

# **Report of the Task Force for Campus Climate and Training**



**December 2005**

# **Members of the Campus Climate and Training Task Force**

**Noor Azizan-Gardner**

*Coordinator*  
Chancellor's Diversity Initiative

**Rachel Binkley**

*Graduate Assistant*  
Chancellor's Diversity Initiative

**Karen Cockrell**

*Associate Professor*  
Educational Leadership & Policy Analysis

**John David**

*Associate Professor and Chair*  
Biological Sciences

**Vicki Dennison**

*Staff Support*  
Office of the Chancellor

**Lisa Flores**

*Assistant Professor*  
Educational, School & Counseling Psychology

**Judith C. Goodman**

*Associate Professor*  
Communication Science & Disorders

**Laura Hacquard**

*Director*  
Women's Center

**Jennifer Hart**

*Assistant Professor*  
Educational Leadership & Policy Analysis

**Catherine Holland**

*Associate Professor*  
Women's and Gender Studies/Political Science

**Lee Henson**

*Americans with Disabilities Act Coordinator*  
Office of Deputy Chancellor

**Paul Ladehoff**

*Director*  
Campus Mediation Services

**Charlotte McCloskey**

*Doctoral Student*  
Educational, School & Counseling Psychology

**James McGlew**

*Associate Professor*  
Classical Studies

**Julie Middleton**

*Director of Organizational Development*  
University of Missouri Extension

**Wally Pfeffer**

*Alumnus*  
MU Alumni Association

**Frances Romero**

*Master's Student*  
Journalism

**Carol Snively**

*Assistant Professor*  
School of Social Work

**Michael Taylor**

*Undergraduate Student*  
President, A&S Student Council

**Roger L. Worthington, Chair**

*Associate Professor/Faculty Fellow*  
Office of the Deputy Chancellor  
Educational, School and Counseling Psychology

# Executive Summary

The Campus Climate Task Force was appointed by Deputy Chancellor Michael Middleton to review findings from the MU Campus Climate Study, develop best practices for addressing concerns, and make recommendations for improving the campus climate for diversity. Recommendations cover climate issues from all perspectives, including training and orientation programs for faculty, staff and students; communications; academic and social programming; curriculum; and future efforts to assess the climate for diversity at all levels.

The need for an inclusive, respectful and equitable campus climate is crucial given MU's history of exclusion for underrepresented minorities, especially for African Americans and lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender individuals. MU also continues to lag behind national statistics in granting degrees to members of underrepresented racial-ethnic groups. Improving campus climate will ensure a healthy, diverse MU, which has been shown in research to be associated with (a) greater learning, (b) increased interpersonal competencies, (c) greater self-confidence among students, (d) fewer irrational prejudices, (e) greater gains in critical thinking, and (f) greater involvement in civic and community service.

After reviewing and assessing research findings, institutional data, and national models of campus climate, the Campus Climate Task Force proposes the following set of recommendations to move MU to a more inclusive, respectful and equitable multicultural university:

## **Enhance infrastructure for leadership, advocacy and accountability:**

- Appoint a senior-level campus administrator as Chief Diversity Officer, and a permanent Diversity Advisory Council, to lead and manage diversity and inclusion activities.
- Create an Equity Assistance Office to respond to equity complaints and concerns, and to coordinate equity and diversity training.
- Establish campus-wide and unit-level diversity resource teams, with accountability for results.
- Provide leadership training across campus to increase multicultural competencies.

## **Develop rigorous and concerted recruitment and retention programs:**

- Recruit and retain significantly more students of color, and students with disabilities, from high schools and community colleges in Missouri (and surrounding states).
- Revise guidelines to allow transfer students to qualify for financial aid on a par with entering freshmen.
- Expand Academic Retention Services so that it can address the needs of students from all racial-ethnic groups, and students with disabilities.
- Increase hires of underrepresented faculty and staff across all ranks.
- Establish voluntary mentoring programs for underrepresented students, faculty, and staff, as well as networking and social opportunities.
- Revise faculty promotion, tenure, and annual merit policies to eliminate real and perceived bias.
- Require each campus unit to demonstrate performance-based salary equity for faculty and staff at all levels.
- Ensure equity for all faculty and staff in benefits programs.

**Establish a diversity mission statement:**

- Establish a comprehensive campus-wide diversity mission statement.
- Require all campus units to establish their own diversity mission statements and action plans consistent with the university-wide statement.
- Adopt “multiculturalism” as a fifth campus value.

**Develop a multicultural curriculum:**

- Institute a multiculturalism requirement in the General Education Architecture.
- Expand Women’s and Gender Studies, Religious Studies and Black Studies.
- Develop Latino, Asian, American Indian, and Disability Studies curriculums.
- Elevate Women’s and Gender Studies and Black Studies to departmental status.
- Investigate the integration of some academic programs into departmental units.

**Enhance multicultural training and address multicultural environment issues:**

- Implement mandatory multicultural training for all faculty, staff and teaching assistants.
- Pursue external funding for multicultural programming and fund innovative diversity programs.
- Increase diversity-related campus news releases and other positive publicity.
- Show greater respect for various cultures by, for example, developing an interfaith calendar, designating a multicultural month, establishing policies to protect members of the campus community who celebrate non-Christian holidays, and designing holiday décor to include non-Christian traditions.
- Continue to improve accessibility of buildings and other areas on campus.
- Reorganize the MU homepage to provide easy access to diversity information and resources, and develop a diversity website.

**Expand multicultural student activities and services:**

- Require all student service units to include multicultural programming and training, and in doing so to involve Student Affairs units with multicultural foci.
- Expand resources and services offered by Women’s Center, LGBT Resource Center, Multicultural Center, International Center, Black Culture Center, and Access Mizzou.

**Expand scope of multicultural research and other scholarly activities:**

- Establish a campus-wide faculty team to review the definition of “scholarship” at MU.
- Provide seed funding for multicultural research and scholarship.
- Increase funding and administrative support for research mentorship programs targeting underrepresented students.

**Establish on-going campus climate assessments:**

- Establish a standing committee (with an appropriate level of human and capital resources) to oversee and administer future climate assessments, oversee data distribution and guide new interventions and guide any needed modifications in the diversity strategic planning process.

## Introduction

In April 2003, Chancellor Richard Wallace appointed Deputy Chancellor Michael Middleton to head the Diversity Council, a new advisory council responsible for addressing a wide range of diversity issues at the University of Missouri (MU). Upon his appointment in 2004, Chancellor Brady Deaton renewed the charge of the Diversity Council and made diversity a major priority of the strategic planning of his administration. Deputy Chancellor Middleton appointed 14 members to the Diversity Council and named three task forces: (a) Campus Climate and Training, (b) Student Recruitment and Retention, and (c) Faculty Recruitment and Retention. Appointees to these groups represent faculty, students, staff, alumni and administrators. Task forces were to engage in strategic planning designed to develop a set of recommendations to the Deputy Chancellor and the Diversity Council that would result in an overall strengthening of diversity efforts and systemic change that would ensure equity and inclusiveness in a multicultural institution. The purpose of this report is to satisfy the following charge:

The task force is to (a) review findings from all five phases of data collection of the MU Campus Climate Study, as well as other pertinent data and reports, (b) develop best practices for addressing concerns, and (c) recommend programs and approaches for improving climate. Recommendations are expected to address climate issues from all perspectives including training and orientation programs for faculty, staff and students, communications, academic and social programming, curriculum, and other areas that may be implicated. Finally, the task force is to recommend a plan for on-going assessment of the MU Campus Climate.

The deliberations of the Campus Climate and Training Task Force have encompassed complex and wide-ranging concerns, many of which require further study and analysis and cannot be addressed by a single task force within a limited timeframe. Thus, we view this report as a work in progress, a framework for action, and an invitation for the MU administration to take the initial steps known to be necessary for improving the campus climate. It is the *beginning* of a process rather than an *end*. We have adopted a perspective of the organizational change process that has resulted in two sets of recommendations, those for immediate action, and those that require broader, long-term initiatives that will ensure continuing progress.

We began by examining effective models of diversity initiatives at other institutions of higher education, reviewed research findings on this topic and compared results with our own campus climate study, and recommended courses of action that both fit the needs of our campus and are widely accepted as “best strategies” for enhancing campus climate.

We understand the budgetary, political and temporal complexities within which the Chancellor and other administrators must operate a large and multifaceted institution. Undoubtedly these recommendations will require further reflection, refinement and prudent decision-making prior to implementation. Therefore, it was our intent to provide a concrete action plan guided by theory and research that will enhance the ongoing activities, goals and objectives of the administration in improving the climate for diversity at MU in the near and distant future. It is clear however that progress will require significant allocation of financial and human capital.

## *The Historical Context of Diversity at MU*

A wealth of scholarship has demonstrated that the historical context of higher education has been characterized by a substantial degree of *exclusion*—meaning that women, racial-ethnic minorities, people with disabilities, sexual minorities, individuals from low socio-economic status backgrounds and particular religious groups were often intentionally or unintentionally barred from admission (Chesler, Lewis & Crowfoot, 2005; Smith and Associates, 1997; Sue et al., 1998). Unique institutional histories create the context of diversity efforts on specific college campuses. With that in mind, we provide a very brief description of the record with respect to diversity at MU.

MU has a long and varied history with respect to diversity. The university was established in 1839 as a Whites-only, men’s institution. Women were admitted for the first time 30 years later, but initially only in the Normal School (today’s College of Education) to qualify as teachers. In 1878 Grace C. Bibb was appointed as Dean of the Normal School but it was not until 1974 that Luverne Walton became the first woman to hold a regular appointment in the central administration (Assistant Provost for Academic Affairs) at MU, and in 1978 Barbara Uehling became the only woman Chancellor of MU to date. During the same period, the Women’s Studies Program achieved formal program status in 1980, but its first full-time faculty member, Dr. Geta LeSeur, was not appointed until 1988. Nonetheless, women continue to be severely underrepresented in the ranks of full professor and in the upper administrative ranks of most colleges, as well as campus and system administration.

In 1936, the first African American applicant to the university was denied admission, sparking a 3-year-long legal battle that went all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court, which ruled against MU in 1939. Still, MU did not admit Gus T. Ridgel and two other African American students until 1950, and it wasn’t until 1969 that Arvarh Strickland was appointed as the first African American professor. In 1981 the U.S. Department of Education required MU to submit a plan to increase African American enrollment from 3.3 percent in 1979 to 10.9 percent to equal the proportion of Black Missouri residents. MU has never reached that goal. In 1984, Mary F. Lenox was appointed Dean of Library and Informational Science, becoming the first African American to hold the position of Dean. The U.S. Department of Justice stepped in to mediate race issues at MU in 1988 by requiring the campus to create diversity leadership positions, and take specific steps to increase minority faculty and student recruitment and retention (Black Alumni Association, 1994). It was at this time that the Office of Minority Affairs was established.

Historical information of Native American/American Indian (NA/AI), Hispanic/Latino(a) and Asian/Asian American/Pacific Islander people at MU is scarce. Oral history suggests that in the 1980’s a Native American female journalism graduate returned to MU and established a Native American student association (NASA). Available data indicate that there has only been a handful (5 or fewer) of NA/AI faculty at MU at any one time. Currently, a small, but dedicated, group of faculty and students have been responsible for furthering the agenda to increase representation, scholarship, awareness and attention toward NA/AI issues.

In 1948, a faculty member in the MU School of Journalism, Emery K. Johnston, was fired by the Board of Curators after being identified by police as part of a “dangerous homosexual ring,”

ending his 24-year teaching career. Thirty years later MU actively fought to deny official recognition of the Gay Liberation Federation as an MU student organization, taking the battle again all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court, only to lose when the high court refused to hear the university's appeal. More recently, in 1999, two openly gay MU professors resigned in protest of the Curators' refusal to reinsert sexual orientation into the nondiscrimination policy—which the Curators ultimately did in October of 2003 (Anderson & Cooper, 1999).

The Task Force found little historical information about people with disabilities at MU. Apparently the University's first initiatives on behalf of people with disabilities took place in 1960. According to a 1977 report from a committee appointed to help MU comply with the Rehabilitation Act of 1973:

The University of Missouri has long been recognized as a leader in providing services for students with disabilities. From 1960 to 1966 the University of Missouri received research and demonstration funds from the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration to make the modifications necessary to establish the University of Missouri-Columbia as an institution which would provide special facilities for the severely disabled. Since that time, the University has continued efforts to work toward a barrier-free environment and is committed to providing equal educational opportunities to all academically qualified students.

MU reportedly was a campus of choice for people who use wheelchairs for more than a decade after 1960, but after the Rehabilitation Act became law, other campuses started catching up. With passage of the ADA, MU moved forward significantly in accessibility, but there continues to be a paucity of people with disabilities among MU faculty, staff, and administrators.

*Multicultural* activism arrived forcefully on campus in 1994, when an alliance of approximately 100 students representing the Legion of Black Collegians, the Hispanic-American Leadership Organization, From the Four Directions, the Asian Students in America, the Women's Center and the Triangle Coalition, staged a protest to confront the MU administration with a list of demands to foster greater sensitivity to diversity on campus (Black Alumni Association, 1994).

Despite its early exclusionary history, more recently MU has made significant strides toward building a more inclusive and welcoming campus. Several significant administrative initiatives have (a) sought the recruitment and retention of minority faculty and students, (b) provided diversity training for faculty, staff and students, and (c) explored institutional changes designed to promote equity and inclusiveness in the campus community.

In 2003, a review team was invited to MU to assess the overall approach to addressing issues of equity and diversity. The team made a variety of recommendations, including (a) initiate a systematic diversity strategic planning process, (b) locate responsibility for oversight of diversity strategic planning in a single office, headed by a Chief Diversity Officer, (c) conduct ongoing climate assessments, and (c) pursue strategic efforts for faculty and student recruitment and retention.

