the first since the inception of the Campus Diversity Initiative. The data for the class previous to the Initiative (2002) indicates that the graduation rate among Caucasian students was higher than that of all ethnic minority students (58.1% versus 54.2%). However, students of color in the SSS program only had a graduation rate of 52%. It will be interesting to see how much graduation rates improve in the coming years since the year to year retention rates among students of color have improved since the start of the diversity programs. This fall I expect to see the 4th year graduation rates for students who began CLU at the start of the grant. See **Appendix N** for the retention and graduation graph.

Internships: The kinds of entry level jobs students get after graduation is in large part dependent upon their previous relevant job experience. For many students, participating in internships during their college years gives them a competitive edge in the job market. Consequently, we began tracking the representation of minority students to see if they were participating in internships at the same level as majority students through our Career Services Department. The good news is that students of color participated in levels commensurate with their percentage on campus from fall 2003 – summer 2006. The latest data has yet to be disaggregated.

Student Leadership: Since making the absence of students of color in significant student leadership positions the topic of my dissertation research in the 2003/2004 academic year, we have made concerted efforts to diversify our student leadership, particularly in the most significant and influential roles where Student Life selects the students. These roles include resident assistant and peer advisor. Prior to the grant period, hardly any of these leadership positions were held by students from ethnic minority groups. That has since changed. The chart in **Appendix O** shows that significant progress has been made in the representation of minority students in these key leadership roles. For the 2007/2008 academic year in particular, the percentage of students of color as resident assistants for the first time nearly mirrors the undergraduate student body. One third (14 students) of the 42 resident assistants are students of color compared with 2 of the 36 students in 2004/2005. When it comes to peer advisors, 26% (10 students) of the 38 students are from ethnic minority groups. This is considerably better than in 2004/2005 when there were only 4 out of 35.

Study Abroad: We have just recently begun looking at ways to increase the number of students of color who study abroad. Nationwide, the number of students of color who study abroad is disturbingly low. In Fall 2007, I asked the study abroad office to begin keeping track of the ethnicity of students at CLU who study abroad. From personal experience (my own and my former CLU mentees), I know that the study abroad experience has a strong and positive impact on undergraduate education. Since 2005, we have been placing an emphasis on the importance of studying abroad by inviting returning study abroad students to make presentations at Multicultural Club meetings, asking FOCUS mentors to encourage their mentees to consider studying abroad, providing graduation lapel pins to study abroad students for graduation, inviting study abroad to participate in joint programs to further expose students of color to the study abroad opportunities.

Of the 62 students who studied abroad in spring 2008, 34 used the newest application and were able to report their ethnicity. The good news is that of those 34 students, 2 were Asian/Pacific Islander; 3 were Hispanic; 2 were Multiracial; and 2 were Native American. Each of these categories outpaces the 2005 national figures for study abroad participation among students of color. Lisa and I both recognize that more students of color actually did study abroad this year—we know them personally and these students used the old application. We are stepping up our efforts to attract students of color to the study abroad programs especially since the “How are you doing?” survey indicated a dramatic drop in interest in study abroad among new students of color from 79% in 2004 to 50% this past fall 2004. See page 24 of the “How are you doing? survey report for details. See **Appendix Q** for post-survey action planning details.

FOCUS Mentoring: The focus mentoring program brings faculty and administrators together in a mentoring relationship with 1-3 new students from ethnic minority groups or international students. The purpose of the program is to help increase retention among these students by encouraging supportive relationships throughout the first year. The program has been able to boast high first to second year retention rates since its inception in 2004/2005. This past year, new students were sent their application forms once they arrived on campus instead of during the summer. By sending the forms over the summer, we found that well meaning parents were either filling out the forms on their student’s behalf or having their student fill out a form that they really knew little about. As a result, a number of students withdrew from the program once they arrived on campus by not responding to their mentor. This year we learned that by waiting until students arrived and putting the application in their boxes, considerably fewer students signed up, but they were more committed to the program. We only had a total of 21 students, down from a high of 53 students in 2004/2005. In 2006/2007, we had 38 students, possibly because we printed a bold notice along the top of the application encouraging the students to “Think carefully about this opportunity before signing up because mentors are dedicated educators and we want to make the best use of their time.” Next year, I believe we will send the applications home (with the bold notice), but reaffirm each application once students arrive on campus and give other students a second opportunity to sign up.

