

Associated Colleges of the South

Report to the Robert W. Woodruff Foundation

New Models in Three Challenged and Critical areas

July 31, 2008

Associated Colleges of the South

Report to the Robert W. Woodruff Foundation

New Models in Three Challenged and Critical Areas:
Interdisciplinary Opportunities, Undergraduate Research and Engagement and Diversity

July 31, 2008

Table of Contents

- I. Introduction
- II. Organization and Structure of the Grant Program
- III. The Program Initiatives
 - A. Interdisciplinary Opportunities
 - B. Undergraduate Research and Engagement
 - C. Diversity
- IV. Conclusion
- V. Appendices
 - A. ACS Financial Report
 - B. Interdisciplinary Mini-Grants
 - Mini-Grant Awardees for April and October of 2006 and for February and October 2007
 - C. Interdisciplinary Evaluative Survey and Survey Report
 - D. Undergraduate Research and Engagement Grant
 - Mini-Grant Awardees for March and October 2006
 - E. Undergraduate Research and Engagement Evaluative Survey and Survey Report
 - F. Diversity Mini-Grants
 - 1. Mini-Grant Awardees for February, April, October 2006, 2007 and 2008 for Student Led Collaboration with Faculty/Staff
 - 2. Mini-Grant Awardees for January, March, October 2006, 2007 and 2008 for Campus Diversity Leadership Models
 - G. Diversity Planning Committee
 - 1. Diversity Leadership Summit Meeting Agenda, June 2008
 - 2. Diversity Leadership Summit Participants List, June 2008
 - 3. Diversity Leadership Summit-Student Concerns and Suggestions, 2008
 - H. Diversity Survey Executive Summary Report
 - I. Diversity Evaluative Survey Final Report

Associated Colleges of the South

Fourth Report to the Robert W. Woodruff Foundation

New Models in Three Critical and Challenged Areas

July 31, 2008

I. Introduction

The Associated Colleges of the South is pleased to submit its fourth and final report on the activities begun under the auspices of the *New Models Grant in Three Challenged and Critical Areas* that was received from the Robert W. Woodruff Foundation in December 2004. This report covers the six month period of January – June 2008, and emphasizes activities that occurred since the third report, dated December 31, 2007, was submitted to the Foundation. The financial summary, in Appendix A, shows activity from receipt of the grant in December 2004 through June 30, 2008.

II. Organization and Structure of the Grant Program

Activities in each of the three program areas supported by the New Models Grant, Interdisciplinary Opportunities, Undergraduate Research and Engagement, and the Diversity Initiative, were coordinated by three separate Task Forces that were created for this purpose. A member of the ACS Council of Deans and an ACS Staff person, who provided programmatic and fiscal oversight, also worked collaboratively with each Task Force.

The majority of the task force work was handled through the cost effective methods of e-mails and conference phone calls. The ACS Council of Deans maintained general program review responsibilities and received a full report of each Task Force's activities and plans at its three meetings during the academic year. The ACS Presidents received full program reports at their annual meeting. Both the Council of Deans and the ACS Presidents received interim reports on a regular basis between meetings.

III. The Program Initiatives

A. Interdisciplinary Opportunities

Two rounds of mini-grants were awarded, one in February and one in October 2007 with up to \$8,500 for new projects and up to \$4,250 for supplemental proposals to continue a project previously funded by an ACS Interdisciplinary mini-grant. Seven proposals were received in February. Of those, one was funded fully and four were partially funded, totaling \$17,600. Four proposals were received in October and three were fully funded and one was partially funded for a total of \$23,271. In 2007, \$40,871 was awarded in Interdisciplinary mini-grants. A total of

\$112, 996.43 for 19 projects was awarded in 2006 and 2007 expending the mini-grant funding in this area. Projects funded in 2006 and 2007 can be found in appendix B.

The Task force developed an evaluative report of the projects and the impact they have had across disciplines and on the campuses as a whole. An evaluation survey was sent to each grant awardee (See http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=SGcq_2bhztuIffg9dNLPdflA_3d_3d) and the responses are summarized in a final evaluative report included here in appendix C. Each proposal and final report is posted on the ACS Interdisciplinary web site to allow for dissemination within ACS. (See <http://www.colleges.org/newmodels/interdisciplinary/minigrants.html>)

One very interesting project at Morehouse College is *Voting Analysis in Mathematics and Politics: Interdisciplinary Research and Education*. The college received an ACS Interdisciplinary mini-grant last year. The project launched collaborative research and teaching with the faculty in the Departments of Mathematics and Political Science at Morehouse College, and the project introduced interested students and faculty colleagues to interdisciplinary work — and possibilities for future work—in mathematical, statistical, and political analysis of voting. Towards these ends, the principal investigators (PIs) and four invited scholars and political organizers presented a weekly one credit seminar during the Spring 2008 semester.

By generating ideas and developing necessary foundations, the seminar sessions and visits became precursors to subsequent research and curriculum development by the PIs at the intersection of the mathematical and political sciences. Additionally, participating students engaged in an Election Day field experience, conducting exit polling of African American voters at precincts in Georgia, and they analyzed data collected from more than 3000 presidential primary voters in Georgia, Louisiana, and Maryland. Each student teamed with a student from another major to investigate a topic on the theme of mathematics and voting for an end-of-seminar interdisciplinary poster presentation.

During the Spring 2008 semester, the Voting Analysis in Mathematics and Politics: Interdisciplinary Research and Education (VAMPIRE) seminar met weekly in Morehouse College's Leadership Center. Thirteen students were regular participants, with occasional attendance and participation of other students, faculty, and staff. Most students enrolled for one credit hour of independent study, either Political Science 493 or Mathematics 398. Of the 13 students, 9 were political science majors, two of whom joined from their sister institution, Spelman College; one of those two was a mathematics minor. The other 4 students were mathematics majors, one of whom did not enroll for credit but who was a regular and reliable participant and contributor.

At the semester's opening of the course, faculty inquired orally about the students' motivations for participating and of their knowledge of the other discipline. Except for one political science major who satisfied a mathematics minor and another who expressed appreciation for and some knowledge of quantitative methods, the political science students had largely taken the minimum college mathematics requirement, expressing neither great affinity nor great aptitude for the subject. But they were intrigued by and interested in what they might encounter and learn in the VAMPIRE seminar. None of the four mathematics majors had taken

any college political science coursework, although one of them expressed extreme interest in politics and plans to take some courses. All 5 of the math majors were sufficiently interested in learning about connections of mathematics to political science. Near the end of the semester, they asked students to complete a brief instrument of free response prompts. Two mathematics majors and five political science majors completed the questionnaire.

The four prompts were these:

- What was the most memorable or valuable moment to you from this semester's experience (from speaker, project, or otherwise)?
- Did the VAMPIRE seminar raise your awareness or appreciation of relationship between the mathematical and political sciences? Please describe how, if so.
- Please describe how, if at all, you envision this awareness or appreciation may be useful to you in your future.
- Please share any additional comments you may have.

To the first question, six of the seven students identified seminar speakers (either individually or collectively) as most memorable or valuable, though the range of presenters who resonated with the students was broad. The seventh student identified the opportunity to conduct exit polling as most memorable.

Students were unanimous on the second question that, yes, their awareness or appreciation of the relationship between the mathematical and political sciences was raised, and several commented that it was significantly raised (“vast”; “amazing”; “I had a very simplistic view ... but now I know more”).

To the third prompt, all students suggested that their increased awareness may be useful in their futures. Most were what might be considered “polite” responses of agreement. A couple felt the knowledge gained would be helpful in their graduate school pursuits. One student, though, was particularly vocal: “This course will be tremendously useful in my future. The more knowledge I gain about the present political system, the more flaws I find. ... This course has made me very aware of obstacles to fair representation.”

The additional comments of the fourth prompt were supportive of the seminar, the guests, and the faculty, with hopes that they would continue the seminar in future semesters and even that they make it a regular course offering. One student referred to the only drawback, the Friday afternoon time slot. One student reflectively wrote that the seminar presented “a different realm of education, not common to the AUC.” The AUC is the Atlanta University Center consortium, of which Morehouse and Spelman Colleges are part. In summary, it seems accurate to say that the students found the VAMPIRE seminar interesting and illuminating.

The Women of San Luis, Costa Rica project at Hendrix College completed their intended research and photographic project goals when they requested a supplemental grant to fund the final phase of the project: the installation of a permanent exhibit in San Luis.

The faculty/student team (Goldberg and Payne (PI's) and four students, two of whom focused on photography and two of whom emphasize anthropology, began meeting in the Spring 2007

semester in preparation for travel to Costa Rica in June 2007. The pre-travel meetings discussed literature reviewed, established a mutual framework for working with Costa Rican consultants, and evaluated previously collected oral histories. They worked to break down disciplinary barriers, emphasizing the overlap of their methods and theories. The group met again in Costa Rica in mid-June 2007 and photographed and interviewed women there for ten days in a period of two weeks (They did not work on weekends in order to allow students time to get to know the community in a broader sense). Because each interview required them to hike together through mountainous terrain, they used the travel time to discuss what had been learned, and to translate some of the Spanish conversation for those members who were not proficient in the language. The travel time allowed them to “debrief” as a group and to discuss ideas for the next meeting.

In the fall of 2007, Payne and three of the four students processed their film at the photography studio at Hendrix College, as there were no photographic facilities close to San Luis. Also in the fall, two of the four students and Goldberg began transcribing the Spanish interviews using a transcription machine. Goldberg translated the interviews into English for the exhibit in the U.S. and for use in a course taught to Hendrix students in Costa Rica in June 2008.

In spring 2008, Goldberg invited Payne to speak in her course, Anthropology 300: Ethnographic Research Methods, about incorporating visual material into ethnographic work. They spoke together about the project and how their diverse experiences made the project richer and more successful than it otherwise would have been. They hoped to demonstrate a successful interdisciplinary project. Goldberg included a unit on visual anthropology in the course, which was a new addition. Likewise, in June 2008, Goldberg taught a unit called “Gender, Oral History, and Community” in the above-mentioned course in Costa Rica, which took place during the installation of the exhibit and Payne again joined the class to discuss the project. All of the students attended the opening, and collected field notes about social interactions during the opening. They then completed a group project investigating aspects of culture in San Luis, with special attention to gender, based on their work.