Strategic planning for the university has begun to incorporate a pursuit of multiculturalism in the past two strategic planning documents. The university's goals, as stated in its current strategic plan, include (a) celebrating the diversity of an international university, (b) improving campus climate and diversity, and (c) developing and implementing programs to infuse the MU Statement of Values into the everyday life of the campus. Indeed, improving campus climate and strengthening diversity initiatives is now listed among the university's top ten priorities. Campus documents state that the university is committed to creating a supportive climate in which the entire campus respects diversity and benefits from participation in a multicultural community as well as preparing students to participate in a diverse domestic and global workforce. These broader efforts to increase institutional responsiveness to diversity are based, in part, on the MU Campus Climate Study.

As evidence of its commitment to these goals, a variety of different academic and nonacademic units at the university provided support for the MU Campus Climate Study from 2001 – 2005. The MU Campus Climate Study was a rigorous and comprehensive self-evaluation that provided new information about how majority and minority group members perceived the current climate for diversity at MU for six groups: women, people of color, people with disabilities, LGBT individuals, non-Christian religious minorities, and non-native English speakers.

Data collection for Phase I began in the fall of 2001, which involved MU's participation as part of the Rankin National Climate Study. There were three simultaneous phases of data collection in 2002, and the fifth and final phase of data collection was completed in February of 2005. Data was collected from nearly 6000 faculty, staff, students and administrators at MU across all five phases of data collection. In addition, three volumes of reports were prepared and disseminated containing nearly 500 pages of findings and information. An executive summary of all five phases of the MU Campus Climate Study appears in Appendix 2 of this report.

## *Definitions of Terms*

There are a variety of terms associated with multiculturalism that are sometimes used interchangeably. As a means of increasing the clarity of language used in this report we provide the following definitions of terms.

**“Multiculturalism”** is concerned with social justice, cultural democracy and equity, and is consistent with the democratic ideals foundational to the United States of America (e.g., the Constitution and Bill of Rights). These ideals are expressed through values of cultural pluralism and diversity. **Multiculturalism** is reflected in more than just race, class, gender, and ethnicity, and also includes diversity in religion, national origin, sexual orientation, ability and disability, age, geographic origin, and so forth. The acquisition of attitudes, knowledge and skills needed to function effectively in a pluralistic democratic society and to interact, negotiate, and communicate with peoples from diverse backgrounds are central tenets of **multiculturalism** (adapted from Sue et al., 1998).

**“Diversity”** refers to the presence or absence of numerical representation of cultural, psychological, and physical differences including but not limited to race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, age, religion, and physical ability or disability (Sue et al., 1998). According to

Smith and Associates (1997), these dimensions are closely related to patterns of societal experience, socialization and affiliation, and influence ways of understanding and interpreting the world, but they do not determine or predict any one person's values, orientation, choices, or responses.

**“Social justice”** refers to the fair and equitable distribution of power, resources, and obligations in society. It is based on the principle that all persons are entitled to the satisfaction of basic human needs, regardless of cultural, psychological, and physical differences such as class, gender, race, ethnicity, religion, age, sexual orientation, and ability or disability. It includes equality of opportunity for healthy personal, academic and social development (Hage, 2005).

**“Underrepresented group”** refers to a set of individuals whose membership in the university (or some segment of the university) is currently (or in the past has been) disproportionately small in relation to their representation in the larger population. In the MU Campus Climate Study for Underrepresented Groups, this term specifically focused on women, racial-ethnic minority group members, people with disabilities, non-native English speakers, non-Christian religious minorities, and lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) individuals.

According to Atkinson (2004), the term **“minority,”** as a multicultural referent, identifies people who are numerically underrepresented, but also includes members of groups that have been oppressed in society primarily because of their group membership (e.g., women's historical oppression with respect to social, political, educational, occupational, and economic opportunities and resources makes them a **minority** despite the fact that they might be a numerical majority in some cases). Use of the term **“minority”** has been the source of criticism because many perceive it to be negatively value-laden (e.g., connoting “less than”). For example, many institutions have shifted away from offices of minority affairs in favor of offices of *multicultural affairs*. Nevertheless, this term is written into specific Federal laws and regulations that directly and indirectly influence diversity efforts on college campuses.

## ***What is Campus Climate?***

Colleges and universities in the United States were once thought of as the exclusive domains of a predominantly affluent, Christian, heterosexual, White, male faculty and student body. Over the past four decades, however, there have been increasing numbers of women, people of color, people with disabilities, non-native English speakers, non-Christian religious minorities, and lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) individuals on campuses around the country (Smith and Associates, 1997).

Greater diversity on college campuses appears to be associated with highly desirable outcomes. The consensus among qualified experts over the past twenty-five years is that diversity on college campuses is associated with: (a) greater learning, (b) increased interpersonal competencies, (c) greater self-confidence among students, (d) fewer irrational prejudices, (e) greater gains in critical thinking, and (f) greater involvement in civic and community service (Blimling, 2001; Smith & Associates, 1997). All of these outcomes are likely to positively affect the preparation of graduates to live and work in a diverse U.S. society as well as the global economic infrastructure. However, campus climate for diversity is not simply a reflection of the

numerical representation of various different minority groups, although the two are closely related. In addition to numerical representation, campus climate includes a multifaceted set of environmental conditions.

The American Association of Colleges and Universities (1995) challenged higher education institutions to create and articulate a commitment to inclusion, fairness, and equality. Their report suggested that in order to provide a framework within which a vital community of learning can be built, a primary mission of the academy must be to create an environment that ideally cultivates diversity and celebrates differences.

Sue (1995) has pointed out that multicultural organizational development tends to progress in a stage-wise fashion, from “monocultural” (e.g., Eurocentric, androcentric, monolingual, heterosexist values, and a view of minorities as “tokens”) through “nondiscriminatory” (a nonsystemic, fragmented approach to diversity intended to meet legal standards for nondiscrimination) to “multicultural” (e.g., actively valuing diversity in its many forms in a manner that permeates all aspects of the institution). Institutions of higher education that are multicultural (a) are composed of faculty, staff and students that are representative of the diversity found in the population; (b) express a valuing of diversity in public statements of commitment, vision, mission, processes, structures, policies, service delivery, and allocation of resources; (c) act in accordance with their positive public statements; and (d) value and reward multicultural competencies, including diversity-positive attitudes, knowledge about salient aspects of diverse groups, and skills in interacting with and serving diverse groups effectively, sensitively, and respectfully (Grieger, 1996).

The philosophical premise underlying multicultural institutions is *social justice*—reflecting an organization that will not permit racism, sexism, homophobia or other forms of intolerance, and instead addresses issues of equal access, and embraces diversity as an *asset* (Grieger, 1996). In order to achieve these ends, the campus environment must be grounded in respect, nurtured by dialogue, and evidenced by a pattern of civil interaction (Rankin, 2003). All members of the academic community contribute to and are impacted by the campus climate (Rankin, 1998).

## ***Overview***

The Campus Climate and Training Task Force spent more than six months reviewing, assessing and analyzing research findings, institutional information, and national models as a means of increasing our understanding of the multicultural campus climate at the University of Missouri-Columbia and other similar universities. We concluded that the campus climate at MU has progressed over a period of years from “monocultural” toward “nondiscriminatory,” and this appears to be the most accurate characterization of its current environment. It is our view that MU is currently engaged in an active effort to move from “nondiscriminatory” to “multicultural.”

In the following sections, we have identified a variety of necessary objectives and action steps that we believe will be instrumental in moving the institution forward toward a multicultural climate. We provide specific action steps to improve campus climate and training, and move forward from a nondiscriminatory institution toward one that is truly multicultural. We organize

our recommendations in the following areas: (1) Leadership, Advocacy and Accountability; (2) Recruitment and Retention; (3) Mission; (4) Multicultural Curriculum; (5) Multicultural Training, Group Relations, and Environmental Issues; (6) Student Activities and Services; (7) Research and Scholarly Activities; and (8) Ongoing Campus Climate Assessments.

## **Leadership, Advocacy and Accountability**

**Rationale:** According to Sue et al. (1998), culturally competent and inclusive institutions demonstrate evidence of multicultural commitment from the very top levels (e.g., the provost, chancellor, president, dean, director, or chair of the department). Students, faculty and staff are most likely to observe and model the actions of those in leadership positions and strong leadership is the most effective method of implementation of diversity initiatives. In addition, top level administrators should be supported by a superordinate or oversight team/group, which is empowered to assess, develop, and monitor the institution's development with respect to the goals of multiculturalism (Sue et al., 1998). Student activities include the systematic development of leadership skills in people who are female, members of an ethnic/racial minority, persons with disabilities, and members of other underrepresented groups (Grieger, 1996).

Leadership at every level is critical if we are to create a world-class institution that openly values diversity. Strategic planning must occur at each level of the university, with each unit bearing some responsibility for achieving diversity outcomes. However, systemic change and comprehensive implementation and oversight of the strategic diversity plan must be the primary responsibility of a senior level administrator. Clear policies, best practices, and behaviors must support diversity outcomes. There must be adequate staffing and resources to ensure that each level of the plan is addressed.

Grieger (1996) recommends that a clearly defined administrative position be established to address the needs of a diverse campus community (e.g., advocacy/ombuds/special services). Individuals in leadership positions should be vocal advocates for diversity and multiculturalism, but all employees need to be encouraged to view advocacy for diversity as part of their role and function (Grieger, 1996). Effective multicultural organizations send a strong message to their workers and other constituents about the importance of identifying their needs and concerns in fostering diversity; it also is a powerful statement of organizational inclusion (Sue et al., 1998).

The MU Campus Climate Study found that victims of sexual harassment, hate crimes, and/or hate incidents often did not make official reports or complaints. Instead, victims most often discussed these incidents with friends, significant others, families, or nobody. When official complaints were filed, victims often reported that they did not perceive university officials' responses to be effective. According to the U. S. Department of Justice (2003), "universities should have a hate crime policy and procedural administration and law enforcement protocol in place to assist campus administrators and law enforcement authorities to react promptly and seriously to all hate motivated episodes." (p. 10). Grieger (1996) recommended that clear policies and procedures relevant to a diverse campus community be established and widely publicized (e.g., sexual assault, sexual harassment, bias incidents, nondiscrimination, etc.), and that the student code of conduct should clearly prohibit racist, sexist, biased, sexually harassing, or sexually or physically assaultive behavior.

According to Sue et al. (1998) multicultural accountability is built-in to the organizational processes and structure of culturally competent and inclusive universities. Divisions, departments, and individuals are held responsible for achieving the goals of diversity and multiculturalism. Deans, directors, and department chairs are held responsible for recruiting, retaining, and promoting underrepresented group members within their own units. Professors are held accountable for incorporating diversity into the curriculum, recognizing the need for alternative teaching styles, and being unafraid to address topics likely to create difficult dialogues in the classroom (e.g., race, gender, sexual orientation, religion, and so on).

New structures of accountability need to be established to supplement existing ones if the MU Diversity Initiative is to result in systemic transformation into a multicultural institution. The bulk of work at the university designed to foster awareness and sensitivity to diversity cannot be initiated and carried out exclusively or even predominantly by faculty, students, and staff who belong to underrepresented groups; it will be necessary for majority group members and other persons in power to shoulder a significantly greater share of the responsibility. A system of rewards for both majority and minority members is a critical component of any process designed to facilitate institutional change with respect to improving the campus climate for diversity.

### **Action Steps:**

- 1. Appoint senior level administrator with adequate staffing and resources to report to the Chancellor or Provost to review and coordinate all diversity and inclusion activities; responsible for oversight and direction of the diversity strategic planning process.**
  - i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Chancellor and Provost in cooperation with Chancellor's Staff, Provost's Staff, and others.
  - ii) Timeline: Appoint Interim Chief Diversity Officer as soon as possible. By July 2006, establish a plan to appoint a permanent Chief Diversity Officer. Conduct national search for Chief Diversity Officer during 2006-07 academic year.
  - iii) Expected outcomes: Establish visible leadership with the authority to advance diversity-related goals and objectives. Establish critical mechanisms for the development, administration, and oversight of campus-wide diversity initiatives.
  - iv) Assessment: Evaluate job performance and outcomes on schedule identical to that of similarly-ranked administrators.
  
- 2. Appoint a permanent advisory council to the Chief Diversity Officer.**
  - i) Coordinating person and/or office: Chancellor, Provost and Interim Chief Diversity Officer in cooperation with Chancellor's Staff, Provost's Staff, Faculty Council, Staff Council and others.
  - ii) Timeline: Establish and appoint a permanent Diversity Advisory Council (with faculty, student and staff representation) by the end of 2005-06 academic year to begin work in 2006-07.
  - iii) Expected outcomes: Enhanced strategic planning processes.
  - iv) Assessment: Annual reports of the Diversity Advisory Council.

3. **Actively recruit and promote women and minorities into leadership positions among administration, faculty, staff, and student organizations (consider establishing a formal process of selection for diversity with the existing President's Academic Leadership Institute at the UM System level).**
  - i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Chancellor, Provost, Deans, Chief Diversity Officer; Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Vice Chancellor for Human Resources, Department Chairs and Unit Leaders.
  - ii) Timeline: Immediate, intensive planning and coordination, 2006-07; implementation, ongoing-continuous.
  - iii) Expected outcomes: In administrative, faculty, and staff positions, rates of female and minority hires should reflect the population from which a search is conducted (e.g., faculty, staff, and administrators hired from national searches should reflect the demographics of the national pool; staff hired from state-wide or local searches should reflect the demographics of the state and/or local community). Increased visual representation of diversity among campus role models; decreased cultural taxation of those women and minorities currently in leadership.
  - iv) Assessment: Progress toward these goals should be monitored continuously by the Chief Diversity Officer, her or his staff, and the permanent Advisory Council on Diversity.
  