Aside from tracking retention rates, mentioned previously, we send out an evaluation each year to both mentors and mentees. This year, I was particularly interested in learning if our mentors are touching on the areas that research asserts as the most important and effective topics to address in the mentoring relationship. The

results of the on-line evaluations from only 8 of the 21 students (38%) indicate that mentees are satisfied with the amount of contact they maintained during the year with their mentor. Interestingly, mentors wanted more contact. However, the quality of that contact was generally very good on both sides. Six of the 8 mentees said they did seek the advice, counsel or support of their mentor during the year and that their mentor was knowledgeable. Four of the eight said their mentor did encourage them to consider studying abroad and the topics discussed the most were adjusting to campus and academics followed by personal issues, then campus involvement opportunities and possible career plans/internships. Three students said they discussed selecting a major and course selections. All eight who responded to the on-line evaluation said they were planning to return next year.

Twelve of the 16 mentors responded to the on-line evaluation and only one reported that their mentee chose not to participate. This was the only pairing of a Caucasian mentor with a student of color. Five mentors said they encouraged their mentee to study abroad and four didn't recall. It is entirely possible that the remaining mentors did not mention study abroad because their mentee was an international student. Their responses to the topics discussed pretty much mirrored that of the student respondents, except they had adjustment to campus and involvement opportunities at as the most prevalent topics. Personal issues and career plans/internships and personal issues followed. For details of the evaluation please see **Appendix P**.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Continue encouraging students of color to participate in student leadership, internships, and study abroad and continue to collect data to track progress.
2. Continue the FOCUS Mentoring Program, but give new students who enter in the spring the opportunity to have a mentor. Resume mailing the applications during the summer with the printed notice, but also reaffirm the application prior to assigning students a mentor at the start of the semester.
3. Provide scholarships to first generation, low income students to participate in the new Telios Leadership Program.
4. Encourage greater numbers of students of color to participate in the Leadership Institute and service projects.
5. Provide partial scholarships for first generation, low income students to participate in Alternative Spring Break service projects.

6. Encourage students of color to study abroad and to apply for scholarships that encourage their participation, eg: the Gillman Scholarship.
7. Continue to fund the SOAR Program through SSS
8. Ask mentors to identify their mentee as an international student or not when filling out the evaluation.

Appendix A
Program from the Fall 2007 President's Diversity
Summit

Appendix B
2007/2008 Faculty Development Mini-grants
for Faculty

Appendix C
Diversity Improvement Model
and Tentative Schedule

Appendix D

Undergraduate Student Ethnic Diversity 2003 - 2007

Graduate Student Ethnic Diversity 2003 -2007

Faculty Demographics 2002 – 2007

Staff Demographics 2002 -2007

Fall 2007 International Student Enrollment

Appendix E

Ambassadors for a Peaceful Multicultural World

Ambassador Workshop Schedule 2007/2008

Returning Ambassador Evaluations

Raw data for Summer 2007

Appendix F
Campus Diversity Initiative Mini-Grants
Mini- Grant Application

Appendix G
List of Safe Zone Allies
Training Evaluations
End of Year Tally Form

Appendix H
Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey Results
from Fall 2002 and Spring 2004

Appendix I
Diversity Leadership Retreat Report

Appendix J
Assessment from Deep Diversity Dialogues

Appendix K
Diversity Data from the National Survey of Student
Engagement
2001 and 2005
(2008 data available this summer)

Appendix L

Faculty Instructional Aids – Recipients List

Faculty Instructional Aids Application Form

Appendix M
Diversity Professor of the Year – List of Nominees

Appendix N
Retention and Graduation Rates

Appendix O
Student Leadership Progress Charts

Appendix P
FOCUS Mentoring Program
2007/2008 List of Mentors/Mentees
Mentor and Mentee Evaluations

Appendix Q
**Current Action Plans from the “How are you doing?”
Survey**