The most important outcome was the successful installation of an exhibit in San Luis on June 15, 2008. Most of the women and their families were able to attend. They provided a luncheon, cake, and coffee at the Ecolodge San Luis. The group brought 450 booklets to Costa Rica and 175 were distributed for free at the opening. The community of San Luis only has a population of about 300, so this number represents a fairly successful turnout from other communities as well. Framed photos were given to each of the women involved. The remaining 275 booklets will be sold to tourists for \$10 a piece, with all proceeds benefiting the San Luis Development Association, which provides scholarships for local children.

No formal instruments were used for evaluation or assessment. Nonetheless, there are several indicators that point to the success of the project. The robust attendance at the exhibition (which was unfortunately on Father’s Day) indicates the interest of the community in the project. At the opening, several grown children of the women approached Goldberg to speak about the importance of the project. They spoke tearfully of their mothers’ hard work and the fact that this work was seldom acknowledged. One of the women said that she felt like an important person, and never dreamed that she would be celebrated in any way. The PI’s described the opening as

quite moving and satisfying, as they watched members of the community move from image to image and flip through the booklets.

Additionally, students in both classes wrote journal entries, response papers, and field notes about the ways in which the project inspired them to work with communities and to collaborate. While the project goal included showing how art and anthropology could come together, students brought in other disciplines like Spanish and Tropical Biology (noting the medicinal uses of plants by some of the women).

Meanwhile other discussions occurred among interdisciplinary groups such as Chinese Studies, British Studies, Latin American Studies and Gender Studies.

B. Undergraduate Collaborative Research and Engagement

The Task Force on Undergraduate Collaborative Research and Engagement decided to offer large grants for divisions/departments within an institution for the purpose of exploring and engaging the idea of collaborative scholarship/research. The sum of \$125,000 was designated for this purpose. Departments or divisions submitted proposals for planning grants **or** for the design, redesign, implementation, or assessment of collaborative scholarship/research opportunities, including community-related research. All grant money for projects (\$124,000) was distributed in the Undergraduate Collaborative Research and Engagement area in 2006. The balance of the funds was earmarked for dissemination of the results in and out of the ACS. The task force created an online evaluative survey and distributed it to all grant recipients. (See http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=VCEldoJAPaGjFDbCSDuWw_3d_3d0 The survey and the full summary of results, which includes how the projects have influenced their current curriculum and research, are in Appendix E. The proposals awarded and final reports are posted online at <http://www.colleges.org/newmodels/undergrad/index.html>. In addition, a complete listing of funded projects in the Undergraduate Collaborative Research and Engagement area can be found in Appendix D.

The Undergraduate Research and Engagement Survey results indicate that while the scope of these projects varied greatly, all five were successful in meeting their goals. In the case of Birmingham-Southern College's Miss Julie Project, the goals were very finite. The student-teacher team set out to develop a play, perform it both locally and internationally, and conduct discussions and write a publication about the play and their experiences. In contrast, Trinity University chose a project which was much broader in scope.

Increasing Collaborative Research through Investigations of Interdisciplinary Multi-Agent Simulations proposed to design a research model that utilized multi-agent simulations. While the development of this model is still on-going, the main goal of the project, to increase the participation of non-science majors in the undergraduate research community at Trinity, was met. Similarly, the University of Richmond also initiated a large scope project entitled *LURE: Long-Term Undergraduate Research Experience*, which was also successful.

Efforts to meet program goals were not without challenge. For example, sometimes it was difficult to determine the precise time frame for a project. Pinpointing the exact costs ahead of

time was also difficult. And there was the problem of student attrition—for example, students graduating early.

Several grantees also cited unexpected opportunities which were brought to light by their projects. Perhaps most notable, were the changes that occurred on the Rollins campus as a result of their *Young Scholars Collective* project. Recognition of similarities in various student-faculty team projects led to on-campus programming, as well as student-sponsored clubs and organizational activities. A variety of service learning projects were also developed as spin offs of the initial research work. While many of these activities and events were initiated by student members of the research teams themselves, some were started by other students who were influenced by their peers in the project. One such service learning activity resulted in *Farm Workers' Awareness*, a new campus organization and a related student-made documentary about pesticides and the working conditions of farm workers that was shown on campus.

Additionally, Trinity College noted unexpected results. In addition to meeting their goals of developing a first-year seminar course and a senior-level research course that allowed students to explore social behaviors in virtual environments, participants discovered that they had "raised the bar" for other departments to offer research opportunities to their students earlier in their college career.

Rollins College also plans to continue its project. The college will put out a call for proposals in the Fall of 2008 and begin with the next cohort group in the Spring of 2009. The Young Scholars Collective is scheduled to last through the Spring of 2009. Additionally, the current project received funding from the Dean of Faculty Office that will enable students to travel to professional conferences to present the original research with their collaborating faculty members.

Overall, the ACS Undergraduate Research and Engagement Grant Program was a great success. It led to the creation of new models of collaborative scholarship/research and offered research opportunities for faculty and students outside of the natural science fields. The program not only allowed the students involved to actively engage in collaborative scholarship/research but also in the culture, methodology, and issues related to it. Similarly, the grant gave faculty opportunities to enhance their teaching and contributions to their discipline. Of equal importance is the fact that the program impacted the culture of the campuses involved, often resulting in related campus programs and activities. While the program had its challenges, they were outweighed by the many benefits that resulted.

Last year, Hendrix College held a symposium for ACS schools interested in undergraduate research. The college formed a committee to oversee proposal development for funding and committed to fund raise for research grants and hold a yearly symposium to further institutionalize this work.

Diversity

1. Diversity Mini-Grants

Two opportunities for diversity mini-grants were created by the Diversity Planning Committee: Student Led Collaboration with Faculty/Staff and Campus Diversity Leadership Models.

- Announcement for Mini-Grants for Student Led collaboration with Faculty/Staff:

While ethnic diversity and campus climate are the primary foci of the ACS Diversity initiative, proposals may be submitted for any type of diversity issues/concerns that affect and challenge campus climate. The proposal must be initiated by one or more students and clearly identify the faculty/staff sponsor/mentor and the extent of his/her involvement OR be submitted jointly by student(s) and faculty/staff member(s) and clearly indicate the role of each of the co-initiators in the project. Collaborative opportunities-- those engaging two or more campus groups, cross-generational activities, curricular and co-curricular activities, or projects involving two or more ACS campuses--are especially encouraged.

- We awarded 7 grants in 2006. The Diversity Planning Committee also agreed to increase the amount of the awards so the campuses could receive greater benefit from the mini-grants. The amount awarded in the October 2006 round increased from \$1800 to \$2500 per award. It was also decided to offer another round of grants in 2007 with a rolling submission deadline at the new level. In 2007, we awarded 4 grants and in 2008 we awarded 3. Totally, in this area of diversity funding, we have funded 14 projects and awarded \$32,500.
- A three person review committee received and reviewed proposals, awarded the grants, and received interim and final reports. A list of grant awardees from April and October 2006 and for 2007 and 2008 under the new rolling deadline is in Appendix F.
- Proposals and final reports to date can be found at <http://www.colleges.org/diversity/programs/minigrants.html>

Below are two examples of mini-grant projects from 2008.

Hendrix College held a Multicultural Leadership Retreat in 2008.

With a student body of approximately 1200, Hendrix College has 56 active, recognized student organizations. Of those 56 organizations, seven focus on multicultural issues. They include the International Club, Students for Black Culture, Students for Latin American and Iberian Cultures, Students Promoting Education on Asian Cultures, UNITY (gay, lesbian, and bisexual student alliance), and Hillel (Jewish student organization). The Cultural Connection

Committee, established to assist in recruiting and retaining multicultural students, and the Feminist Club are unofficial multicultural student organizations. These student organizations sponsored the vast majority of educational programs and entertaining activities that address diversity issues. They also offered immeasurable support for multicultural students and those interested in multicultural and diversity issues.

There was a concern within the Hendrix College Office of Multicultural and International Services about the future of the multicultural student organizations without their seasoned leaders. The goal of the retreat was to prepare 24 freshmen and sophomores for leadership positions in multicultural student organizations by strengthening leadership and programming skills. The goal of the retreat was accomplished by having students complete activities that involved self-assessments, identification and labeling, role-playing, and discussions. Evaluation of goals included students completing pretests and posttests on items covering leadership styles, methods of communication, and programming strategies; submitting reflective pieces; and completing a critique on a diversity program that reflected upon the process of planning a large-scale program. Anticipated outcomes included increased leadership participation among the freshmen and sophomore classes.

Progress towards attaining the retreat's goal was measured using the session activities, pretest/posttest results, and facilitators' observations. Each of the four sessions included interactive activities that asked participants to demonstrate the skills learned during the session. Students were successful in completing all session activities. Pretest/posttest results reveal significant increases in students' perceptions of themselves as leaders and in their ability to plan programs. We believe this change in perception will manifest itself in the coming school year with student organization program planning, and with participants' willingness to take on leadership roles on campus.

Eighteen students participated in this retreat. They had the opportunity to meet other freshmen and sophomores interested in multicultural issues. These students were able to work collaboratively towards meeting retreat objectives, while also reflecting on their own personal strengths and weaknesses that influence their participation in multicultural student organizations. Retreat evaluations reveal that students highly valued information gained and interactions with peers during the retreat. The collaboration initiated within the retreat will likely overflow to collaborative efforts among the student organizations represented at the retreat. In fact, during the retreat at least three participants expressed interest in joining another student organization represented at the retreat. Having the ability to collaborate with others on campus is a valuable skill for any student leader, but especially for multicultural student organization leaders who often work with limited resources.