4. **Create Equity Assistance Office to improve the accessibility and understandability of the complaint process for harassment and discrimination.**
  - i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Chancellor, Director of the Equity Assistance Office
  - ii) Timeline: Appoint Interim Director for the 2006-2007 academic year and begin search for a permanent director to start for the 2007-2008 academic year.
  - iii) Expected outcomes: Increased clarity of *who*, *when*, *how*, *where*, and *why* complaints can and should be made; consistent and comprehensive training and information for all faculty, staff, and students in process of handling complaints. Perceptions of campus responsiveness to complaints will markedly improve.
  - iv) Assessment: Incorporate assessment of these outcomes into future campus climate assessments.
  
5. **Establish accountability mechanisms at all levels (e.g., division, department, etc.).**
  - i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Chancellor, Provost, Deans, non-academic unit heads.
  - ii) Timeline: Intensive planning and coordination, 2006-07, in conjunction with central and divisional planning outlined above; ongoing, and continuous.
  - iii) Expected outcomes: Expectation that efforts to create an equitable and diverse campus climate are inviolable. All divisions will have customized plans for enhancing and sustaining diversity in the context of their work and mission(s); these will include clear statements of responsibility and accountability for all employees.
  - iv) Assessment: Progress should be monitored continuously by the Chief Diversity Officer, her or his staff, and the permanent Advisory Council on Diversity.

6. **Develop and implement campus-wide and unit-level reward systems for multicultural university service (e.g., Recognition of individuals through awards and rewards; address service load inequities for faculty through buy-outs or service load reductions; reward departments and divisions for constructive participation in the Diversity Initiative; set aside a fraction of divisional budget designated as reward for accomplishing diversity-related goals).**
  - i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Chancellor, Provost, Chief Diversity Officer, Deans, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs.
  - ii) Timeline: Develop program during the 2006-2007 academic year and begin implementation during the 2007-2008 academic year.
  - iii) Expected outcomes: Systematic recognition of and reward for multicultural service; integration of multicultural service throughout university units; elimination of service-load inequities for minority faculty, staff, and administrators; establishment of divisional incentive system for enhancing diversity.
  - iv) Assessment: Progress should be monitored continuously by the Chief Diversity Officer, her or his staff, and the permanent Advisory Council on Diversity.
  
7. **Establish diversity resource teams at multiple levels (e.g., unit, department, division).**
  - i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Deans, Department Chairs, non-academic unit heads.
  - ii) Timeline: Begin pilot implementation in the 2006-2007 academic year; based upon successful implementation strategies, expand implementation throughout the university to all units by end of 2007-2008.
  - iii) Expected outcomes: Tailors diversity efforts at the unit-level; broadens responsibility for diversity-related efforts throughout the campus community.
  - iv) Assessment:
  
8. **Provide leadership training to increase administrators' multicultural competencies and effectiveness in diverse environments.**
  - i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Provost, Deans, Chief Diversity Officer, UM System Vice President.
  - ii) Timeline: Planning 2006-07; implementation 2007-09; ongoing-continuous.
  - iii) Expected outcomes: Increased quality of multicultural leadership and advocacy; increased implementation of diversity strategic planning.
  - iv) Assessment: Leadership training initiatives should be evaluated as part of the regular job-performance review of the Chief Diversity Officer. Leadership in enhancing diversity should become a regular component of all job performance reviews for university administrators.

## **Recruitment and Retention**

**Rationale:** The most recent U. S. Supreme Court decisions regarding university affirmative action policies indicate that the pursuit of diversity objectives through the consideration of race in admissions is acceptable and desirable (Gratz et al. v. Bollinger 2003; Grutter et al. v. Bollinger 2003). The U.S. Census Bureau (2002) reported the percentage distribution of

Bachelor’s degrees conferred by colleges and universities by race/ethnicity in 2000 as follows: 77.5% White, 9.0% Black, 6.3% Hispanic, 6.5% Asian/Pacific Islander, 0.7% American Indian/Alaskan Native. Although MU was ranked among the top 20 institutions granting the Ph.D. to American Indians (7) from 1993 – 1997, the institution was not ranked among the top 20 for Asians, Blacks, or Hispanics (Turner, 2002). On the basis of these national statistics, MU lags behind in granting degrees to members of underrepresented racial-ethnic group members.

**Fall 2005 Undergraduate On-Campus Enrollments:**

African Americans	5.9%
American Indians/Alaskan Native	0.6%
Asian/Pacific Islander	2.8%
Hispanic/Latino(a)	1.8%
White/European American	84.5%
Non-Resident International	1.3%
Unreported	3.1%

**Fall 2005 Graduate/Professional On-Campus Enrollments:**

African Americans	3.9%
American Indians/Alaskan Native	0.5%
Asian/Pacific Islander	2.7%
Hispanic/Latino(a)	1.7%
White/European American	67.4%
Non-Resident International	19.7%
Unreported	4.1%

MU is able to recruit only a portion of the qualified students of color who graduate from high schools in Missouri each year. Overcoming perceptions of monoculturalism and discrimination in order to recruit qualified students of color is a critical aspect of affirmative action admissions efforts. Key components of retaining underrepresented students include (a) providing support (e.g., through orientation and mentorship), (b) publicly confronting and challenging campus incidents of discrimination and hate, and (c) accepting and supporting student diversity initiatives (Chesler et al., 2005). Chesler et al. (2005) emphasize that a large segment of racial-ethnic minority high school graduates first pursue higher education at the community college level due to academic and economic constraints. Thus, recruitment of students of color via community college transfers is one crucial aspect of increasing diversity in the student body.

With respect to faculty, Moody (2004) recommends that retention plans need to be developed and implemented even before recruitment begins, including (a) mentoring programs, (b) career development workshops, (c) benefits programs that reflect and promote equity, (d) opportunities for leadership, (e) senior faculty diversity champions, and (f) “level playing fields” for tenure and promotion (e.g., maintaining flexibility in the recognition and definition of high quality scholarship). Branch (2001) has asserted that “support” in three key forms is the critical element of retaining faculty of color (which can also be applied appropriately to other underrepresented groups): (a) providing orientation and mentorship, (b) valuing their research agenda, and (c) protecting their workload (e.g., teaching assignments and committee assignments prior to

tenure). Furthermore, culturally competent and inclusive universities infuse multiculturalism into evaluation criteria used for hiring, promotion and performance appraisal (Sue et al., 1998).

As of October 31, 2004, faculty from underrepresented racial/ethnic groups (including American Indian/Alaska Natives, Asian/Pacific Islanders, Black/African Americans, and Hispanics) constituted only 17% of the regular faculty across campus. Of 113 new faculty members hired during 2004-05, only eight (or 7%) were Black/African American or Hispanic/Latino(a); of 133 new faculty hired in 2003-04, nine (6.7%) were Black/African American or Hispanic/Latino(a); of 114 hired in 2002-03, five (4.4%) were Black/African American or Hispanic/Latino(a). Similarly, as of October 31, 2004, women constituted only 32% of ranked faculty, and historically their numbers have been sparse at the rank of full professor (averaging less than 11% for the 11 year period ending in 2001).

In the past 5 years ending with new promotions and tenure appointments in September 2005, MU has awarded tenure to only 6 African Americans/Blacks and 2 Hispanics (out of a total of 189). Only 7.2% of promotions to full professor in the past five years have been Black/African American or Hispanic/Latino(a). In addition, 75% of African American/Black women, 40% of Asian women, and 50% of Hispanic men who went up for tenure were required to appear for a hearing in front of the Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee, but only 16% of White men and 23% of White women did. Whereas only 12% of White men applying for promotion to full professor had a hearing, 24% of White women and 25% of African American/Black women did. Women were required to appear for a hearing more often than men at every level of the process.

(NOTE: Faculty demographics for race/ethnicity lump international scholars from Asian, African and Latin American countries into the Asian/Pacific Islanders, Black/African Americans, and Hispanics categories, making it impossible to know how many U.S. racial-ethnic minority group members versus international scholars are among these groups.)

### **Action Steps:**

- 1. Successfully recruit and retain significantly larger numbers of racial-ethnic minority students and students with disabilities from high schools and community colleges throughout Missouri and surrounding states.**
  - i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Provost; Vice Provost for Enrollment Management; Deans; Department Chairs.
  - ii) Timeline: Beginning immediately and then continuous.
  - iii) Expected outcomes: Student body diversity that at a minimum reflects the diversity of the State.
  - iv) Assessment: Collect and report data to track admissions and retention related to this objective.
  
- 2. Revise scholarship and financial aid guidelines to allow community college transfer students to qualify for financial aid on par with entering freshmen.**
  - i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Provost; Vice Provost for Enrollment Management.

- ii) Timeline: Begin immediately and then continuous re-evaluation 2006-07 academic year.
  - iii) Expected outcomes: Increased enrollment and retention of community college students leading to greater student body diversity.
  - iv) Assessment: Collect and report demographic data to track community college student admissions and retention. Interviews to ascertain if the level of support offered is sufficient.
- 3. Expand the scope of Academic Retention Services (ARS) to address the needs of students from all racial-ethnic groups and students with disabilities. Eliminate the perception that its services are exclusively remedial.**
- i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Provost
  - ii) Timeline: Begin immediately and then continuous re-evaluation.
  - iii) Expected outcomes: Increased comfort and success of underrepresented students and thus increased retention.
  - iv) Assessment: Conduct exit interviews to assess treatment of underrepresented groups among departing students. Do the same for those who have not left.
- 4. Establish and support voluntary mentoring programs for underrepresented undergraduate and graduate students, and faculty.**
- i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Chief Diversity Officer; Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs; Dean of Graduate School; Provost, Deans; Department Chairs.
  - ii) Timeline: Immediate assessment of current mentoring programs in all colleges and elsewhere on campus (for example, Student Success Center and Honors College), with implementation of enhanced programming beginning 2006-2007 academic year.
  - iii) Expected outcomes: Increased morale; increased coping and problem solving among underrepresented students; retention.
  - iv) Assessment: Track retention and morale by formative (qualitative research including interviews and focus groups and opinion surveys) as well as summative evaluations.
- 5. Expand and enhance networking and social opportunities for minority faculty, students and staff (e.g., Unity; BFSO; HLAFFSA: HALO; LBC; Women's Faculty Network, etc.).**
- i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Chief Diversity Officer.
  - ii) Timeline: Begin immediately and then continuous re-evaluation
  - iii) Expected outcomes: Increased morale; retention; expanded pipeline for minority leadership.
  - iv) Assessment: Formative (qualitative research including interviews and focus groups and opinion surveys) as well as summative evaluations.
- 6. Expand minority faculty hires to include all ranks, and develop a program to recruit senior faculty from underrepresented groups.**
- i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Provost; Chief Diversity Officer; Deans; Department Chairs; Search Committees.
  - ii) Timeline: Begin immediately and then continuous re-evaluation.

- iii) Expected outcomes: A truly multicultural faculty. Faculty diversity that is at a minimum is representative of the national pool from which candidates are drawn.
- iv) Assessment: Collect and report demographic data to track hiring. Formative evaluations (interviews of those who accepted positions and those that did not to assess the effectiveness of various parts of the recruiting and hiring process).

**7. Revise promotion and tenure policies and annual merit policies to eliminate real and perceived bias against women and minority and other underrepresented faculty (e.g., service loads; definitions of quality scholarship; tenure clock stoppages; hearings).**

- i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Provost; Deans; Chief Diversity Officer; Department Chairs; new task force.
- ii) Timeline: Appoint task force immediately to report recommendations in one year.
- iii) Expected outcomes: Increase morale and retention of underrepresented faculty and students; expand minority faculty numbers at associate and full professor levels.
- iv) Assessment: Conduct exit interviews to assess treatment of underrepresented groups among departing faculty, professional and non-professional staff, and students. Do the same for those who have not left. Collect and report demographic data to track P&T applications through the review, appeal, and approval process at each level.

**8. Require each unit to achieve and demonstrate performance-based salary equity for all faculty and staff at all levels.**

- i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Provost, Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services, Deans, Institutional Research, Human Resources.
- ii) Timeline: Immediate and ongoing until completed with periodic reviews.
- iii) Expected outcomes: Eliminate non-performance based inequities in salaries. Increased retention and morale and thus faculty and staff productivity.
- iv) Assessment: Collect and report demographic data to indicate areas of possible salary inequity that need further assessment. Track by formative (qualitative research including interviews and focus groups and opinion surveys) as well as summative evaluations.

**9. Actively recruit and mentor underrepresented staff to occupy visible positions of responsibility.**

- i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Provost, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services, Vice Chancellor for Human Resources, Department and Unit Heads.
- ii) Timeline: Begin immediately and then continuous re-evaluation.
- iii) Expected outcomes: A truly multicultural staff.
- iv) Assessment: Collect and report demographic data to track hiring and promotion and retention. Formative (qualitative research including interviews and focus groups and opinion surveys) as well as summative evaluations.

**10. Develop additional benefits programs to recruit and retain high quality faculty, students, and staff (e.g., childcare programs for faculty, staff, and full-time graduate and professional students; workload accommodations policy for new parents; domestic partner benefits; domestic partner/spousal accommodations for new hires).**

- i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Provost, Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services, Chief Diversity Officer, Human Resources, Faculty Council, Staff Council.
- ii) Timeline: Begin immediately to work with UM System Vice President for Human Resources.
- iii) Expected outcomes: Increased retention and morale and thus productivity in all parts of the University.
- iv) Assessment: Incorporate appraisal of benefits programs into ongoing campus climate assessments.