Each retreat participant received a Leadership Manual to assist them in their leadership skills and programming abilities. Each manual included a checklist for programming, purchasing procedures, the Hendrix College Student Organization Manual, tips for planning diversity programs, information for showing movies, and other information critical for student organization leaders. The information contained in the Leadership Manual will prove beneficial for retreat attendees and the organizations of which they are members. Several students who did

not attend the retreat have requested a manual because a retreat attendee informed them of the valuable information contained inside.

Students have already begun using the information they learned at the retreat for improving their organizations. For example, seven members of “Students for Black Culture” attended the retreat. The day after the retreat the students were scheduled to host a dinner for prospective students. During the dinner, one of the students stated, “We really need to do an evaluation for this event so we can make it even better next year.” She stated that she had learned the importance of evaluating events the day before at the retreat. So, the following Monday that student and another organization member completed an evaluation of the event. Similarly, these students planned a Senior Reception for graduating members of the organization at the end of April. During one of the retreat sessions, a student commented that before arriving at the retreat they believed they already had everything done for the reception. After reviewing the programming checklist and learning other information, the students realized they had many other things to complete before the reception could be successful. So, the students used their Leadership Manuals and the information they learned during the retreat to finish planning the reception. Because of their attention to detail and effective planning, the reception was very successful.

Many retreat attendees have commented on the importance and usefulness of the retreat both verbally in days and weeks following the retreat, and in writing through retreat evaluations. We have also witnessed the positive results of the retreat through informal observations of retreat attendees with graduating multicultural organization leaders. The retreat attendees have been able to explain concepts and procedures associated with programming and leadership that were not familiar to the seniors. These seniors did not receive training in leadership or programming like that provided in the Multicultural Leadership Retreat.

Participants were asked to individually complete the “Multicultural Leadership Retreat Questionnaire” at the beginning of the retreat. Participants completed the same questionnaire after the last retreat session. Participants were assigned a participant number in order to compare pretest and posttest results. Overall, results of the pretest/posttest indicate a slight increase in students’ content knowledge of leadership, motivation, and programming. However, significant increases were noted in students’ perceptions of themselves as leaders and in their ability to plan programs. This increase in perceptions is noteworthy because confidence in one’s ability to lead others, to be viewed as a leader by others, and to fulfill the obligations of a student organization leader is essential before a student seeks a leadership position. Since this retreat focused on laying a foundation to prepare future leaders in multicultural student organizations, this result is encouraging

Rollins College held its 3rd Annual Multicultural Retreat on February 29 and March 1, 2008

While most of the programming at Rollins leaned towards educating the campus, the members of the different multicultural groups did not often find the time to reconnect within their group to recognize and celebrate the beauty of the diversity in the community. The purpose of this retreat was to facilitate an opportunity in which this type of connection could occur. From these connections amongst the various student groups, the goal was to develop initiatives in which the

cultural groups would collaborate on further goals throughout the rest of the current school year, serving as a foundation for the upcoming year.

The 2008 Multicultural Retreat did a consistent job at meeting the goals of 1) establishing relationships amongst students of diverse identities, 2) identifying areas of privilege, power, and oppression and providing open dialogues around these issues, 3) and engaging students in advocacy for underrepresented and marginalized populations on campus.

In total, there were thirty-two students and seven faculty/staff, who participated in the retreat. We felt confident that a group of 30+ was better able to build relationships and share stories than a group of 50+.

The retreat brought together a very diverse group of people, representing different races, ethnicities, language, political beliefs, socioeconomic statuses, religious beliefs and sexual orientations amongst other identities. This made the experience incredibly rich as students began to share their own stories and experiences.

The students were truly genuine and authentic with one another allowing for each of them to ask questions, disagree, or even simply admit to not knowing. The students shared some of the challenges and adversities they have faced throughout their lives as well as some of the areas in which they considered themselves “lucky” and privileged.

In addition to being a truly unifying experience for the group, participants engaged in powerful conversations that examined their individual identities and the concept of privilege vs. oppression. The group delved into deep conversation around the concept of the labels that society gives us versus the contexts that life truly provides. How we can begin to better understand each others contexts and not simply judge others on the basis of labels? The group worked through concepts of social norming and how they make us feel like we have to be people that we are not.

The conversations challenged participants to evaluate themselves and how society perpetuates stereotypes and labels. At times some of the activities caused participants to feel vulnerable, uncomfortable and challenged. Many students expressed feeling uncomfortable because “these are not things we talk about.” The challenge in an off-campus setting allowed them to break down some of the societal barriers that often inhibit them.

At the conclusion of the retreat, many participants voiced that they felt empowered to continue these dialogues on campus at their student organizational meetings, in their classrooms and/or within their residential halls. The group ended their time together with a pact to each other that promised they would continue to reach out, forge new relationships, and build bonds beyond difference.

- Announcement for Workshop Mini-Grants for Campus Diversity Leadership Models

The purposes of these grants are fourfold: (1) To encourage development of ongoing models for training and maintaining active diversity leadership teams on campuses. (2) To support diversity leadership models that already exist or are newly being implemented on campuses. (These include but are not limited to the National Coalition Building Institute (NCBI), the Anti-Defamation League, Training for Social Change, and the National Conference for Community and Justice.) (3) To promote leadership models that provide a campus structure for diversity leadership continuity [through staff, faculty, and administration], while including student participation and helping them develop leadership skills. (4) To create a pool/core of persons in ACS who are available to support/assist their own and other ACS campuses in prejudice reduction and education for leadership sessions.

The Planning Committee agreed to divide the remaining Diversity Grant funds between the two funding opportunities: Student Led Collaboration with Faculty/Staff and Campus Diversity Leadership Models. It was also decided to raise the individual grant award from \$1500 to \$2000 for the Campus Leadership Models and offer the grants for 2007 with a rolling submission deadline. In 2007, we awarded 5 grants and in 2008 we awarded 2. To date, we have awarded 16 mini-grants totaling \$24,745 in this area of diversity funding. (In both areas of funding we have given 30 awards over the course of the grant amounting to \$57,245.)

A three person review committee received and reviewed the proposals, awarded the mini-grants and received follow-up reports. A list of mini-grants awarded is located in Appendix F and proposals and final reports to date can be found at <http://www.colleges.org/diversity/programs/minigrants.html>

The following is an example of one of the funded workshops that took place in 2008.

Southwestern University held a Faculty Development Workshop entitled, Faculty Development, Diversity and Inclusion on Campus during the spring of 2008.

The focus of the seminar was on making classrooms inclusive for wide ranges of difference among students. The two presenters, Drs. Maurianne Adams and Barbara Love, are experienced trainers and authorities on pedagogical approaches to the inclusive classroom. Because this half-day seminar took place during the annual, mandatory Faculty Conference, the entire faculty of Southwestern University was able to take part in the training.

The focus of the seminar was on making classrooms inclusive for wide ranges of difference among students. The presentation began with the premise that critical thinking about one's own

pedagogy is a difficult proposition. Yet recognizing one's own personal and cultural biases is essential for creating a more inclusive teaching environment. The seminar leaders presented material on the different ways in which people learn and different pedagogical strategies to reach these different kinds of learners. They also talked about the ways in which power dynamics operate in classrooms and the inadvertent messages that are sent by both faculty and fellow students about who are, and who are not, included as equal members in the classroom.

Lecture presentations were interspersed with small group sessions that included both groups and pairs of faculty members, to reflect upon and consider how each faculty's teaching strategies reflected the material they presented. The workshop allowed time for each faculty member to adopt one goal for themselves for the upcoming year on improving their pedagogy and work as a teacher. Each faculty member thus left with a 'mini-action plan' to move forward in creating a more inclusive classroom.

This workshop was well-received by faculty. A compilation of assessment comments is attached below.

SESSION ASSESSMENT

Created in response to a follow-up Questionnaire by Participating Faculty

One highlight from today's session

- Getting to know my colleagues and realizing that many of them, contrary to my expectations, share my fears and insecurities and frustrations.
- Talking openly about these issues with my colleagues.
- Hearing about my colleagues experiences that helped them help students with different cultural backgrounds.
- Learning that people from all cultures have the same struggle with diversity
- modeling the approach > questions > trigger group work > larger group results
- The four types of learning are quite useful.
- Awareness, not just of other people's differences/cultures but awareness of ones own perspective and culture. We are not neutral.
- Every part of who we are, as whole people, deserves to be acknowledged and celebrated!
- Idea that social justice belongs in every classroom.
- Having colleagues respond to each other's challenges.
- The group work with colleagues I admire.
- "Social justice pedagogy" seems to be similar to "how to be an excellent teacher" books and articles.
- Power of listening and self-examination.
- The multicultural life experience profile helped me to realize that we "wear" ideas that can promote injustice and we can choose to take them "off".
- Forced me to think how I manage my classroom.

Something I want to learn more about

- Practical applications of the strategies and ideas we've discussed today.
- How other people in my discipline have approached pedagogy.
- How to make/have African American students (when they are few) feel comfortable when talking about race.
- Dealing with conflict in the classroom.
- How to enable student to take charge of their own education.
- Ways to appeal to different learning styles.
- *A different mirror* - Ronald Takaki.
- How to deal with these issues in a math classroom – stereotype threat.
- Different learning styles and how to address all of them in my courses (though not all at once!) I know about kinesthetic, visual, aural, etc. but not about the styles you presented.
- Ways to incorporate social justice without alienating students.
- Different learning styles
- How to hold discussions that center on the facts, but can incorporate these issues.

One thing I will take away and use

- An increased self-awareness about the implications of my pedagogical process.
- Kolb's learning model.
- Motivation to incorporate social justice issues into classes.
- Vocabulary to express some ideas I've had and an avenue to solidify them.
- The necessity to include a variety of learning experiences that map to more than one learning style.
- Awareness that one tends to use one's own learning style as the preferred pedagogy.
- Renewed commitment to students. Awareness of social justice dimension.
- Match and stretch
- I have a lot to learn!

Issues I'd like to see incorporated in future sessions

- More about how to implement the concepts we talked about today; how to address problems.
- Assessment of campus culture, classroom, community, and world.
- Focus on these things at the departmental level.
- more learning styles for community
- Disabilities of mental health.
- More detail on science course pedagogy.

Feedback to Barbara and Maurianne, the presenters

- More focused discussion of how to address the problems we've identified would be nice!
THANKS FOR A GREAT SEMINAR.
- Thank you for leading us in this learning experience
- You made this very welcoming.

- Great presentation, in content and style!
- Excellent. All teachers should attend this workshop.
- Congratulations on presenting these topics with gentleness, good humor, and acceptance and on creating a safe space for us.
- Great session!!
- Thanks for the enthusiasm, good clear thinking, straight forwardness, acknowledgement of religion. NOTE – I’m less inclined to believe we’re socially constructed, but thanks to you’re great presentation and genuine concern – I now see this doesn’t matter. We’re after knowing the other.
- Very thought provoking – left with more questions because the discussions brought up some great ideas that I need to explore further. Great topic of comfort zone and learning edge – is very valuable
- I would love to be able to talk to you long and without time constraints!!!

Diversity Leadership Summit

The Diversity Leadership Summit organized by the Diversity Planning Committee was held at Emory University in Atlanta, Georgia, June 11 and 12, 2008 to look at next steps and plan for the future. A total of 45 Participants (13 were students) from 10 institutions attended the summit. Academic Deans, Deans of Students, Diversity Directors (some institutions refer to them as Multicultural Directors) and two multicultural students from each campus attended the summit. The ACS Presidents who were already meeting at Emory also joined us for part of the summit. (The meeting agenda and participants list can be found in Appendix G.)

An informal dinner opened the summit where students, staff and administrators discussed the diversity climate on their campuses. Students created a list of their mutual concerns and topics for discussion to be used back on campus. The full list is in Appendix G. A lively discussion ensued. Part of the next day was an hour where the students had an opportunity to address the presidents with some of their concerns. They compiled four questions to present:

1. As students, many of us are interested in ensuring that the importance of diversity is accepted and implemented, beginning with the very top-tier of administration, the president. How can the president strengthen the institutional commitment to diversity for their campus through the policies and procedures? Or, simply, how can the president set the tone for diversity on their respective campus?
2. A concern we had as students was that the perceived lack of diversity within the faculty impacts the overall diversity of the courses offered and the overall curriculum. What policies and actions, if any, have been implemented in hiring and retaining faculty from diverse backgrounds and educational specializations? Also, what efforts have been made towards expanding the curriculum into more diverse areas?
3. A concern we had was that diversity is often seen as primarily a numbers game, where students of color are merely tokens rather than diversity being an attempt to build a campus of well-rounded students. In acknowledging that, my question is how do you incorporate diversity in student recruitment while focusing on varied background differences rather than color?

4. A concern many students have are how the presidents are influencing the student climate on campus beyond the classroom. We are concerned that even with a curriculum change, how students interact with one another on a day to day basis defines much of how we view diversity on our campuses. As a president, how do you or how would you like to incorporate diversity into student life, such as programming, resources, and student interaction?

The next day, the agenda included an overview of the 30 grants awarded and a synopsis of programs held. Several panels presented important and useful information. Best practices in diversity programming and minority graduation rates across the ACS were shared. Diverse faculty and diverse student recruitment and retention were discussed.

Sewanee: University of the South presented its comprehensive plan to increase diverse student and faculty populations and more importantly how they retain them. The plan was board approved, money was raised by alumni, faculty and staff bought into it and were a part of the process and the success. The plan included a summer outreach program with the local high schools, orientation for entering freshman faculty and peer mentoring, summer school scholarships, contingency funds for emergencies and regular activities to support the new energy on campus. Their graduation rate is now over 90%. Results of a Furman survey and study on diversity offices and diversity funding across ACS were also presented. It was eye opening as it compared the budgets, staff size, education of staff, amount of programming, audiences served etc of Diversity (Multicultural) Offices across ACS. It is included online at <http://www.colleges.org/diversity/reports/index.html>

The Presidents joined the group and the students posed questions of the Presidents. The presidents and students benefited greatly from the exchange. The results of our consortium wide diversity survey were presented in a report by David Taylor, a diversity consultant and former academic dean at Morehouse College. The report discussed the challenges and successes in what was currently occurring on our campuses, but most importantly also made suggestions for next steps at the institutions and for the consortium. One of the suggestions was for the consortium to create a 5 year Diversity Action Plan. Part of the plan would be to fund raise to support the institutionalization of Diversity Offices on every campus and to sponsor workshops to bring diversity directors together for increased networking, problem solving and sharing of ideas. It will also include the continuation of small groups of diverse students meeting with the Deans as a part of the regular Deans meetings. The plan will keep us moving forward with the initiative and help us set a course for the future. Towards that end, there will be a meeting of diversity directors at Southwestern University, September 19 and 20 to draft the plan. The full list of suggestions for next steps for the institutions and for the consortium is below: (The complete report and the executive summary can be found in appendix H and I. They can also be found on line at <http://www.colleges.org/diversity/reports/index.html>.)

Report Suggestions

ACS colleges may wish to adopt the following:

- The colleges should establish “Diversity Enrichment Committees” charged with the development of a systematic institutional approach for creating a more diverse teaching and learning community. Such a plan should be woven into the larger 3-5 year strategic plan for the institution and funded appropriately. Accordingly, each campus should have an office of Multicultural or Diversity Affairs to coordinate the daily work and annual collegiate goals relating to diversity.
- It would strengthen collegiate resolve to engage this very difficult and challenging work if the board of Directors/Trustees, the President and senior members of the administrative team, and influential members of the faculty publicly endorsed this imperative (diversity multi-year plan).
- The recruitment and hiring of new administrative officers, faculty, staff and the recruitment students from diverse socio-economic and ethnic/racial/cultural backgrounds will be important to transforming the campuses. Encouraging existing faculty of color to take on administrative responsibilities as a form of service to the academic discipline or campus may bring forth fresh voices to the councils of decision making.

There is abundant literature on the practice of cohort hiring of minority faculty. Studies have shown that group hiring of faculty of color is more likely to result in greater retention. (See attachment –Advertisement on Keeping Faculty of Color Conference.)

There is abundant research and literature of programs designed to meet the academic support and social needs of students of color, Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender (GLBT) students as well as students with physical disabilities and learning disabilities.

- Campuses may wish to find ways to assist their faculty in developing programs around diversifying their ranks and retaining new scholar/teachers.

Consortium Opportunities:

Representing 16 institutions the ACS consortium could engage in additional grantsmanship to provide most needed resources to support the following initiatives.

- Funding for new initiatives based upon past success of campus students, staff or faculty groups. (See examples below)
 1. Major fund raising for campus initiatives designed to increase the number of faculty of color.

2. Funding for specific student led initiatives designed to engage larger numbers of students in diversity related discussions, leadership training and perhaps forms of community service.
 3. Continuation of inviting diverse students to discuss campus climate at the Deans meetings which occur three times a year
- Major fund raising to support the institutionalization of Multicultural Affairs and Diversity Affairs offices on every campus.
 - Sponsorship of workshops designed to bring ACS diversity officers together for increased networking, problem solving and sharing of ideas.
 - The hiring of someone at ACS to coordinate this initiative and provide assistance to the campuses as their individual plans unfold.
 - The creation of a 5 year Consortial Diversity Action Plan incorporating the above

Diversity Planning Committee

By June 2008, 30 mini-grants had been awarded and the subsequent projects completed in the area of Student Led Collaboration with Faculty or Staff and in the Campus Leadership Models program. The Diversity Planning Committee will remain active and continue to have conference calls and meet to present the Consortial Diversity Five Year Plan to the ACS Deans after it is completed.

The ACS Diversity Initiative web site offers links to ACS campus diversity programs; other diversity related websites, centers, and organizations, and a short bibliography of the best diversity resources available. This site, <http://www.colleges.org/diversity/index.html>, will continue to expand with our next steps and creation of the consortial five year diversity initiative plan. It has become a means of disseminating the results of the two mini-grant opportunities, information about campus climate and other ACS diversity related activities.

IV. Conclusion

The past six months have been filled with many substantial activities. We are grateful for the extension, which granted us time to complete these vital events and establish next steps. The programs and grants have increased dialogue, encouraged growth and given direction and support to campuses across the consortium. A committee has been established to continue undergraduate collaborative research and our diversity committee is determined to continue conversation and effect change. Interdisciplinary opportunities are flourishing. Our liberal arts community has been strengthened, moved forward and improved through the workshops, meetings and mini-grant projects, resulting in deeper discussion, collaboration, new ideas and a higher quality of education for our students.

Once again, the ACS expresses its deep appreciation to the Robert W. Woodruff Foundation for its extraordinary support, which has made these advances possible.