**11. Disentangle U.S. racial-ethnic minority group members from international racial-ethnic group members when collecting and reporting faculty and staff data in terms of applicant pools, position finalist pools, new hires, tenure applicants, tenure awards, and promotions.**

- i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Provost, Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services, Chief Diversity Officer, Human Resources, Institutional Research.
- ii) Timeline: Begin immediately by establishing an ad hoc committee to plan and implement a strategy to address this issue.
- iii) Expected outcomes: Increased reliability and validity of data regarding faculty and staff diversity; more effective strategic planning for diversifying the faculty.
- iv) Assessment: Report of the committee on plan to provide more accurate data.

## **Mission**

**Rationale:** According to Sue et al. (1998) culturally competent and inclusive organizations have a written policy, mission or vision statement that frames the concepts of multiculturalism and diversity into a meaningful operational definition. The multicultural statement cannot be simply an add-on but must be stated in such a manner as to infuse concepts throughout an organization's operations, structures and policies. Furthermore, culturally competent and inclusive organizations have developed a multicultural and diversity action plan with clear objectives and specific timeframes for implementation of multicultural goals. This allows an organization to assess whether its actions are consistent with its stated goals concerning multiculturalism. Thus, the mission, philosophy and goals at all levels clearly address issues of diversity and multiculturalism (Grieger, 1996).

Although there are clearly identifiable statements about diversity contained in the current mission and vision statements of the university, as well as in the current strategic planning document, these documents do not yet contain meaningful "*operational definitions*," and they could be further enhanced so as to "infuse concepts throughout the organization's operations, structures and policies." In addition, academic divisions and departments, as well as nonacademic units, must develop specific actions plans that are tied to the broader mission, vision and strategic planning documents.

Many reasons exist for including multiculturalism as value. Although there were mixed views among the focus group participants in Phase 5 of the MU Campus Climate Study, the majority of those expressing negative views did so out of concern that MU does not yet exemplify such a value, and that doing so would seem cosmetic rather than demonstrative of the value of diversity. Thus, adopting multiculturalism as a value should be a reflection of the actions the university takes to show its commitment to a diverse campus rather than a nice sentiment that is not backed up by concrete acts. Such an action needs to be part of a comprehensive plan that infuses multiculturalism into all facets of the university.

### **Action Steps:**

#### **1. Establish a comprehensive, campus-wide diversity mission statement.**

- i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Chancellor and Provost in cooperation with Chancellor's Staff, Chancellor's Strategic Planning and Resource Advisory Council, the Diversity Council, Provost's Staff, the Council of Deans, MU Faculty Council and MU Staff Council.
- ii) Timeline: By the end of the 2005-06 academic year.
- iii) Expected outcomes: Clear and consistent operational definitions of diversity, multiculturalism and related constructs will be available for administrators, faculty, staff, and students to draw upon in taking further action to advance MU toward a multicultural institution. The mission, philosophy and goals of MU will clearly address issues of diversity and multiculturalism.
- iv) Assessment: Incorporate appraisal of the institution as multicultural versus nondiscriminatory into ongoing assessments of campus climate.

#### **2. Require all divisions, departments and nonacademic units to establish a local diversity mission statement and action plan that is consistent with the university-wide diversity mission statement.**

- i) Coordinating Persons and/or Offices: Deans in cooperation with divisional faculty, staff and students. Department Chairs in cooperation with departmental faculty, staff and students. Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs in cooperation with Directors of Residential Life, Student Life, student organizations and other nonacademic units. All other directors and unit heads.
- ii) Timeline: By the end of 2006-07 academic year.
- iii) Expected outcomes: The mission, philosophy and goals of each division, department and nonacademic units clearly address issues of diversity and multiculturalism in ways that are consistent with the broader MU Diversity Mission Statement.
- iv) Assessment: Introduce assessment of the achievement of multicultural objectives into annual performance evaluations for deans, department chairs, and unit directors.

#### **3. Adopt "Multiculturalism" as a fifth value: Emphasize that commitment to the recognition of *all* cultures and *all* peoples will be integrated into every aspect of university life and work.**

- i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Chancellor, Provost, Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Chief Diversity Officer in cooperation with a new campus-wide task force.

- ii) Timeline: Immediately empower a new task force to convene public forums and conduct campus-wide surveys to address the proposal to adopt “Multiculturalism” as a fifth value. Charge the task force with coming to a resolution by the end of the 2006-07 academic year.
- iii) Expected outcomes: “Multiculturalism” will be adopted as a fifth value of the university, or some other viable alternative will be proposed and enacted.
- iv) Assessment: Incorporate appraisal of the institution as multicultural versus nondiscriminatory into ongoing assessments of campus climate.

## **Multicultural Curriculum**

**Rationale**: Smith and Associates (1997) have provided a rich review of the research on the effects of diversity in the curriculum on a variety of outcomes for both majority and minority students. Their review indicates that diversity-related coursework is associated with the following outcomes: (a) openness to racial understanding, (b) cultural awareness, (c) understanding of racism, (d) support for educational equity, (e) advances in cognitive development, (f) reduction of prejudicial attitudes, and (g) overall satisfaction in college. The majority of findings support the inclusion of multicultural material in the classroom as directly related to increased multicultural understanding and greater satisfaction with college.

In our efforts to approach multiculturalism as a worldview, we need to better prepare our students to view the world from the perspective of others. Reducing ethnocentrism will be an essential component of helping students to comfortably work and live with people from other parts of the world. In pursuing these goals, we must consider whether they will be achieved more efficiently through academic cooperation rather than competition, integration rather than compartmentalization. Sue et al. explicitly encourage coalition building and networking among minorities and women and the development cross-cultural competence. Can we be a national model for achieving diversity in its broadest definition—by breaking down barriers of difference between disciplines on campus and countering specialization and separatism? Is that goal best achieved by a wide series of distinct "Studies" programs or by organizing around broader topics and in the process modeling the true multiculturalism that we all seek to achieve? There is a model for this at Baruch College-City University of New York (See details in an article in *Diverse* Sept 22, 2005 or at [www.diverseeducation.com](http://www.diverseeducation.com)).

### **1. Include a multiculturalism requirement in the General Education Architecture.**

- i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Provost; Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education.
- ii) Timeline: Appoint a task force to design the approach immediately - report with a proposal or set of proposals by fall 2006.
- iii) Expected outcomes: Improved climate, improved recruitment and retention, improved undergraduate learning outcomes (see above) for all students. Development of our students (and faculty and staff) as citizens of the world.
- iv) Assessment: Qualitative evaluation in interviews/focus groups and by survey both before and after implementation. Assess perceptions of campus climate as a function of multicultural coursework. Utilize longitudinal surveys (e.g., as entering freshmen and then again when graduating).

**2. Expand the curriculum of Women's and Gender Studies, Religious Studies, and Black Studies.**

- i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Provost, Deans, Program Directors.
- ii) Timeline: Begin immediately to develop the new curricular components and have some of them in place by fall 2006 and all of them in place by fall 2007.
- iii) Expected outcomes: Improved climate, improved recruitment and retention, improved undergraduate learning outcomes for all students. Development of our students (and faculty and staff) as citizens of the world.
- iv) Assessment: Qualitative evaluation in interviews/focus groups and by survey both before and after implementation. Assess perceptions of campus climate as a function of multicultural coursework. Utilize longitudinal surveys (e.g., as entering freshmen and then again when graduating).

**3. Develop new curriculum for Latino(a)/Latin American Studies, Asian Studies, American Indian Studies, and Disability Studies.**

- i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Provost, Deans, Program Directors.
- ii) Timeline: Begin immediately to develop the new curricular components and have some of them in place by fall 2006 and all of them in place by fall 2007.
- iii) Expected outcomes: Improved climate, improved recruitment and retention, improved undergraduate learning outcomes for all students. Development of our students (and faculty and staff) as citizens of the world.
- iv) Assessment: Qualitative evaluation in interviews/focus groups and by survey both before and after implementation. Assess perceptions of campus climate as a function of multicultural coursework. Utilize longitudinal surveys (e.g., as entering freshmen and then again when graduating).

**4. Elevate Women's and Gender Studies and Black Studies programs to departmental status.**

- i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Provost, Deans, Program Directors.
- ii) Timeline: Develop proposed plans for transition from program to department immediately. Coordinate next steps in accordance with timelines established by each proposal.
- iii) Expected outcomes: Improved climate, improved recruitment and retention, improved undergraduate learning outcomes for all students. Development of our students (and faculty and staff) as citizens of the world.
- iv) Assessment: Qualitative evaluation in interviews/focus groups and by survey both before and after implementation. Assess perceptions of campus climate as a function of multicultural coursework. Utilize longitudinal surveys (e.g., as entering freshmen and then again when graduating).

5. Investigate the integration of some of the following academic programs into a smaller number of units and elevate those units to departmental status: **Black Studies, Latino(a)/Latin American Studies, Asian Studies, American Indian Studies. Consider for example: Comparative American Ethnic Cultures (Black/Latino(a)/Asian/American Indian); World/Regional Cultures (with specialty/emphasis in Latin America and Asia).**
- i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Provost, Deans, Program Directors, task force.
  - ii) Timeline: Begin discussions as soon as possible with all relevant faculty.
  - iii) Expected outcomes: Integration of the study of various cultures to reach toward a multicultural perspective while not losing touch with the individual cultures and their histories. More effective sharing of resources and the development of critical mass of faculty and students and thus more effective delivery of academic programs and perhaps new ways to look at academic areas. Cross-disciplinary collaboration among faculty. Potential administrative costs saving over independent programs approach. Reduced redundancy (in teaching courses on basic aspects of multiculturalism) and expanded coursework options on discipline specific content.
  - iv) Assessment: Qualitative analysis of the effects of any integration on the academic disciplines at MU and the productivity of associated faculty. Qualitative evaluation in interviews/focus groups and by survey both before and after implementation.

## **Multicultural Training, Group Relations, and Environmental Issues**

**Rationale:** According to Sue et al. (1998), culturally competent and inclusive universities have a systematic and long-term commitment to provide multicultural education and diversity training, to work toward the elimination of barriers that block multiculturalism, and to increase the sensitivity and competencies of faculty, staff and students. In-service multicultural training for faculty, staff and administrators should be an intimate part of the university's activities.

Gurin (2004), in her expert testimony in the reverse discrimination cases at the University of Michigan, *Gratz v. Bollinger*, 135 F. Supp. 2d 790 (E.D. Mich. 2001) (affirmed in part and reversed in part by *Gratz v. Bollinger*, 539 U.S. 244, 123 S. Ct. 2411, 156 L. Ed. 2d 257 (2003)) and *Gutter v. Bollinger*, 137 F. Supp. 2d 821 (E.D. Mich. 2001) (affirmed by *Gutter v. Bollinger*, 539 U.S. 306, 123 S. Ct. 2325, 156 L. Ed. 2d 304 (2003)), stated:

“Diversity experiences during college had impressive effects on the extent to which graduates in the national study were living racially or ethnically integrated lives in the post-college world. [Controlling for background characteristics], 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. This confirms that the long-term pattern of segregation noted by many social scientists can be broken by diversity experiences during college” (¶22).

The MU Campus Climate Study found that over half of the respondents believed that providing more sensitivity training/awareness workshops would increase the university community's awareness of the issues concerning students, faculty, and staff of different races, nationalities, sexual orientations and religions, as well as issues faced by those with disabilities. Further, non-academic student service providers (e.g., Student Health, Counseling Center, Admissions, etc.) reported that certain aspects of their service quality were lower, on average, for some segments of students from underrepresented groups. While many employees indicated that they had received training directed specifically at working with people from underrepresented groups, a small but significant number reported they had received no training to address the needs of individuals from underrepresented groups.

Research on undergraduate students shows that, controlling for entering student characteristics, attending and participating in multicultural training has positive effects on promoting racial-ethnic understanding and overall satisfaction with college (see Blimling, 2001 or Smith and Associates, 1997 for reviews of this expansive research base). Gurin (2004) also demonstrated that the diversity experiences out of the classroom are part of the seamless learning that contributes to a well-educated and multicultural citizenry. Furthermore, these experiences (for students, faculty, and staff) have shown to benefit our global economy (Chang, 2002; Hurtado, 2004). As a result, it is recommended that MU actively provide experiences that complement and enhance classroom learning to promote a multicultural learning and working climate.

Smith and colleagues (1997) note that inter-group relations and campus climate are significant dimensions of multiculturalism, involving complex issues such as blatant and subtle racism, as well as "legacies of intolerance." Furthermore, culturally competent and inclusive organizations encourage coalition building and networking among racial and ethnic minorities and women, and they are not threatened by "clustering" of employees along racial, cultural, ethnic lines, because they recognize that clustering which allows for nourishment and support may lead to greater cross-cultural interactions in the long term (Sue et al., 1998).

### **Action Steps:**

- 1. Implement mandatory multicultural training for all faculty, staff and teaching assistants, and increase options for voluntary multicultural training opportunities (e.g., ADA & disability information; classroom multicultural discourse; Safe Space).**
  - i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Chancellor, Provost, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services, Chief Diversity Officer; Chancellor's Diversity Initiative.
  - ii) Timeline: Ongoing-continuous.
  - iii) Expected outcomes: Improved intergroup interactions and relations on campus and constituent satisfaction with services. Faculty, staff, and TAs with increased multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills.
  - iv) Assessment: Track of numbers of training sessions for at least three years, with training sessions to include standardized evaluation instruments. Incorporate multicultural awareness item on teaching evaluations, job performance. On-going evaluation of faculty, staff, and TAs multicultural competencies.