FINANCIAL REPORT

Associated Colleges of the South
Robert W. Woodruff Foundation
New Models in Three Challenged & Critical Areas
Financial Report
As of June 30, 2008

APPENDIX B

Interdisciplinary

Interdisciplinary Mini-Grant Awardees for 2006 and 2007

Interdisciplinary Mini-Grant Awardees- April 2006

1. Millsaps College, *Teaching Critical Thinking to Freshmen across Disciplines*, Dr. Hopkins, PI- \$8,000
2. Rhodes College, *Integrating Material Culture and Service into the Curriculum: Ames Plantation/Zion Cemetary Projects at Rhodes College*, Drs. Moreland and Byrnes, PI's- \$8,500
3. Rollins College, *Culture Wars: Current Debates in Ethics, Aesthetics and Politics*, Drs. Levis, Libby and Musgrave, PI's- \$4,300
4. University of the South: Sewanee, *A New Integrative Model for Teaching the History and Traditional Theatre of Japan*, Drs. Backlund and Goldberg, PI's - \$8,500

Interdisciplinary Mini-Grant Awardees-October 2006

5. Centenary College, *Interdisciplinary Quantitative Data Colloquium*, Drs. Demerath, Weeks and Rankin PI's-\$5,300
6. Furman University, *Interdisciplinary Course on Disease and Culture*, Drs. Liao and Worth, PI's-\$8486.50
7. Hendrix College, *The Women of San Luis, Costa Rica: Sharing Life Experiences Through Oral History and Photography*, Drs. Goldberg and Payne, PI's-\$5238.93
8. Millsaps College, *Interdisciplinary Program in Albania*, Drs. Galaty and Bowley, PI's-\$8,500
9. Rollins College, *Activism 101: Making A Difference Locally and Globally*, Drs. Lloyd and Hewitt, PI's-\$6,800
10. Rollins College, *Ecological Restoration: Cultivating the 'Civilized Landscape' in the Liberal Arts*, Drs. Stephenson and Phelan, PI's-\$8,500

Interdisciplinary Mini-Grants Awarded in February 2007

11. Trinity University, *Developing a Laboratory Manual and Lecture Notes for Mathematical Models in Life Sciences*, Saber Elaydi, Mathematics, David Ribble, Biology, PI's-\$2,500
12. Millsaps College, *Teaching Scientific Reasoning to Undergraduates Across Disciplines*, Patrick Hopkins, Philosophy, Sarah McGuire, Biology, PI's-\$4,500
13. Rollins College, *Activism 101 in the Galapagos & Ecuador Follow-up Planning*, Les Lloyd, Information Technology, Scott Hewitt, Education, Michael Gunter, Political Science, Joe Hughes, Technical Support, PI's- Supplemental Grant-\$3,850
14. Morehouse College, *An Interdisciplinary Analysis of the African American Male and the Public School Classroom*, Charles Meadows, Education & Modern Foreign Languages, Michael Hodge, Sociology, Marcellus Barksdale, History, PI's-\$2,500
15. Rhodes College, *Integrating Material Culture and Service into the Curriculum: The Ames Plantation and Zion Cemetery Projects at Rhodes College*, Milton Moreland, Archaeology, Ryan Byrne, Archaeology, PI's-Supplemental Grant-\$4,250

Interdisciplinary Mini-Grants Awarded in October 2007

16. Morehouse College, *Voting Analysis in Mathematics and Politics: Interdisciplinary Research and Education*, Duane Cooper, Mathematics, Hasan Crockett, Political Science, Gregory Hall, Political Science, PI's-\$8,500
17. Morehouse College, *Toward Pedagogy of International Ethics: Developing a Social Justice-Centered Humanities And Social Sciences Learning Community at Morehouse College*, Leah Creque, English/African-American Studies, Samuel Livingston, History, PI's-\$8,500
18. Hendrix College, *The Women of San Luis, Costa Rica: Sharing Life Experiences Through Oral History and Photography*, Anne Goldberg, Sociology/Anthropology, Maxine Payne, Art, -Supplemental Grant-\$5,720
19. Hendrix College, *Assessing Candidates' Emotive Displays: The Role of Gender*, Kimberly Maslin-Wicks, Politics, Leslie Wade, Psychology, PI's-\$551.00

Interdisciplinary Evaluative Survey

Interdisciplinary Evaluative Survey Report

Survey Report
Associated Colleges of the South
Interdisciplinary Initiative
May 30, 2008

Introduction

During the academic years 2006-2007, the Associated Colleges of the South (ACS), a consortium of sixteen distinguished liberal arts colleges and universities located in the South, issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) designed to enhance/promote the discussion of interdisciplinary work and support for interdisciplinary programs on its member campuses. While the consortium recognized that certain interdisciplinary programs already existed, it also believed that faculty needed new opportunities to look at issues from multiple perspectives in order to prepare students to be "global citizens."

Nine campuses were awarded funding with several campuses being awarded two or three grants each. All nine campuses participated in the survey questionnaire and twelve responses are summarized in this document.* The survey questionnaire consisted of twenty-five response items, designed to measure the degree of campus impact and the potential need for continued programmatic funding support.

Survey Responses

The first seven questions of the survey pertained to informational items relating to the institution and the persons completing the survey form. One (1) response was completed by a director. Eleven (11) were submitted by persons holding faculty rank and actively engaged in instruction.* The disciplines represented were English, biology, sociology/anthropology, theatre arts, philosophy, environmental studies, mathematics, English, and teacher preparation.

*Centenary College of Louisiana, Centre College, Furman University, Hendrix College, Millsaps College (2), Rollins College, Sewanee: The University of the South, Trinity University, Morehouse College (2)

Question #8: This question asked if any of the institutions offered opportunities for interdisciplinary study prior to the grant. It also asked how resistance to such an idea was overcome.

Only one institution, the Center for Teacher Preparation at Morehouse College, indicated that they did not offer any opportunities for interdisciplinary study. This was largely due to faculty workload and lack of incentives to pursue additional course offerings.

Among the institutions that offered interdisciplinary studies, the responses were not very different. While some grantees mentioned that programs on their campus lacked structure, most listed lack of motivation and/or incentives as being the reasons why overtaxed faculty did not consider participating in existing programs.

Question #9: Desired Grant Outcomes

While the goal of almost all of the grantees was to develop an interdisciplinary study program, the focus of the programs themselves differed greatly. Programs ranged from a study abroad program in Albania, a course on quantitative data analysis, an interdisciplinary analysis of the African-American male, and a critical thinking course for freshman. Only two institutions deviated from planning a course. Hendrix College opted to create an exhibit entitled *Women of San Luis: Oral History and Photography in Rural Costa Rica*, which will tour ACS schools and other venues throughout the United States. Trinity University chose to produce a book and lab manual for an interdisciplinary mathematics course

Question #10: This question asked if grantees successfully achieved their outcomes.

Most of the respondents achieved their goals to varying degrees. For many, the course development process has been completed, but the course has not actually been offered yet.

Others, such as Millsaps College, completed their course development, but were disappointed in the results. According to student standardized test scores, course participants did not improve their critical thinking skills. However, faculty felt that the students did increase their understanding of scientific methodology.

Centenary College was also disappointed in the end result of their coursework. While the respondents did meet their goals, they met them for a smaller number of students and staff than they had planned.

Most notable were the outcomes achieved by Rollins College. Participants in the *Ecological Restoration: Cultivating the Civilized Landscape in the Liberal Arts* project produced a website and field guide and hosted a conference. They were also able to integrate the project in a series of courses across several disciplines.

Question #11: Describe the opportunities and challenges that have come to light as a result of the interdisciplinary initiative on your campus?

Opportunities:

1. The opportunity for students to gain a new perspective by working for a client group
2. Gained the support of college administration after several college trustees accompanied participants to Albania
3. The interdisciplinary approach was enlightening and invigorating.
4. Opportunities to engage with methodologies with which we were unfamiliar and uncomfortable.
5. Getting students to think about group goals instead of personal goals

Challenges:

1. Problems with advertising events on campus
2. Difficulties recruiting students for a course on scientific methodology
3. Coordination of faculty schedules
4. Time and teaching loads

Question # 12: How did this project further the work of each discipline involved?

1. The grant forced us together which resulted in much progress
2. It created the beginning of a collaboration that will continue on other projects
3. Demonstrated that humanities and sciences can team teach very useful courses
4. Established relationships among faculty and students who share interest in quantitative data analysis
5. Teaching disease and its impact on culture simultaneously will engage students better than teaching two subjects separately

Question #13: How did the faculty and students benefit from this project?

Faculty:

1. This experience has helped faculty relate to students better.
2. Faculty learned from each other's disciplines.
3. The faculty was granted the wherewithal to create new college programs of study
4. Faculty benefited professionally
5. Increased mathematical skills of faculty and their understanding of mathematical approaches in biology
6. Both faculty and students gained new insights into our own understanding of our discipline specific knowledge in light of learning more about the other

Students:

1. Students interacted with other students from different disciplines and heard questions and analyses they normally would not have
2. The students had the opportunity to contribute to the design and Implementation of the project gaining valuable experience
3. Students got experience with a group project that crossed disciplinary boundaries, practiced a variety of skills

Question # 14: Are you involved in any new interdisciplinary projects as a result of your work with the project?

Of the twelve respondents, three are involved in new projects, Rollins, Hendrix and Centenary. In addition, participants from Millsaps college are working to improve the scientific methodology course which they developed through the current grant. They plan to teach the course again after modifications have been made. Trinity University

indicated that they are considering submitting a NSF grant to further their efforts and provide support to students.

Question #15: If you could redesign your project, what would you do differently? Why?

Of the twelve respondents, four would not make any changes to their project. One did not respond. The others answered as follows:

- 1 Have money for teaching release
- 2 Figure out a different way of assessing critical thinking and training faculty
- 3 Develop a more structured plan of recruitment and retention of students
- 4 Select students carefully and have more pre-project prep time with them
- 5 Included a student driven taping and review of our conference
- 6 Involve a social scientist the next time we teach the course
- 7 Incorporate quantitative analysis used in epidemiology
- 8 Hire more staff support to handle the administrative duties
9. Pay more attention to providing resources that would increase the probability of expedient,
effective implementation of newly designed courses

Question #16: This question asked participants if their grant was a catalyst for other initiatives or changes on campus. It also asked what still needs to happen to encourage more interdisciplinary projects.

The ACS Interdisciplinary Grant influenced changes on several of its member campuses. The most notable of the responses came from Millsaps College. While they have had interdisciplinary programs on campus before, none have spanned all three divisions of the college. The scope of this endeavor may encourage others to think more broadly about interdisciplinary programs.

Both Morehouse College and Sewanee: The University of the South recognized the grant as having been a catalyst for more faculty to duplicate such a project. They felt that their colleagues were inspired by the projects and gained a better understanding of how it worked.

Unfortunately, everyone did not share a favorable opinion of the grant projects' effects. The four respondents who indicated that there had been no changes on campus since the projects noted more students and faculty needed to see the benefits

of interdisciplinary endeavors. In addition, the respondent from Furman University mentioned the difficulty in calculating teaching credits for interdisciplinary programs as being a barrier to more such projects.

Question #17-18: These questions are regarding the promotion of the ACS grant projects on campus, to ACS institutions, and to the public at large.

Seven projects have not yet disseminated information on their work. Listed below is how the other five have publicized their work:

- Sewanee: The University of the South presented to a group of educators at the U.S. Institute for Theatre Technology National Conference in 2007.
- Trinity University has shared information about their project on campus. They are also scheduled to present at a math conference in January 2009.
- Rollins College designed a website about their work. They were also honored by 1000 Friends of Florida.
- Morehouse College presented at the CETL Conference in January 2008. They also shared information on their project at a divisional meeting.
- Millsaps College promoted their project through campus recruitment. Additionally, they made presentations to college alumni and the Board of Trustees. Their project was highlighted in the last issue of Millsaps Magazine.

Question #19: Planned follow-up activities after the grant period

Three respondents have not yet piloted their programs. Of those who have, one had no plans for follow-up activities and one did not respond. The rest of the responses fell into two categories:

Continuing the work already begun: The majority of the grantees expressed the need to build upon their current efforts by acquiring additional funding and/or streamlining the current project.

Exploring Next Opportunities: Several institutions expressed in pursuing new opportunities such as creating a publication, developing new workshops, exploring new collaborations, and developing a new studies program.

Question #20: Would a course that was developed through this grant be offered again?

Of the institutions that have already offered their courses, five will offer them again in the future.

Question #21: How was the project evaluated? What did the evaluation reveal?

Four of the grantees who have already piloted their programs responded that they had evaluated them. The result of one was a peer-reviewed article. Two institutions used student reviews of the course as an evaluation tool. The fourth institution, Millsaps College, used their students' standardized test scores as their method of evaluation. They reported that the tests revealed that there was no improvement in students' critical thinking skills following the course.

Question #22-23: These questions asked respondents if their course would be offered again and when.

The majority of courses that were already offered will be offered again in 2009.

Question #24-25: Describe any subsequent funding that you have received. What resources would you need to continue?

While most of the institutions still need funding to continue their efforts, a few of them will continue to offer their courses without further assistance. Several grantees have already received funding. Most notably, the *Florida Studies Initiative Grant* at Rollins College was awarded a grant from the Elizabeth Morse Genius Foundation and the *Interdisciplinary Program in Albania* received support from some of the Millsaps College trustees.

In addition to needing funds, several institutions stated that faculty needed release time and clerical assistance in order to continue their work.

SUMMARY

The ACS Interdisciplinary Initiative proved crucial to growth in this area of programming. Even though most of the grant-funded institutions already had some type of interdisciplinary programming on their campuses, grantees were able to build upon or improve what previously existed. Not only did the majority of them meet their goals, but there were unexpected results as well. Perhaps the most important outcome outside of anticipated accomplishments is the fact that these projects became "models of excellence" for faculty who had been reluctant about embarking on such an endeavor. As a result of the work of their colleagues, other faculty were able to see what could be accomplished and how interdisciplinary programming could look different from the traditional model. Students also benefited from exposure to more in depth work in their fields.

Despite the accomplishments of the grant initiatives, the programs were not without its challenges. Faculty noted lack of release time and need for administrative assistance as two of the main obstacles

to completing their work. Some also had problems recruiting students as advertising on campus was a challenge.

Overall, the objectives of this program funding seemed to have been met. In addition, several grantees have opted to pursue new interdisciplinary projects after their experience with the ACS initiative.

APPENDIX D

**Undergraduate Research & Engagement Grant
Mini Grants Awardees for 2006**

Undergraduate Research and Engagement Grant Awardees-March 2006

1. Rollins College, *Young Scholars Collective*, Dr. Hoyt Edge, PI-\$25,000
2. University of Richmond, *LURE: Long-Term Undergraduate Research Experience*, Dr. William Ross, PI-\$24,000

Undergraduate Research and Engagement Grant Awardees-October 2006

3. Birmingham-Southern College, *Miss Julie Project*, Dr. Michael Flowers, PI-\$28,000
4. Rhodes College, *Historical Archaeology in W. Tennessee: Collaborative Projects in Excavation Survey and Artifact Analysis*, Dr. Milton Moreland, PI-\$22,000
5. Trinity University, *Increasing Collaborative Research Through Investigations of Interdisciplinary Multi-Agent Simulations*, Dr. Eugenio Suarez, PI-\$25,000

Undergraduate Research and Engagement Evaluative Survey

Undergraduate Research and Engagement Evaluative Survey Report

Survey Report
Associated Colleges of the South
Undergraduate Research and Engagement Initiative
May 30, 2008

Introduction

During the academic years 2005-06 and 2006-07, the Associated Colleges of the South (ACS), a consortium of sixteen distinguished liberal arts colleges and universities located in the South, issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) designed to offer more opportunities for collaborative research/scholarship between/among students and faculty at its member institutions. Most notably, it enabled the five institutions that were awarded grants to engage disciplines outside of the natural sciences in the collaborative research/scholarship process, expand current projects beyond summer programming, and/or design programs that were much larger in scope.

Four campuses were awarded funding with one campus being awarded two grants each. Five grantees participated in the survey questionnaire. The grants ranged from \$22,000 to \$28,000. Their responses are summarized in this document. The survey questionnaire consisted of twenty-two response items, designed to measure the degree of campus impact and the potential need for continued programmatic funding support.

Survey Responses

The first seven questions of the survey pertained to informational items relating to the institution and the persons completing the survey form. All five surveys were submitted by persons holding faculty rank and actively engaged in instruction. The disciplines were philosophy/religion, theatre arts, and mathematics/computer science.

The institutions represented are:

* Birmingham-Southern College, University of Richmond, Rollins College, Rhodes College and Trinity University

Question 8: Were there opportunities for student/professor collaborative research on your campus prior to this grant?

While all the grantees institutions already provided some type of opportunities for collaboration, this grant allowed them to go beyond the traditional collaborative design and create new models of scholarly research and learning.

Questions 9-10: What were the desired outcomes of your grant? Did you achieve them?

While the scope of these projects varied greatly, all five were successful in meeting their goals. In the case of Birmingham-Southern College's Miss Julie Project, the goals were very finite. The student-teacher team set out to develop a play, perform it both locally and internationally, and conduct discussions and write a publication about the play and their experiences. In contrast, Trinity University chose a project which was much broader in scope.

Increasing Collaborative Research through Investigations of Interdisciplinary Multi-Agent Simulations proposed to design a research model that utilized multi-agent simulations. While the development of this model is still on-going, the main goal of the project, to increase the participation of non-science majors in the undergraduate research community at Trinity, was met. Similarly, the University of Richmond also initiated a large scope project entitled *LURE: Long-Term Undergraduate Research Experience*. Even though most of its project goals extended far beyond the timeline of this grant, the University was able to meet its short-term goal which was to use the ACS grant as seed money in order to get long-term funding from the National Science Foundation.

Question 11: Were there any opportunities/challenges that were brought to light by your project? What were they?

Efforts to meet program goals were not without challenge. The majority of grantees underestimated the amount of time and/or funding needed to successfully meet their goals. For example, Trinity University found that the actual development of their MAS (Multi-Agent Simulation) Platform took much longer than anticipated. As a result, they recommended that their summer program be held over several summers in the future. On the other hand, Birmingham-Southern College underestimated the costs associated with developing and presenting a theatrical production. In particular, they cited that costs of the venue rental in Edinburg, as well as shipping costs of furniture for their sets. In the latter case, they recommended purchasing furniture overseas rather than shipping what was already purchased.

In addition to budget and time constraints, one institution, Rollins College, had problems with student and faculty attrition. While the main purpose of their project was to offer a student/faculty collaborative research/scholarship opportunity that extended beyond their eight week Summer Scholarship Program, the longer timeframe resulted in the loss of a faculty member who took another job, and several students who either graduated early, left their major, or left the institution altogether. Even though these challenges did not prevent the grantees from meeting their goals, they were major unforeseen setbacks that resulted from their efforts to expand their initial program.

Several grantees also cited unexpected opportunities which were brought to light by their projects. Perhaps most notable, were the changes that occurred on Rollins campus as a result of their *Young Scholars Collective* project. Recognition of similarities in various student-faculty team projects led to on-campus programming, as well as student-sponsored clubs and organizational activities. A variety of service learning projects were also developed as spin offs of the initial research work. While many of these activities and events were initiated by student members of the research teams themselves, some were started by other students who were

influenced by their peers in the project. One such service learning activity resulted in *Farm Workers' Awareness*, a new campus organization and a related student-made documentary about pesticides and the working conditions of farm workers that was shown on campus.

Additionally, Trinity College noted unexpected results. In addition to meeting their goals of developing a first-year seminar course and a senior-level research course that allowed students to explore social behaviors in virtual environments, participants discovered that they had "raised the bar" for other departments to offer research opportunities to their students earlier in their college career.

Question 12: If you could redesign your project, what would you do differently? Why?

Only two respondents mentioned any program design changes. University of Richmond would build in opportunities for older, experienced students to mentor 1st and 2nd year students. The Miss Julie Project at Birmingham-Southern College would add venue rental as a budget item and purchase furniture overseas rather than ship it from Birmingham.

Question 13: Was your grant a catalyst for other initiatives or changes on campus?

Not only was the grant a catalyst in the creation of new student/faculty collaborative scholarship opportunities, it was successful in attracting a variety of initiatives. New research projects, a newly created theatrical performance, both summer programming and those offered during the academic year were seen on campus as a result of awarded grant funding.

Questions 14-15: How did you share your project on campus, with ACS institutions, and the others?

Grantees found diverse ways of sharing their project results. Through ACS activities and publications, project websites, articles, and conference presentations on campus and at national and international venues, institutions that received ACS grants were able to communicate their goals and results to others. Birmingham-Southern College was also able to share their project in two unique ways. Participants performed *Miss Julie* at the Edinburgh Fringe Festival, the largest and most distinctive performing arts festival in the world. They also participated in a panel presentation at the Southeastern Theatre Conference, the largest conference of its kind in the country.