2. **Actively pursue extramural funding to support multicultural programming.**
  - i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Provost, Chief Diversity Officer; Office of Sponsored Programs; Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs; Student Affairs Directors.
  - ii) Timeline: Ongoing-continuous.
  - iii) Expected outcomes: Increase funding to bring in nationally recognized experts across a variety of academic disciplines to present on multicultural issues in their area. Faculty, staff, and students are exposed to a variety of diversity learning opportunities.
  - iv) Assessment: Compute the number of university-sponsored multicultural programming offered each academic year. Semi-annual reports on progress in obtaining additional funding.
  
3. **Fund innovative diversity programs designed to increase inter-group knowledge, understanding and skills (e.g., Interactive Theatre; Safe Space; Vagina Monologues; Difficult Dialogues).**
  - i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Chancellor; Provost; Chief Diversity Officer.
  - ii) Timeline: Ongoing-continuous.
  - iii) Expected outcomes: Increased range of methods for faculty, students, and staff to learn about diversity issues. New programs funded and operational.
  - iv) Assessment: Track attendance to programs and develop quick satisfaction survey for participants to evaluate these innovative programs. Semi-annual reports on progress.
  
4. **Designate a Multicultural Month to celebrate the campus community's multiple forms of diversity.**
  - i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Chief Diversity Officer; Chancellor; Provost; Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services.
  - ii) Timeline: Appoint a committee to begin meeting 2006-07 to engage in planning and implementation. Produce first month of programming 2007-08 and ongoing thereafter.
  - iii) Expected outcomes: Increased programming to celebrate all areas of diversity represented in today's society. Increased sensitivity to a range of diversity issues.
  - iv) Assessment: Track attendance to programs and develop quick satisfaction survey for participants to evaluate new programming. Semi-annual reports on progress.
  
5. **Support diversity-related media reports and increase diversity-related press releases that address gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, disability, international issues, and religious diversity.**
  - i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Assistant to the Chancellor for University Affairs; Chief Diversity Officer; Office of Sponsored Programs; Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs; Student Affairs Directors.
  - ii) Timeline: Immediately and ongoing, continuous.
  - iii) Expected outcomes: Increased visibility of diversity programming, research and campus activities.
  - iv) Assessment: Retroactively study past diversity-related media reports to establish a baseline; follow with setting new objectives and annual tracking and reporting of diversity-related media reports.

**6. Provide interfaith calendar.**

- i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Chief Diversity Officer; Provost.
- ii) Timeline: By the end of 2005-06 academic year.
- iii) Expected outcomes: A resource for faculty and administrators in responding to the needs of students and employees with respect to religious observances. Improved perceptions of campus climate for members of non-Christian religious minorities.
- iv) Assessment: Campus climate assessments.

**7. Establish a policy to protect students, staff and faculty from adverse consequences when celebrating non-Christian religious holidays.**

- i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Chancellor; Provost; Deans; Faculty Council; Staff Council; Human Resources, Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services.
- ii) Timeline: Immediately.
- iii) Expected outcomes: Improved perceptions of campus climate for members of non-Christian religious minorities.
- iv) Assessment: Campus climate assessments.

**8. Design holiday décor to explicitly include non-Christian traditions.**

- i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Chancellor; Provost; Deans; Department Chairs; Unit Directors; Residence Hall Coordinators.
- ii) Timeline: Immediately, ongoing, continuous.
- iii) Expected outcomes: Improved perceptions of campus climate for members of non-Christian religious minorities.
- iv) Assessment: Campus climate assessments.

**9. Continue to improve accessibility of buildings and other areas of the campus.**

- i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services, Chief Diversity Officer; ADA Coordinator.
- ii) Timeline: Ongoing, continuous.
- iii) Expected outcomes: Continuous improvement in accessibility.
- iv) Assessment: Annual reports from ADA Coordinator.

**10. Reorganize MU homepage to provide easy access to diversity information and resources.**

- i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Assistant to the Chancellor for University Affairs; Chief Diversity Officer.
- ii) Timeline: By the end of 2005-06 academic year.
- iii) Expected outcomes: Provide a more user-friendly method for obtaining information on diversity-related campus resources.
- iv) Assessment: Track number of times the diversity website information is accessed.

**11. Develop diversity web site.**

- i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Assistant to the Chancellor for University Affairs; Chief Diversity Officer; Chancellor's Diversity Initiative.
- ii) Timeline: By the end of 2005-06 academic year.

- iii) Expected outcomes: Easy access to information on diversity-related support services, offices, centers, and programming.
- iv) Assessment: Track number of times the diversity website is accessed.

## **Student Activities and Services**

**Rationale**: All student services must be fully responsive to the needs of a diverse student population. Grieger (1996) recommends that annual programming for students reflects an appreciation for diversity and addresses multicultural issues (e.g., New Student Orientation, Black History Month, Women’s History Month, Disability Awareness, Coming Out Week), and that programs offered in residence halls regularly address issues of diversity and multiculturalism. Offices designated for multicultural student services must be provided with facilities that are visible, and centrally located in high traffic areas on campus. In addition, all student affairs programming must be physically accessible, provide interpreters for deaf persons and bilingual translators when appropriate. Student affairs professionals must actively support and attend campus events that celebrate diversity and multiculturalism. Regularly scheduled training must be available for all student services units, so that student affairs professional staff is equipped to respond effectively in addressing the needs of a diverse student population.

### **Action Steps**:

- 1. Require all student services units to be responsible for including multiculturalism in their programming and training, drawing upon specialized units with multicultural foci.**
  - i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs.
  - ii) Timeline: Beginning immediately and ongoing.
  - iii) Expected outcomes: Infusion of multicultural issues across all student services units sends a message that diversity issues are highly valued and recognized as an integral aspect that cuts across all service areas.
  - iv) Assessment: Annual reports by student service units that document their collaborative work with specialized units and multicultural focused programming offered during the academic year.
  
- 2. Expand resources for and services offered by the Women’s Center, LGBT Resource Center, Multicultural Center, International Center, Black Culture Center, Access Mizzou project.**
  - i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Provost, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs.
  - ii) Timeline: Immediately establish a committee to develop a plan for the fiscal and logistic priorities for these service units; begin implementation of this plan during 2006-07 year with yearly updates on progress through 2009.
  - iii) Expected outcomes: Students experience a greater exposure to diversity issues through increased programming; increased opportunities to meet with and interact with diverse student groups; more opportunities for continued professional development training for student services employees.
  - iv) Assessment: Annual reports by student service units that document the programming offered during the academic year.

**3. Evaluate space allocations for multicultural services offices and increase and/or relocate as appropriate.**

- i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Provost, Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs.
- ii) Timeline: Immediately appoint a committee to develop assessment; conduct assessment throughout 2006-07 academic year; and continue until completed.
- iii) Expected outcomes: Increase utilization of multicultural services offices by all students.
- iv) Assessment: Annual reports of service utilization.

**4. Establish clear lines of communication with departmental and divisional academic advisors to ensure that they are aware of the full range of courses and academic programs related to diversity, as well as relevant student services and activities.**

- i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Director of Student Success Center.
- ii) Timeline: Immediately establish a committee to develop a plan increase communication; begin implementation of that plan in 2006-07 academic year.
- iii) Expected outcomes: Increased enrollment in courses and utilization of services.
- iv) Assessment: Track course enrollments and attendance at diversity related programs.

## **Research and Scholarly Activities**

**Rationale:** Institutions of higher education fulfill the purpose of knowledge creation and dissemination through their tripartite function of teaching, research and service. While each function is requisite to achieving the institutional mission, Fairweather and Beach (2002) suggest the value placed upon research in the faculty rewards system demonstrates the prominence accorded to the research function within research universities. Deeply embedded in the institutional culture, research universities have historically situated scholarly research in a positivistic paradigm and have conceived research effort and production as grant/contract generation, publication in recognized journals, and scholarly conference presentations.

In his seminal work on scholarly activity, Boyer (1990) suggests re-envisioning scholarship within the academy:

*Surely, scholarship means engaging in original research. But the work of the scholar also means stepping back from one's investigation, looking for connections, building bridges between theory and practice, and communicating one's knowledge effectively to students. Specifically, we conclude that the work of the professoriate might be thought of as having four separate, yet overlapping, functions. These are: the scholarship of discovery; the scholarship of integration; the scholarship of application; and the scholarship of teaching (Boyer, 1990, p. 16)*

Rather than the dichotomous view of professorial work as research and teaching, this broader conception of scholarship sees the four types as interconnected and inseparable. This holistic approach acknowledges the diversity of talents within the professoriate and validates diverse faculty strengths, talents and efforts through the faculty reward system.

Culturally competent and inclusive universities seek to broaden the concept of research and scholarship to actively promote diverse scholarly interests and methodological perspectives within their research communities. A re-thinking of the meaning of scholarship is needed for the work of non-majority scholars to be viewed as worthy and accorded recognition by the reward system. Aquirre (2000) notes that within the traditional research university culture the scholarly work of underrepresented and minority faculty is often marginalized and languishes on the periphery of the academic borders. According to Aquirre (2000) and Turner & Myers (2000), many underrepresented group scholars develop research agendas focused on topics related to minority/underrepresented group issues and apply post-positivist methods to their research endeavors. Such research extends the bounds of knowledge creation, offers alternate epistemological perspectives, and expands the base of contributions to the academic enterprise.

Institutions of higher learning have, as their principal goal, the production and dissemination of new knowledge and the training of new generations of practicing scholars in evolving social contexts. Multiculturalism is a central component of these scholarly activities.

Underrepresented minority students constitute the fastest growing segment of our population. Their opportunities and ultimate achievements in higher education as both students and scholars will in no small measure determine the social and economic future of our state and nation. It is therefore a compelling national and local interest to increase the diversity of university scholars and to do so as rapidly and completely as possible. But an effective response to the changing university population also requires the promotion of multicultural scholarship. Institutions valuing diversity will actively promote a mix of scholarly endeavors including the scholarship of multiculturalism, which conceptualizes and promotes the diversity within the scholarly community and the larger community to which it responds.

According to Grieger (1996), professional staff, faculty and administrators in a variety of roles and positions engage in research, including mentored research projects, writing, and professional presentations on multicultural issues; their research also typically leads scholars to pursue extramural grants to provide funding for efforts to promote and enhance diversity and multiculturalism. All of these activities build on internal financial and administrative support. Just as a strong university scholar base requires increased participation by underrepresented minorities, it needs strong internal support to support multicultural scholarship.

### **Action Steps:**

- 1. Establish a campus-wide faculty team charged with reviewing the meaning of scholarship at MU, examining the scholarly rewards system, facilitating dialogue among MU faculty, and developing a set of recommendations for institutional consideration.**
  - i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Chancellor; Provost; Provost's staff.
  - ii) Timeline: Immediately appoint faculty committee representative of the multiple disciplines and fields of study, faculty ranks, and cultural diversity. Committee to submit a report and recommendations to Chancellor and Provost by the end of academic year 2007-08.

- iii) Expected outcomes: A broader conception of scholarly activity that is reflected in the faculty rewards system; greater faculty satisfaction.
  - iv) Assessment: Report of the outcomes of the committee.
- 2. Provide special funding (small grants) for broadly defined multicultural research and scholarship.**
- i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Vice Provost for Research; Provost; Chief Diversity Officer.
  - ii) Timeline: Intensive planning, 2006-07; ongoing and continuous implementation.
  - iii) Expected outcomes: All faculty and administrators at MU will come to recognize multicultural scholarship as central to the university's scholarly mission; additional research resources will be made available to a broad range of MU scholars.
  - iv) Assessment: Annual reports on the outcomes of this new program (e.g., publications, conference presentations, extramural funding).
- 3. Increase funding and administrative support for new and existing research mentorship programs specifically targeting underrepresented students.**
- i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Vice Chancellor for Development and Alumni Relations; Vice Provost for Research.
  - ii) Timeline: Intensive planning, 2006-07; ongoing and continuous implementation
  - iii) Expected outcomes: Create strong and extensive networks of faculty and students whose research focuses on multiculturalism; develop and institutionalize mentoring practices for faculty and students from underrepresented groups. Enrich the academic experience of scholarship for both undergraduate and graduate students concerned with multiculturalism; integrate students from underrepresented groups into the research mission of the university; develop and expand the next generation of scholars from underrepresented groups and/or those with scholarly interest in multiculturalism.
  - iv) Assessment: Track new funding for these programs as well as outcomes of increased resources on outcomes (e.g., student advancement, publications, conference presentations, extramural funding).

## **On-going Campus Climate Assessments**

**Rationale**: According to Sue et al. (1998), culturally competent and inclusive universities actively solicit feedback from students, faculty and staff related to issues of race, culture, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, disability, religion, linguistic background, and so forth. Institutions may find that feedback from various groups provides a rich source of useful information in their movement toward multiculturalism. Institutional self-assessment sends a strong message to members of the campus community about the importance of identifying their needs and concerns, and also provides a powerful statement about inclusion.

The MU Campus Climate Study for Underrepresented Groups was a comprehensive, multifaceted, multiphase institutional assessment conducted over the course of five years. The targets of assessment in the MU Campus Climate Study included many but not all aspects of campus climate, spanning individual to unit to campus-wide levels of analysis. Nevertheless, the

data and findings of the MU Campus Climate Study were only a snapshot of a continuously evolving process, which examined as well as influenced the campus climate. It is critical that the university establish a system of ongoing evaluation of the climate for diversity.

**Action Steps:**

- 1. Establish a standing committee to oversee and administer future campus climate assessments. This committee must have a clear charge and authority to engage in assessment of campus climate deemed necessary by the committee, as well as a sufficient budget to engage in these activities.**
  - i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Chief Diversity Officer; Diversity Advisory Council; Faculty Council; Staff Council; Student Organizations.
  - ii) Timeline: Immediately appoint the committee; ongoing, continuous.
  - iii) Expected outcomes: Accountability for ongoing data collection and analyses.
  - iv) Assessment: Annual reports on activities of the committee.
  
- 2. Administer surveys and conduct focus groups and interviews to assess academic and non-academic units at all levels.**
  - i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Campus Climate Assessment Committee.
  - ii) Timeline: Ongoing-continuous.
  - iii) Expected outcomes: Benchmarking and longitudinal assessment of diversity efforts and campus climate at all levels.
  - iv) Assessment: Annual reports on activities of the committee.
  
- 3. Make campus climate data available to the Chief Diversity Officer and to members of the Diversity Advisory Council, and others as appropriate.**
  - i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Campus Climate Assessment Committee.
  - ii) Timeline: Ongoing-continuous.
  - iii) Expected outcomes: Enhanced accountability for diversity initiatives.
  - iv) Assessment: Annual reports on activities of the committee.
  
- 4. Use campus climate assessment data as a guide to develop new interventions that will improve campus climate more generally and provide feedback for diversity strategic planning process.**
  - i) Coordinating Person and/or Office: Chief Diversity Officer, Diversity Advisory Council.
  - ii) Timeline: Ongoing-continuous.
  - iii) Expected outcomes: Development of strategic plans that maintain the centrality of diversity initiatives; implementation of policies, programs, and procedures that enhance the campus climate related to diversity.
  - iv) Assessment: Annual reports of the committee should identify how data and findings from past activities have been used to develop new interventions and in the strategic planning process.

## *Summary and Conclusion*

The University of Missouri-Columbia is at a critical juncture in its history with respect to diversity, multiculturalism and social justice. As part of its progression from “monocultural” through “non-discriminatory” toward “multicultural” (e.g., Sue et al., 1998), MU has begun the process of diversity strategic planning to establish goals and objectives toward that end. MU has made significant progress over the years moving from a non-inclusive institution to one that expressly values inclusion. Yet we believe it is apparent to most members of the MU community that there is still work to be done.

Tremendous benefits will emerge as the transformation toward multicultural organizational development begins to materialize. Nevertheless, accomplishing those goals and objectives will require a substantial commitment of human capital and financial resources. It will also require a long-term institutional commitment at all levels of the university organizational structure, and will necessitate “buy-in” from members of all constituent groups of faculty, staff, students and administrators. Indeed, the ultimate success of efforts to improve the campus climate at MU will require a significant level of responsibility and accountability among those charged with carrying out this plan.

This report provides the historical context, conceptual foundations, and empirically-based rationales for a highly specific set of recommended action steps designed to improve the multicultural campus climate at MU. For each action step, we have identified one or more persons or offices we believe should be responsible and accountable for carrying out the activities of the recommendation within a specified timeframe. In addition, we have identified a specific set of outcomes expected to result from each action step, along with a recommended plan for assessment of those outcomes.

Members of the task force are under no illusion that every step will be immediately implemented, or that there will not be fiscal, practical, and/or political obstacles to establishing multiculturalism as an institutional priority. However, in our work we have frequently encountered what we believe to be one of the most prevalent perceptions of institutional culture that remains from MU’s exclusionary past:

Committees are formed, problems are studied, plans are formulated, but very little is ever implemented.

It requires a great deal of openness and courage for an institution to voluntarily submit to a deep and honest examination of itself at the level necessary to develop a full and comprehensive understanding of the campus climate for diversity. Yet the development of insight is only a single step forward in the process of improving climate in real and substantive ways. Ultimately, if MU is to achieve the goal of multiculturalism, the institution must not allow fiscal, practical, or political obstacles to prevent the active, persistent pursuit of the goals and objectives outlined in this report. It is clear that we cannot change our past. But it is equally clear that we must not forget it. Today, we must move forward in an effort to improve on mistakes from the past, remembering our pledge to the values of this institution: *Respect, Responsibility, Discovery and Excellence*.

## References

- American Association of Colleges and Universities. (1995). *The drama of diversity and democracy: Higher education and American commitments*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Anderson & Cooper, 1999
- Aquirre, Jr., A. (2000). *Women and minority faculty in the academic workplace: Recruitment, retention, and academic culture*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A. (1993). *What matters in college: Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Atkinson, D. R. (2004). *Counseling American minorities, 6<sup>th</sup>*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Black Alumni Association (1994). *The African American experience at the University of Missouri: 1950-1994*. Columbia, MO: Author.
- Blimling, G. S. (2001). Diversity makes you smarter. *Journal of College Student Development*, 42, 517-519.
- Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
- Branch, A. J. (2001). How to retain African-American faculty during times of challenge for higher education. In L. Jones (Ed.) *Retaining African Americans in higher education: Challenging paradigms for retaining students, faculty and administrators*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Chang, M. J. (2002). Preservation or transformation: Where's the real educational discourse of diversity? *The Review of Higher Education*, 25(2), 135-140.
- Chesler, M., Lewis, A., Crowfoot, J. (2005). *Challenging racism in higher education: Promoting justice*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Fairweather, J.S. & Beach, A.L, (2002). Variations in faculty work at research universities: Implications for state and institutional policy. *The Review of Higher Education*, 26, 97-115.
- Grieger, I. (1996). A multicultural organizational development checklist for student affairs. *Journal of College Student Development*, 37, 561-573.
- Gurin, P. (2004). The compelling need for diversity in higher education. Retrieved October 18, 2005 from University of Michigan, Admissions Lawsuits Web site, from <http://www.umich.edu/%7Eurel/admissions/legal/expert/gurintoc.html>

- Hage, S. M. (2005). Future considerations for fostering multicultural competence in mental health and educational settings: Social justice implications. In M. G. Constantine & D. W. Sue (Eds.) *Strategies for building multicultural competence in mental health and educational settings*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons.
- Hurtado, A. (2004). Toward a more equitable society: Moving forward in the struggle for affirmative action. *The Review of Higher Education*, 28(2), 273-284.
- Moody, J. (2004). *Faculty diversity: Problems and solutions*. New York: RoutledgeFarmer.
- Rankin, S.R. (2003). *Campus climate for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people: A national perspective*. Available from the Policy Institute of the National Gay and Lesbian Taskforce, [www.nglftf.org](http://www.nglftf.org)
- Rankin, S.R. (1998). The campus climate report: assessment and intervention strategies. In R.L. Sanlo (Ed.). *Working with lesbian, gay, bisexual & transgender college students* pp.277-284 , Westport, Connecticut, Greenwood Press.
- Smith, D. G. and Associates (1997). *Diversity works: The emerging picture of how students benefit*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Sue, D. W. (1995). Multicultural organizational development: Implications for the counseling profession. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 474-492). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sue, D. W., Carter, R. T., Casas, J. M., Fouad, N. A., Ivey, A. E., Jensen, M., LaFromboise, T., Manese, J. E., Ponterotto, J. G., Vazquez-Nuttall, E. (1998). *Multicultural counseling competencies: Individual and organizational development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Turner, C. S. V. (2002). *Diversifying the faculty: A guidebook for search committees*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Turner, C.S. V. & Myers, Jr., S.L. (2000). *Faculty of color in academe: Bittersweet success*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- U. S. Census Bureau (2002). *Statistical abstract of the United States, 2002*. Washington, DC: Author.
- U. S. Department of Justice (2003). *Responding to hate crimes and bias-motivated incidents on college/university campuses*. Available at [www.usdoj.gov/crs](http://www.usdoj.gov/crs).

## **Appendix 1**

### **Summary Chart of Recommendations with Action Steps and Timelines**

***Campus Climate and Training Task Force Report***  
***Summary Chart of Recommendations with Action Steps and Timelines***

<b><i>Leadership, Advocacy and Accountability</i></b>		
<b>Action Step</b>	<b>Coordinating Office/ Person</b>	<b>Timeline</b>
<b>1. Appoint senior level administrator with adequate staffing and resources to report to the Chancellor or Provost to review and coordinate all diversity and inclusion activities; responsible for oversight and direction of the diversity strategic planning process.</b>	Chancellor and Provost in cooperation with Chancellor's Staff, Provost's Staff, and others.	Appoint Interim Chief Diversity Officer as soon as possible. By July 2006, establish a plan to appoint a permanent Chief Diversity Officer. Conduct national search for Chief Diversity Officer during 2006-07 academic year.
<b>2. Appoint a permanent advisory council to the Chief Diversity Officer.</b>	Chancellor, Provost and Interim Chief Diversity Officer in cooperation with Chancellor's Staff, Provost's Staff, Faculty Council, Staff Council and others.	Establish and appoint a permanent Diversity Advisory Council by the end of 2005-06 academic year under the leadership of the Interim Chief Diversity Officer beginning in 2006-07.
<b>3. Actively recruit and promote women and minorities into leadership positions among administration, faculty, staff, and student organizations (maybe establish a formal process of selection for diversity with the existing President's Academic Leadership Institute at the UM System level.</b>	Chancellor, Provost, Deans, Chief Diversity Officer; Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Vice Chancellor for Human Resources, Department Chairs and Unit Leaders.	Immediate, intensive planning and coordination, 2006-07; implementation, ongoing-continuous.
<b>4. Create Equity Assistance Office to improve the accessibility and understandability of the complaint process for harassment and discrimination.</b>	Chancellor, Director of the Equity Assistance Office.	Appoint Interim Director for the 2006-2007 academic year and begin search for a permanent director to start for the 2007-2008 academic year.

<p><b>5. Establish accountability mechanisms at all levels (e.g., division, department, etc.).</b></p>	<p>Chancellor, Provost, Deans, non-academic unit heads.</p>	<p>Intensive planning and coordination, 2006-07, in conjunction with central and divisional planning outlined above; ongoing, and continuous.</p>
<p><b>6. Develop and implement campus-wide and unit-level reward systems for multicultural university service (e.g., Recognition of individuals through awards and rewards; address service load inequities for faculty through buy-outs or service load reductions; reward departments and divisions for constructive participation in the Diversity Initiative; set aside a fraction of divisional budget designated as reward for accomplishing diversity-related goals.</b></p>	<p>Chancellor, Provost, Chief Diversity Officer, Deans, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs.</p>	<p>Develop program during the 2006-2007 academic year and begin implementation during the 2007-2008 academic year.</p>
<p><b>7. Establish diversity resource teams at multiple levels (e.g., unit, department, division.</b></p>	<p>Deans, Department Chairs, non-academic unit heads.</p>	<p>Begin pilot implementation in the 2006-2007 academic year; based upon successful implementation strategies, expand implementation throughout the university to all units by end of 2007-2008.</p>
<p><b>8. Provide leadership training to increase administrators' multicultural competencies and effectiveness in diverse environments.</b></p>	<p>Provost, Deans, Chief Diversity Officer, UM System Vice President.</p>	<p>Planning 2006-07; implementation 2007-09; ongoing-continuous.</p>

## ***RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION***

<b>Action Step</b>	<b>Coordinating Office/ Person</b>	<b>Timeline</b>
<b>1. Successfully recruit and retain significantly larger numbers of racial-ethnic minority students and students with disabilities from high schools and community colleges throughout Missouri and surrounding states.</b>	Provost; Vice Provost for Enrollment Management; Deans; Department Chairs.	Beginning immediately and then continuous.
<b>2. Revise scholarship and financial aid guidelines to allow community college transfer students to qualify for financial aid on par with entering freshmen.</b>	Provost; Vice Provost for Enrollment Management.	Begin immediately and then continuous re-evaluation 2006-07 academic year.
<b>3. Expand the scope of Academic Retention Services (ARS) to address the needs of students from all racial-ethnic groups and students with disabilities. Eliminate the perception that its services are exclusively remedial.</b>	Provost	Begin immediately and then continuous re-evaluation.
<b>4. Establish and support voluntary mentoring programs for underrepresented undergraduate and graduate students, and faculty.</b>	Chief Diversity Officer; Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs; Dean of Graduate School; Provost, Deans; Department Chairs.	Immediate assessment of current mentoring programs in all colleges and elsewhere on campus (for example, Student Success Center and Honors College), with implementation of enhanced programming beginning 2006-2007 academic year.
<b>5. Expand and enhance networking and social opportunities for minority faculty, students and staff (e.g., Unity; BFSO; HLAFSA: HALO; LBC; Women's Faculty Network, etc.).</b>	Chief Diversity Officer.	Begin immediately and then continuous re-evaluation

<p><b>6. Expand minority faculty hires to include all ranks, and develop a program to recruit senior faculty from underrepresented groups.</b></p>	<p>Provost; Chief Diversity Officer; Deans; Department Chairs; Search Committees.</p>	<p>Begin immediately and then continuous re-evaluation.</p>
<p><b>7. Revise promotion and tenure policies and annual merit policies to eliminate real and perceived bias against women and minority and other underrepresented faculty (e.g., service loads; definitions of quality scholarship; tenure clock stoppages; hearings).</b></p>	<p>Provost; Deans; Chief Diversity Officer; Department Chairs; new task force.</p>	<p>Appoint task force immediately to report recommendations in one year.</p>
<p><b>8. Require each unit to achieve and demonstrate performance-based salary equity for all faculty and staff at all levels.</b></p>	<p>Provost, Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services, Deans, Institutional Research, Human Resources.</p>	<p>Immediate and ongoing until completed with periodic reviews.</p>
<p><b>9. Actively recruit and mentor underrepresented staff to occupy visible positions of responsibility.</b></p>	<p>Provost, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services, Vice Chancellor for Human Resources, Department and Unit Heads.</p>	<p>Begin immediately and then continuous re-evaluation.</p>
<p><b>10. Develop additional benefits programs to recruit and retain high quality faculty, students, and staff (e.g., childcare programs for faculty, staff, and full-time graduate and professional students; workload accommodations policy for new parents; domestic partner benefits; domestic partner/spousal accommodations for new hires).</b></p>	<p>Provost, Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services, Chief Diversity Officer, Human Resources, Faculty Council, Staff Council.</p>	<p>Begin immediately to work with UM System Vice President for Human Resources.</p>