Question 16: What are your planned follow-up activities?

As a result of their initial successes, all five ACS-funded projects have decided to seek funding to further their work. One project, *LURE: Long-Term Undergraduate Research Project*, has already succeeded in receiving additional funding to extend their project beyond the original grant period. Through a grant from the National Science Foundation, the University of Richmond will be able to continue its program for four years. Not only will they continue scholarship/research collaborations among faculty and students, but they will also collaborate with faculty and students from four other colleges that received similar grants from NSF.

Rollins College also plans to continue its project. They will put out call for proposals in the Fall of 2008 and begin with the next cohort group in the Spring of 2009. The Young Scholars Collective is scheduled to last through the Spring of 2009. Additionally, the current project received funding from the Dean of Faculty Office that will enable students to travel to professional conferences to present the original research with their collaborating faculty members.

Question 17: Are the students who were involved in the project continuing to do research with project faculty? Other faculty? Independently? If so, what are they doing?

Faculty and students continue to work on related projects both collaboratively and individually. In fact, with the exception of students who have graduated, most of the faculty and students involved in the grant projects continue to do some type of research in their fields.

Question 18: How has the grant project influenced the students and faculty involved?

The students and faculty involved in the Undergraduate Research and Engagement grant were also influenced beyond initial expectations. Students at the University of Richmond reported their Undergraduate Research and Engagement project, *LURE: Long-term Undergraduate Research Experience* as being the highlight of their summer. In particular, they noted benefits such as "understanding the research process," "skill at giving oral presentations," and "gaining self-confidence."

In the case of Rollins College, students who participated in the *Young Scholars Collective* reported their research project experience as being the highlight of their college career. They felt that it was a "synthesis of all of the work they had done during their time in college." They also noted that the project experience had "enabled them to better apply their major in the real world." As a result of their positive experiences, the students, who were graduating seniors, plan to return to the campus in the Fall to help recruit the next cohort group. Faculty involved in the *Young Scholars Collective* credited the project with helping their students to become more effective student leaders. They felt that the experience also augmented faculty mentoring and communications skills. Faculty at both Rollins College and Trinity University reported that lasting bonds had been formed across disciplines among students and faculty.

SUMMARY

Overall, the ACS Undergraduate Research and Engagement Grant Program was a great success. It led to the creation of new models of collaborative scholarship/research and offered research opportunities for faculty and students outside of the natural science fields. The program also allowed the students involved to actively engage in collaborative scholarship/research and the culture, methodology, and issues related to it. Similarly, the grant gave faculty opportunities to enhance their teaching and contributions to their discipline. Of equal importance is the fact that the program impacted the culture of the campuses involved, often resulting in related campus programs and activities. While the grant program had its challenges, they were outweighed by the many benefits that resulted from them.

Appendix F

**Diversity Mini-Grant Awardees for 2006, 2007 and 2008
Student Led Collaboration with Faculty/Staff**

**Diversity Mini-Grant Awardees for 2006, 2007 and 2008
Campus Leadership Models**

Student Led Collaboration with Faculty/Staff 2006-2008

Student Led Collaboration with Faculty/Staff April 2006

1. Birmingham-Southern College, *International Bazaar*, Erica Brown and Melissa Latko, \$1300
2. Birmingham-Southern College, *Multicultural Resources Library*, Erica Brown and Chryston Jones-\$1800

October 2006 Student Led Collaboration with Faculty/Staff

3. Centenary College, *Centenary Safe Zone*, Michelle Wolkomir, Caroline Cottingham and Sarah Eich, \$2500
4. Rollins College, *Multicultural Retreat*, Maruxa Murphy, Tracey Hardy and David Colon, \$2500
5. Southwestern University, *As Seen On TV*, Katherine Juhl, and Leia Crawford, \$2500
6. Washington and Lee University, *English for Speakers of Other Languages*, Ellen Mayock, Greg Dresden, Tal McIver and Stephanie Dodson, \$2500
7. University of the South, *Co-Operative Approach to Address Impact of Growth of Campus Diversity*, Paige Schneider and Asia Watson, \$2500

2007-Rolling Deadlines-Student Led Collaboration with Faculty/Staff

8. Trinity University, *Tracing Chicanismo-History, Community & Impact Workshop*, Robert Huesca and Aaron Sanchez-\$2500
9. Furman University, *Black Student Leadership Conference*, Idella Glenn and Emmanuel Chandler-\$2500
10. Southwestern University, *The Disabilities Project*, Kathleen Juhl and Lindsey Smith, August -October 2007-\$ 2500
11. Birmingham-Southern College, *Religious Life Fellows*, John Richardson and Johnny Croft, September 2007-May 1, 2007-\$2500

2008-Rolling Deadlines-Student Led Collaboration with Faculty/Staff

12. Davidson College, *Black Student Leadership Conference*, Ernest Jefferies and Jeffrey Scott -\$2,500
13. Hendrix College, *Multicultural Leadership Retreat*, Kesha Baoua and Ryan Williams-\$1,000
14. Rollins College, *3rd Annual Multicultural Retreat*, Megan Harte and Sabrina Ramirez - \$2,500

Total-\$32,500

Campus Diversity Leadership Models Mini-Grants Awards for 2006-2008

Campus Diversity Leadership Models Mini-Grant Awardees -January 2006

1. Davidson College, *NCBI One Day Workshop*, Ernest Jefferies, March 17-18, 2006-\$1500

Campus Diversity Leadership Models Mini-Grant Awardees –March 2006

2. Rollins College, *Training for Social Change Workshop*, Jill Gorman, March 2 & 3, 2006-\$1500
3. University of Richmond, *National Conference for Community & Justice Training Workshop*, Dan Fabian, August 19, 2006-\$1500

Campus Diversity Leadership Models Mini-Grant Awardees-October 2006

4. Furman University, *NCBI Train the Trainer Workshop*, Idella Glenn, September 30-November 1, 2006-\$1125
5. Hendrix College, *National Conference for Community & Justice Diversity Inclusion Training*, Kesha Baoua, March 2007-\$1500
6. Rollins College, *Allies Training Program*, Odile Perez, March 26-30 2007-\$1120
7. Southwestern University, *Pac Rim Conference*, Tom Larkin, April 1, 2007-\$1500
8. Southwestern University, *Program on Intergroup Relations*, Michele Amerson, February 8 & 9, 2007-\$1500
9. Washington & Lee University, *Forum for Leaders of Greek Organizations*, Marguerite McClinton, January 30, 2007-\$1500

Campus Diversity Leadership Models Mini Grant Awardees-2007

10. Millsaps College, *Faculty Diversity Workshop*, Darby Gray, August 24, 2007-\$2000
11. Washington & Lee University, *Content of Character Workshop*, Burr Datz, September 29, 2007-\$2000
12. Southwestern University, *Intergroup Relations Workshop*, Michele Amerson, October 20-21, 2007-\$500
13. Centre College, *Posse Retreat*, J. Carey Thompson, March 28-30, 2008-\$2000
14. Furman University, *LGBT Leadership Training Workshop (NCBI)*, February 15-17, 2008-\$1360

Campus Diversity Leadership Models Mini Grant Awardees-2008

15. Centenary College, *NCBI Training Workshop*, Kelly Weeks- \$2000

16. Southwestern University, *Faculty Diversity Workshop*, Larkin
Tom-\$2000

Total: \$24,745

Diversity Planning Committee

Diversity Leadership Summit Meeting Agenda, June 2008

Diversity Leadership Summit Participants List, June 2008

Diversity Leadership Summit-Student Concerns and Suggestions, June 2008

Associated Colleges of the South

Diversity Leadership Summit

Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia
June 11 & 12, 2008

AGENDA

Wednesday, June 11, 2008

1-5:00 pm- Check in at Woodruff Residence Hall and Emory Inn

1:30-5:00 pm-Van available at Emory Inn to transport students to Woodruff Hall

6:30 pm- Meet in lobby of Emory Inn and Woodruff Hall for van to
Dinner

7:00 pm-Dinner & informal meeting at Cox Hall-Room 2 & 3-choose topics and student
representatives for the President's hour on Thursday.

9:30 pm- Van return to Emory Inn and Woodruff Residence hall

Thursday, June 12, 2008

7:30 am- Check out & meet in hotel lobby and Woodruff Residence hall for van to Cox
Hall

8:00 am-Continental Breakfast- Cox Hall Room 2 & 3

8:15 am -Welcome and Housekeeping- Dr. Jim Hunt, Diversity Committee Chair
& Marcia White, ACS-Cox Hall Room 2 & 3

8:30 am- Purpose and Introductions- Dr. Jim Hunt

8:45 am-Overview of Diversity Activities-Woodruff Grant-Marcia White

- a. Activities to Date
- b. Assessment Report of Grant Activities

9:00 am-Grants given in Student Led Collaboration with Faculty & Staff-Marcia White

- 9:15 am-Grants given in Campus Leadership Models- Idella Glenn, Diversity Steering Committee & students
- 9: 45 am- Diversity Faculty & Student Recruitment, Retention & Graduation Rates- Whole Group discussion- led by Eric Benjamin, Diversity Steering Committee & Eric Hartman, University of the South: Sewanee
- 10: 30 am-All Participants Board Van for Emory Conference Center
- 11:00 am-Presidents' Hour at Emory Conference Center (Silver Bell Pavilion)- Facilitated by Jim Hunt, meeting with student representatives, Diversity Survey recommendations-David Taylor
- 12:00 pm-Van to Cox Hall from Emory Conference Center
- 12:15 pm- Lunch-Cox Hall-Room 1
- 1:15 pm- Sharing of Best Practices at all ACS schools-Whole group- led by Ron Swain, Diversity Steering Committee-Cox Hall Room 2 & 3
- 2:15pm- Current Models for Diversity Offices & Directors, Policies, Concerns & Ideas- Whole group discussion-led by Eric Benjamin & Idella Glenn-Diversity Steering Committee
- 3:15pm- ACS Diversity Survey Results & Next Steps-Dr. David Taylor, Diversity Consultant
- 4:00 pm-Evaluation and reimbursement forms
- 4:30 pm-Adjourn
- 4:30 pm-Van to Emory Inn and Woodruff Residence Hall
- 6:00 pm-Van from Woodruff Residence Hall to Dinner at Emory Inn (Save receipts to be reimbursed.)
- 7:30 pm-Van back to Woodruff Hall