<p><b>11. Disentangle U.S. racial-ethnic minority group members from international racial-ethnic group members when collecting and reporting faculty and staff data in terms of applicant pools, position finalist pools, new hires, tenure applicants, tenure awards, and promotions.</b></p>	<p>Provost, Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services, Chief Diversity Officer, Human Resources, Institutional Research.</p>	<p>Begin immediately by establishing an ad hoc committee to plan and implement a strategy to address this issue.</p>
<p><b><i>Mission</i></b></p>		
<p><b>Action Step</b></p>	<p><b>Coordinating Office/ Person</b></p>	<p><b>Timeline</b></p>
<p><b>1. Establish a comprehensive, campus-wide diversity mission statement.</b></p>	<p>Chancellor and Provost in cooperation with Chancellor and Provost in cooperation with Chancellor’s Staff, Chancellor’s Strategic Planning and Resource Advisory Council, the Diversity Council, Provost’s Staff, the Council of Deans, MU Faculty Council and MU Staff Council.</p>	<p>By the end of the 2005-06 academic year.</p>
<p><b>2. Require all divisions, departments and nonacademic units to establish a local diversity mission statement and action plan that is consistent with the university-wide diversity mission statement.</b></p>	<p>Deans in cooperation with divisional faculty, staff and students. Department Chairs in cooperation with departmental faculty, staff and students. Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs in cooperation with Directors of Residential Life, Student Life, student organizations and other nonacademic units. All other directors and unit heads.</p>	<p>By the end of 2006-07 academic year.</p>
<p><b>3. Adopt “Multiculturalism” as a fifth value: Emphasize that commitment to the recognition of <i>all</i> cultures and <i>all</i> peoples will be integrated into every aspect of university life and work.</b></p>	<p>Chancellor, Provost, Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Chief Diversity Officer in cooperation with a new campus-wide task force.</p>	<p>Immediately empower a new task force to convene public forums and conduct campus-wide surveys to address the proposal to adopt “Multiculturalism” as a fifth value. Charge the task force with coming to a resolution by the end of the 2006-07 academic year.</p>

<b><i>Multicultural Curriculum</i></b>		
<b>Action Step</b>	<b>Coordinating Office/ Person</b>	<b>Timeline</b>
<b>1. Include a multiculturalism requirement in the General Education Architecture.</b>	Provost; Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education.	Appoint a task force to design the approach immediately - report with a proposal or set of proposals by fall 2006.
<b>2. Expand the curriculum of Women's and Gender Studies, Religious Studies, and Black Studies.</b>	Provost, Deans, Program Directors.	Begin immediately to develop the new curricular components and have some of them in place by fall 2006 and all of them in place by fall 2007.
<b>3. Develop new curriculum for Latino(a)/Latin American Studies, Asian Studies, American Indian Studies, and Disability Studies.</b>	Provost, Deans, Program Directors.	Begin immediately to develop the new curricular components and have some of them in place by fall 2006 and all of them in place by fall 2007.
<b>4. Elevate Women's and Gender Studies and Black Studies programs to departmental status.</b>	Provost, Deans, Program Directors.	Begin immediately to develop the new curricular components and have some of them in place by fall 2006 and all of them in place by fall 2007.
<b>5. Investigate the integration of some academic programs into a smaller number of units and elevate those units to departmental status: Black Studies, Latino(a)/Latin American Studies, Asian Studies, American Indian Studies. Consider for example: Comparative American Ethnic Cultures (Black/Latino(a)/ American Indian/Asian); World/Regional Cultures (with specialty/emphasis in Latin America and Asia).</b>	Provost, Deans, Program Directors, task force.	Begin discussions as soon as possible with all relevant faculty.

<b><i>Multicultural Training, Group Relations, and Environmental Issues</i></b>		
<b>Action Step</b>	<b>Coordinating Office/ Person</b>	<b>Timeline</b>
<b>1. Implement mandatory multicultural training for all faculty, staff and teaching assistants, and increase options for voluntary multicultural training opportunities (e.g., ADA &amp; disability information; classroom multicultural discourse; Safe Space).</b>	Chancellor, Provost, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services, Chief Diversity Officer; Chancellor's Diversity Initiative.	Ongoing-continuous.
<b>2. Actively pursue extramural funding to support multicultural programming.</b>	Chief Diversity Officer; Office of Sponsored Programs; Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs; Student Affairs Directors.	Ongoing-continuous.
<b>3. Fund innovative diversity programs (e.g., Interactive Theatre; Safe Space; Vagina Monologues; Difficult Dialogues).</b>	Chancellor; Provost; Chief Diversity Officer.	Ongoing-continuous.
<b>4. Develop Difficult Dialogues program designed to increase inter-group knowledge, understanding and skills.</b>	Chief Diversity Officer.	Beginning 2005-06 sustained a minimum of 2 years.
<b>5. Designate a Multicultural Month to celebrate the campus community's multiple forms of diversity.</b>	Chief Diversity Officer; Chancellor; Provost; Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services.	Appoint a committee to begin meeting 2006-07 to engage in planning and implementation. Produce first month of programming 2007-08 and ongoing thereafter.
<b>6. Support diversity-related media reports and increase diversity-related press releases that address gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, disability, international issues, and religious diversity.</b>	Assistant to the Chancellor for University Affairs; Chief Diversity Officer; Office of Sponsored Programs; Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs; Student Affairs Directors.	Immediately and ongoing, continuous.
<b>7. Provide interfaith calendar.</b>	Chief Diversity Officer; Provost.	By the end of 2005-06 academic year.

<b>8. Establish a policy to protect students, staff and faculty from adverse consequences when celebrating non-Christian religious holidays.</b>	Chancellor; Provost; Deans; Faculty Council; Staff Council; Human Resources, Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services.	Immediately.
<b>9. Design holiday décor to explicitly include non-Christian traditions.</b>	Chancellor; Provost; Deans; Department Chairs; Unit Directors; Residence Hall Coordinators.	Immediately, ongoing, continuous.
<b>10. Continue to improve accessibility of buildings and other areas of the campus.</b>	Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services, Chief Diversity Officer; ADA Coordinator.	Ongoing, continuous.
<b>11. Reorganize MU homepage to provide easy access to diversity information and resources.</b>	Assistant to the Chancellor for University Affairs; Chief Diversity Officer.	By the end of 2005-06 academic year.
<b>12. Develop diversity web site.</b>	Assistant to the Chancellor for University Affairs; Chief Diversity Officer; Chancellor's Diversity Initiative.	By the end of 2005-06 academic year.

### ***Student Activities and Services***

<b>Action Step</b>	<b>Coordinating Office/ Person</b>	<b>Timeline</b>
<b>1. Require all student services units to be responsible for including multiculturalism in their programming and training, drawing upon specialized units with multicultural foci.</b>	Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs.	Beginning immediately and ongoing.
<b>2. Expand resources for and services offered by the Women's Center, LGBT Resource Center, Multicultural Center, International Center, Black Culture Center, Access Mizzou project.</b>	Provost, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs.	Immediately establish a committee to develop a plan for the fiscal and logistic priorities for these service units; begin implementation of this plan during 2006-07 year with yearly updates on progress through 2009.

<b>3. Evaluate space allocations for multicultural services offices and increase and/or relocate as appropriate.</b>	Provost, Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs.	Immediately appoint a committee to develop assessment; conduct assessment throughout 2006-07 academic year; and continue until completed.
<b>4. Establish clear lines of communication with departmental and divisional academic advisors to ensure that they are aware of the full range of courses and academic programs related to diversity, as well as relevant student services and activities.</b>	Director of Student Success Center.	Immediately establish a committee to develop a plan increase communication; begin implementation of that plan in 2006-07 academic year.
<b><i>Research and Scholarly Activities</i></b>		
<b>Action Step</b>	<b>Coordinating Office/ Person</b>	<b>Timeline</b>
<b>1. Establish a campus-wide faculty team charged with reviewing the meaning of scholarship at MU, examining the scholarly rewards system, facilitating dialogue among MU faculty, and developing a set of recommendations for institutional consideration.</b>	Chancellor; Provost; Provost's staff.	Immediately appoint faculty committee representative of the multiple disciplines and fields of study, faculty ranks, and cultural diversity. Committee to submit a report and recommendations to Chancellor and Provost by the end of academic year 2007-08.
<b>2. Provide special funding (small grants) for broadly defined multicultural research and scholarship.</b>	Vice Provost for Research; Provost; Chief Diversity Officer.	Intensive planning, 2006-07; ongoing and continuous implementation.
<b>3. Increase funding and administrative support for new and existing research mentorship programs specifically targeting underrepresented students.</b>	Vice Chancellor for Development and Alumni Relations; Vice Provost for Research.	Intensive planning, 2006-07; ongoing and continuous implementation

<b><i>On-Going Campus Climate Assessments</i></b>		
<b>Action Step</b>	<b>Coordinating Office/ Person</b>	<b>Timeline</b>
<b>1. Establish a standing committee to oversee and administer future campus climate assessments. This committee must have a clear charge and authority to engage in assessment of campus climate deemed necessary by the committee, as well as a sufficient budget to engage in these activities.</b>	Chief Diversity Officer; Diversity Advisory Council; Faculty Council; Staff Council; Student Organizations.	Immediately appoint the committee; ongoing, continuous.
<b>2. Administer surveys and conduct focus groups and interviews to assess academic and non-academic units at all levels.</b>	Campus Climate Assessment Committee.	Ongoing-continuous.
<b>3. Make campus climate data available to the Chief Diversity Officer and to members of the Diversity Advisory Council, and others as appropriate.</b>	Campus Climate Assessment Committee.	Ongoing-continuous.
<b>4. Use campus climate assessment data as a guide to develop new interventions that will improve campus climate more generally and provide feedback for diversity strategic planning process.</b>	Chief Diversity Officer, Diversity Advisory Council.	Ongoing-continuous.

## **Appendix 2**

### **Executive Summary for Phases I - V of the MU Campus Climate Study for Underrepresented Groups**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**PHASES I - V**  
**MU CAMPUS CLIMATE STUDY**

- Phase I consisted of participation in the Rankin National Climate Studies for Underrepresented Groups (URG) and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) Individuals.
- 19.2% of the entire sample of URG participants reported being the victim of harassment on campus;
- 30.7% of African Americans, 32.4% of Hispanics/Latino/as, 23.6% of Asian/Asian Americans, 38.9% of Middle Easterners, 33.3% of Native American Indians, 22.5% of women, 37.5% of LGB individuals, 25% of transgender, and 44.0% of people with disabilities in the sample reported experiences of harassment on campus;
- 36.3% of the entire sample of URG participants reported having witnessed harassment of other individuals on campus;
- 54% of African Americans, 40.0% of Hispanics/Latino/as, 46.0% of Asian/Asian Americans, 62.5% of Middle Easterners, 46.4% of Native American Indians, 39.4% of women, 60.3% of LGB individuals, 14% of transgender, and 49.3% of people with disabilities in the sample reported observing harassment on campus;
- There were significant differences between majority and minority group members regarding perceptions of campus climate for minority group members, in which minority group members perceived the environment to be less positive than majority group members in all cases;
- There was extensive agreement among participants from different groups that visible racial-ethnic groups, non-native English speakers, and LGBT individuals were the least accepted groups on campus;
- Individuals who reported being the victim of, or having witnessed, harassment on campus tended to report lower levels of psychological well-being (e.g., greater degree of depressive symptoms and greater fears for personal safety);
- 21% of the LGBT survey participants indicated that they had been harassed due to their sexual orientation/gender identity;
- Derogatory remarks were the most common forms of LGBT harassment (85%), but other types of harassment included verbal threats (40%), graffiti (38%), and pressure to conceal one's sexual orientation/gender identity (36%), and
- Participants who reported being victims of LGBT harassment had significantly higher fears for physical safety, expectations that LGBT individuals would be harassed on

campus, needs to conceal one's sexual orientation/gender identity, and negative perceptions of campus responsiveness to harassment and discrimination.

- There were a total of 15,356 participants in the national study (20% of whom came from MU alone). The distributions of students, staff/administrators, and faculty were virtually identical for the national and MU samples. The gender distribution of the two samples was virtually identical. The racial/ethnic background of the participants in the two samples was also very similar, with the MU sample comprising slightly larger percentages of African American/Black and white participants and slightly smaller percentages of Asian/Pacific Islander, Middle Eastern, American Indian/Alaskan Native, and Chicano/Latino/Hispanic participants. A comparison of the sexual orientation identities of the participants in the two samples reveals that the MU sample had a slightly larger percentage of heterosexuals and fewer lesbian, gay, bisexual and uncertain participants than the national sample. Overall, the two samples are quite comparable.
- One-quarter of the survey respondents in the national sample, versus 19.2 percent of the MU sample, reported experiences of harassment, which was defined as conduct that unreasonably interfered with their ability to work or learn on campus. Approximately 30 percent of people of color versus 22 percent of whites reported harassment in the national sample, whereas 29.3 percent of people of color and 16.9 percent of whites in the MU sample reported harassment. Thus, the lower overall percentage of participants reporting harassment in the MU sample versus national sample can be partially explained by a substantially lower percentage of whites in the MU sample reporting harassment, whereas people of color in the MU sample reported harassment at approximately the same rate as people of color in the national sample.
- A higher percentage of people of color in the MU sample (59%) reported experiences of harassment based on race or ethnicity than people of color in the national sample (31%).
- A higher percentage of women in the MU sample (72%) reported gender-based harassment than women in the national sample (60%), whereas relatively equivalent percentages of transgender individuals in both samples (50% and 56%, respectively) reported gender-based harassment.
- Similar percentages of LGB/uncertain participants reported harassment based on sexual orientation in the MU (60%) and national (55%) samples.
- In both the national and MU samples, students were the main source of harassment for all groups (students, faculty, staff/administrators), but when the source of harassment is examined by position, the greatest percentage of harassment comes from within groups. For example, staff members report that they most often experience harassment from other staff. The result is similar for faculty, students and administrators.
- Forty-two percent of respondents in the national sample reported having observed harassment on their campuses, only slightly higher than the 37 percent of participants in the MU sample who reported observing harassment.

- Although roughly the same percentage of people of color and whites in the national sample reported observing harassment on their campuses (43% and 41%, respectively), there was a higher percentage of people of color than whites in the MU sample who reported observing harassment (49% versus 35%, respectively).
- Similar percentages of women and men reported observing harassment on campus in both the national (44% and 38%) and MU samples (39% and 34%).
- Substantially higher percentages of LGB/uncertain versus heterosexual participants reported observing harassment on campus in both the national (61% versus 42%, respectively) and MU samples (57% versus 37%, respectively).
- A cross-tabulation of race/ethnicity (whites versus people of color) with perceptions of the campus climate as racist (non-racist, neutral, racist) revealed similar patterns in both the national sample and MU sample, in that the percentage of people of color who believed that campus to be racist was virtually twice the percentage of whites with the same perceptions, yet people of color were evenly split between perceptions of the campus as non-racist, neutral, and racist and the largest percentage of whites believing the campus to be non-racist.
- A cross-tabulation of gender (men versus women) with perceptions of the campus climate as sexist (non-sexist, neutral, sexist) revealed similar patterns in both the national and MU samples, in that slight higher percentages of women than men perceived the campus as sexist, but the largest percentages of both men and women perceived the campus to be non-sexist.
- A cross-tabulation of sexual identity (LGB/uncertain versus heterosexual) with perceptions of the campus climate as homophobic (non-homophobic, neutral, homophobic) revealed similar patterns in both the national sample and MU sample, in that heterosexuals were relatively evenly split among the three climate perception categories but LGB/uncertain individuals were 2 to 4 times more likely to perceive the climate as homophobic versus neutral or non-homophobic.
- Similar percentages of respondents in both samples (national and MU) believed that the college/university thoroughly addresses racism, sexism, homophobia, ageism, and religious harassment. However, there was a substantial difference in the percentages of participants in the MU sample versus the national sample who believed that the college/university thoroughly addresses issues related to disabilities, in which the MU sample agreed by a margin of 2 to 1 versus a much smaller margin of agreement in the national sample. Note that supplemental analyses conducted by the MU Campus Climate Research Team also indicated that people with disabilities viewed the campus acceptance of people with disabilities as considerably less than people without disabilities viewed campus acceptance of people with disabilities, which suggests that the discrepancy in the data noted above is likely to have been influenced primarily by the overwhelmingly greater numbers of people without disabilities in the MU sample.

- A cross-tabulation of race/ethnicity (people of color versus whites) with perceptions of whether the college/university thoroughly addresses racism resulted in similar patterns of results for both the national and MU samples, in which the largest percentages of both groups agreed or strongly agreed that the university thoroughly addressed racism, but with substantially larger percentages of people of color than whites who disagreed or strongly disagreed.
- A cross-tabulation of sexual identity (LGB/uncertain versus heterosexual) with perceptions of whether the college/university thoroughly addresses heterosexism/homophobia revealed a substantial discrepancy between the MU sample and the national sample. A substantially higher percentage of LGB/uncertain participants in the MU sample than the national sample disagreed or strongly disagreed that the college/university thoroughly addresses heterosexism/homophobia. This finding may be the result of the lack of inclusion of sexual orientation in the nondiscrimination policy in the University of Missouri System at the time of the survey, which was a hotly contested issue for many years until the policy was changed in 2003.
- A cross-tabulation of gender (women versus men) with perceptions of whether the college/university thoroughly addresses sexism resulted in similar patterns of results for both the national and MU samples, in which the largest percentages of both groups agreed or strongly agreed that the university thoroughly addressed sexism, but with substantially larger percentages of women than men who disagreed or strongly disagreed.
- Phase II data indicate that respondents overall tended to rate the quality of the services provided by their units on average as above “adequate” and below “extremely well” with respect to the issues addressed in the survey questionnaire. Among Phase II participants, average ratings for the “*effectiveness of diversity trainings*,” “*staff knowledge*,” and “*availability of appropriate resources*” tended to be lower than ratings on other items.
- Phase II respondents rated the quality of services rendered by their units lower on average for non-native English speakers, non-Christian individuals, persons with disabilities, and LGB students.
- Many Phase II participants reported that they had received no training at MU to address the needs of underrepresented groups, and many others reported training that appears to have taken place outside the context of their current employment at MU.
- The vast majority of student service units evaluated in Phase III received average ratings from all six underrepresented group participants that were above a rating of “adequate” and below a rating of “extremely well,” with only a few exceptions.
- Average ratings that were below “adequate” were obtained for a small number of student service units in Phase III with respect to LGBT and/or non-Christian religious minorities.

- There were 224 Phase IV participants (16.5%) who reported being victimized by sexual harassment by a person affiliated with MU, which was primarily reported by women (n = 194) of European American descent (n = 199) and heterosexual orientation (n = 199).
- The primary forms of sexual harassment reported in Phase IV were “unwanted contacts” (n = 97) and “uncomfortable sexual speech/jokes” (n = 134), and were committed most often by work supervisors (n = 41), faculty/TAs (n = 60), peers (n = 80), and coworkers (n = 63).
- Participants in Phase IV reported that they most often discussed the harassment with nobody (n = 54), family (n = 59), friends (n = 124), and significant others (71).
- The majority of Phase IV respondents who provided a rating of the effectiveness of the responses received from university officials regarding sexual harassment did not perceive them to be effective.
- Experiences of sexual harassment were associated with higher rates of depressive symptoms and fears for personal safety.
- There were 33 Phase IV participants (2.4%) who reported being victims of hate crimes on campus at MU, which were primarily based on the victim’s gender (n = 8), race/ethnicity (n = 9), sexual orientation (n = 5), religion (n = 5) and other (n = 5).
- The types of hate crimes reported by Phase IV participants included threats of violence (n = 7), threatening or harassing phone calls (n = 5), vandalism (n = 5), and other (n = 15).
- Participants in Phase IV indicated that they primarily discussed the hate crimes with nobody (n = 6), family (n = 9), friends (n = 16), and significant others (n = 10).
- The majority of Phase IV respondents who provided a rating of the effectiveness of the responses received from university officials regarding hate crime victimization did not perceive them to be effective.
- Experiences of hate crime victimization were associated with higher rates of fears for personal safety.
- There were 142 Phase IV participants (10.5%) who reported being victims of hate incidents on campus at MU, which were primarily based on the victim’s gender (n = 42), race/ethnicity (n = 57), sexual orientation (n = 37), religion (n = 52) and other (n = 10).
- The types of hate incidents reported by Phase IV participants included offensive jokes or remarks (n = 122), offensive editorials, cartoons or news stories (n = 120), and public displays of objects, signs or symbols (n = 51).

- Participants in Phase IV indicated that they primarily discussed the hate incidents with nobody (n = 26), faculty/TA (n = 21), family (n = 63), friends (n = 97), and significant others (n = 55).
- The majority of Phase IV respondents who provided a rating of the effectiveness of the responses received from university officials regarding hate incident victimization did not perceive them to be effective.
- Experiences of hate incident victimization were associated with higher levels of depressive symptoms.
- There were 95 Phase IV participants (7.0%) who reported witnessing hate crimes and 340 Phase IV participants (25.1%) who reported witnessing hate incidents on campus at MU.

Phase V of the MU Campus Climate Study involved focus groups and interviews held with members of the MU community. The goal was to provide a qualitative analysis of the four earlier phases of data collection and to generate recommendations for specific improvements in the campus climate via changes in the social, cultural, academic and physical environment as well as targeted changes in policies designed to promote diversity.

Phase V of the MU Campus Climate Study was not designed to objectively evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the campus climate for diversity at MU—that was the purpose of the four earlier phases of data collection (from which a number of specific strengths and weaknesses emerged and were highlighted in prior reports). Instead, this phase of data collection was intended to generate specific, concrete recommendations for action strategies designed to improve the climate for diversity at MU. Readers are cautioned to avoid thinking about this report as a reflection of the overall quality of the campus climate for diversity at MU, and to instead consider this document as a source of recommendations designed to address specific problem areas that are likely to be present on any number of campuses across the country.

There were a total of 60 participants in Phase V of the MU Campus Climate Study. The sample included 21 students, 23 staff, and 16 faculty with diverse backgrounds.

Participants were asked to review summary findings of the four earlier phases of data collection and respond to four focus questions. The four focus questions were as follows:

- (1) On the basis of the findings of the MU Campus Climate Study, what are your immediate reactions?**
- (2) How do these findings make you personally feel as a member of the MU community?**
- (3) What environmental changes might be beneficial for MU to address the needs of underrepresented groups?**
- (4) What policy recommendations should we make to the university administration on the basis of these findings?**

There were a number of critical areas of improvement identified by participants, including

- Increasing non-minority members' work to improve climate.
- Establishing mandatory and/or voluntary training programs for sensitivity to diversity.
- Improving the process of handling complaints about harassment and discrimination.
- Increasing accountability for reinforcing cultural sensitivity.
- Enacting policy to enforce "truth in advertising" about diversity during recruitment.
- Adding "Diversity" as a fifth value received mixed reactions among participants.
- Promoting diversity is a central responsibility of individuals in key leadership positions.
- Respecting all forms of diversity was acknowledged to be complex and difficult.

In addition to these focal areas, there were a host of issues raised that were relevant specifically to faculty, staff and students. Some of the major points were as follows:

1. Many respondents expressed the belief that the academic climate at MU was the primary responsibility of professors, instructors and TAs. At the same time, a number of minority faculty felt that their work was much more difficult as a result of resistance from students and a lack of shared responsibility from their non-minority colleagues and administrators.
2. Some participants believed that minority faculty experience added pressures and heavier burdens. Minority faculty experience added pressure to contribute extra service out of a sense of commitment to improving the campus with respect to diversity, which are often not recognized or acknowledged by non-minority faculty or administrators.
3. All types of staff were perceived to have glaring inequities in the power and hierarchy structure, in which women and people of color occupy the bottom rungs and are perceived as being passed over for promotion.
4. There were a variety of issues addressed which would improve the campus climate at MU with respect to students. Minority students were interested in seeing the campus climate for diversity improve so that their own experiences as minority students would improve. On the other hand, many participants felt there was a need for specific efforts designed to promote a greater awareness and sensitivity to diversity among students at MU.

Finally, there were a variety of issues raised that were relevant specifically to the target groups. Some of the major points were as follows:

1. A number of participants from a variety of backgrounds expressed the belief that efforts to promote different ethnic studies programs to departmental status were important to the improvement of the campus climate for diversity at MU.
2. There were a significant number of participants who perceived the university community as equating "diversity" with Black-White race relations, and expressed concern over the lack of attention to other racial-ethnic minority groups on campus.

3. There was considerable discussion among participants from a variety of backgrounds about the perceived rift between the MU administration and African American faculty, staff and students.
4. A number of participants believed that some stress has been relieved for LGBTQ people on campus after sexual orientation was included in the nondiscrimination policy. However, many continue to express concern that there is still a substantial amount of work to do to improve the campus climate for LGBTQ individuals. Domestic partner benefits were a major source of concern among LGBTQ individuals and their allies.
5. Major themes in focus group discussions regarding people with disabilities included (a) ongoing problems on campus in some buildings related to accessibility, (b) problems with accessible parking (c) perceptions of lengthy delays in responding to complaints about accessibility issues on campus, (c) perceptions that many people on campus think of disabilities only in terms of physical disabilities, and (d) harassment and discrimination against people with disabilities most often occurs in more subtle and hidden ways than when other underrepresented groups are targeted.
6. Overarching themes related to the campus climate for non-native English speakers included (a) experiences of marginalization and rejection from the larger MU community, (b) perceptions that the MU community as a whole tended to be uninformed and unconcerned with a global perspective in education, and (c) the perception that International graduate students were vulnerable to exploitation from faculty.
7. A number of themes emerged about the climate for non-Christian religious minorities. Overall the perception was that Christianity is “an unseen, invisible, ever-present force on campus” that results in the marginalization of members of other groups. A number of participants complained that consideration is rarely given to non-Christians who would like to observe religious holidays.
8. A number of major themes emerged from discussions about the campus climate for women at MU, including (a) concerns about a variety of forms of exploitation of women on campus, (b) inequities in hiring, promotion and pay across all levels of employment at MU, and (c) concerns about the need to increase efforts to prevent sexual harassment and sexual violence.

Nearly 100 specific recommendations were offered by participants that reflected a variety of concrete, specific proposals and a number of broad, overarching ideas about strategies to improve the climate for diversity at the University of Missouri-Columbia. In realistic terms, the responses to these recommendations can be swift for some and gradual for others. With little exception, participants in Phase V viewed *action* as the critical determinant of change.