Friday, June 13, 2008

- 7:30-10:30 am- Van to Emory Inn from Residence Hall (Continental breakfast available in Emory Inn lobby. Save receipts to be reimbursed.)
- 7:30-11am-Check out of Emory Inn and Residence Hall

This meeting is supported by the Robert W. Woodruff Foundation

Appendix G-2
 Associated Colleges of the South
Diversity Leadership Summit
 Emory University, Atlanta, GA
 June 11 & 12, 2008
 37 Participants

<u>Participants</u>	<u>University</u>	<u>Email</u>
1. Dudley Long	Birmingham-Southern	dlong@bsc.edu
2. Erica Brown	Birmingham-Southern	ebrown@bsc.edu
3. Darrel Colson	Centenary College	dcolson@centenary.edu
4. Kelly Weeks	Centenary College	kweeks@centenary.edu
5. Ned Frazer	Centre College	ned.frazer@centre.edu
6. Beau Weston	Centre College	beau.weston@centre.edu
7. John Beckford	Furman University	john.beckford@furman.edu
8. Idella Glenn	Furman University	idella.glenn@furman.edu
9. Sherryl Wilburn	Millsaps College	wilburse@millsaps.edu
10. Carol Casey	Rhodes College	casey@rhodes.edu
11. Anita Davis	Rhodes College	adavis@rhodes.edu
12. Cynthia P. Johnson	Rhodes College	polk_johnson@rhodes.edu
13. Darlene Loprete	Rhodes College	loprete@rhoedes.edu
14. Laurie Joyner	Rollins College	kknight@rollins.edu
15. Jim Hunt, Chair	Southwestern University	huntj@southwestern.edu
16. Ron Swain	Southwestern University	swainr@southwestern.edu
17. Michelle Amerson	Southwestern University	amersonm@southwestern.edu
18. Ankita Rakhe	Trinity University	ankita.rakhe@trinity.edu
19. Eric Benjamin	University of the South: Sewanee	ebenjami@sewanee.edu
20. Eric Hartman	University of the South: Sewanee	ehartman@sewanee.edu
21. David Taylor	Diversity Consultant	reedtajo2@comcast.net
22. Marcia White	Associated Colleges of the South	mwhite@colleges.org
<u>Student Participants</u>	<u>University</u>	
1. Buddy Permenter	Birmingham-Southern	bepermen@bsc.edu
2. Kamari Little	Birmingham-Southern	krlittle@bsc.edu
3. Samantha Green	Centenary College	sgreen@centenary.edu
4. Adrienne Johnson	Furman University	Adrienne.johnson1114@furman.edu
5. Samantha Smith	Furman University	Samantha.smith1534@furman.edu
6. Eric Dailey	Rhodes College	daier@rhodes.edu
7. Diana Villa	Rhodes College	vildi@rhodes.edu
8. Marissa Germain	Rollins College	mgermain@rollins.edu
9. Ashley Green	Rollins College	agreen@rollins.edu
10. Laura Burrow	Southwestern University	burrowl@southwestern.edu
11. Carissa Fritz	Southwestern University	fritzc@southwestern.edu
12. Nigel Robinson	Trinity University	nrobins2@trinity.edu
13. Jennifer Burkey	Trinity University	jburkey@trinity.edu
14. Bakari Faulkner	University of the South: Sewanee	faulks0@sewanee.edu
15. Kristin Whitely	University of the South: Sewanee	whitekd0@sewanee.edu

**Student Compiled Questions From President's Hour
ACS Diversity Leadership Summit, June 2008**

1. As students, many of us are interested in ensuring that the importance of diversity is accepted and implemented, beginning with the very top-tier of administration, the president. How can the president strengthen the institutional commitment to diversity for their campus through the policies and procedures? Or, simply, how can the president set the tone for diversity on their respective campus?
2. A concern we had as students was that the perceived lack of diversity within the faculty impacts the overall diversity of the courses offered and the overall curriculum. What policies and actions, if any, have been implemented in hiring and retaining faculty from diverse backgrounds and educational specializations? Also, what efforts have been made towards expanding the curriculum into more diverse areas?
3. A concern we had was that diversity is often seen as primarily a numbers game, where students of color are merely tokens rather than diversity being an attempt to build a campus of well-rounded students. In acknowledging that, my question is how do you incorporate diversity in student recruitment while focusing on varied background differences rather than color?
4. A concern many students have are how the presidents are influencing the student climate on campus beyond the classroom. We are concerned that even with a curriculum change, how students interact with one another on a day to day basis defines much of how we view diversity on our campuses. As a president, how do you or how would you like to incorporate diversity into student life, such as programming, resources, and student interaction?

Concerns and Possible Topics of Discussion Presented by the Students at the Summit

- How to strengthen the institutional commitment to diversity and the president's role in making that happen.
- Gear goals in diversity to the entire campus and then zero in on the diverse people.
- When you look at the diversity as a numbers game and not what they can bring to the campus, the campus loses.
- Diversity is often seen as something optional and only a small group of people participate. All students should participate and possibly have it as a part of the freshman course.
- It would be good if each leadership position candidate when being interviewed was asked what their commitment to diversity is. (Faculty and Staff)
- How does the institution go about hiring diverse faculty? What is the process? How important is to diverse students?

- It is important to have a diverse curriculum, not only a diverse staff. Be sure the curriculum represents global cultures.
- How the administration views diversity vs. how the students view diversity. The students do not think they are part of a diverse population.
- Make it intentional to discuss diversity, possibly in small groups.
- Use programming to bring diverse groups together.
- Bring the different cultural groups together to run as one campus. (Collaboration)
- Certain groups put on programs for diverse student groups and only the same people show up.
- Have administration provide incentives for groups to collaborate.
- **It would be good to see presidents come to some of the programs and to have a presence would have a strong impact.
- Have the presidents support faculty teaching diverse topics.
- Possibly hire someone who can represent the president in coming to campus functions.
- It would help to have different faculty members attend diversity events also.
- Have a diversity committee where you can discuss issues. (Have both students and faculty on this committee.)
- We need to push people outside of their comfort zones and each person has to take the responsibility to address problems that are hurtful.
- Put freshman together and have the facilitator push them beyond their comfort zone in diversity conversations. Be sure the facilitators know how to facilitate and has training. This should be mandatory.
- Minorities should only have to speak on behalf of themselves, not their entire race.
- Have an online way to post your feelings to avoid painful and uncomfortable attacks or questions.
- Have administration define diversity and what falls underneath that as a student.
- Have president set the tone for diversity and be a role model and sincere when addressing diversity issues.
- Have a series of talks/dinners with the president and small groups of students and faculty throughout the year to discuss diversity.
- How can we aim for diversity in our admissions process and concentrate on skills you don't see on paper- look at each person holistically.
- Don't just admit diverse people from one geographic area- spread out.
- Look at merit scholarships and how they are distributed.

Diversity Survey Executive Summary Report

Executive Summary
Final Report
Associated Colleges of the South
Diversity Initiative Survey Questionnaire

SUMMARY

The ACS Diversity Initiative was intended to be a catalyst for fostering candid discussions about diversity on ACS campuses. In keeping with the liberal arts tradition the goal was to “create and to sustain campus learning/teaching and social environments that welcome, value and celebrate diversity.” Funded by the Robert W. Woodruff Foundation, a request for proposals was announced for the award of mini-grants to support Student Led Collaboration with Faculty/Staff and Campus Leadership Models Workshops.

Twenty grants were awarded to twelve of sixteen ACS institutions that comprise the consortium. One campus, not a grant applicant, also responded to the survey, indicating their accomplishments around diversity related initiatives. Initiatives supported by the grant encompassed racial, ethnic, and cultural affinity groups, religious beliefs, sexual orientation, the disabled, socio-economic class and ESL speakers and learners. The expressed intent of these programs was to bring constituencies on campus together for meaningful discussion and dialogue concerning differences in order to create a more inclusive and inviting campus community and learning environment. Essential to the intended programmatic outcomes was the necessity for the training of student leadership and faculty capable of facilitating difficult discussions and navigating organizational change in and outside of the classroom. Ostensibly, such a trained cadre of leaders would be responsible for providing an orientation for future leaders and discussion.

All of the recipients felt that the objectives articulated in their proposals had been accomplished. Most of them could cite instances of additional initiatives outside of the scope of their grant that may have been influenced by the presence of grant related activities. Many of the campuses had planned follow-up activities post grant period contingent upon additional institutional or grant funds availability.

When asked if the grant had led to discussion about establishing a new administrative office on campus dedicated to diversity affairs, only a few indicated a possibility within the context of a larger strategic plan. The majority of responding campuses, however, had pre-existing offices or programs with the title of Diversity Affairs or Multicultural Affairs.

When asked if the diversity initiative addressed the possibility of the recruitment of diverse faculty, some respondents acknowledged that these conversations did take place

but they were not aware of any specific outcomes with respect to the hiring of new faculty. When asked specifically if their program resulted in such recruitment only two campuses responded with examples of a hire or potential hire.

A similar question was asked concerning the discussion of strategies or programs initiated to increase the recruitment and retention of students of color. Again many did not respond to this question or may not have been in the position to know. A couple did make passing reference to instances of students of color working in tandem with admissions offices in meeting with perspective students. Another pointed to new admissions materials that appeared to be more inclusive. No direct references were made to programs designed to retain students of color.

Uniformly, respondents felt that the campus climate around diversity issues has improved as a direct result of these sponsored initiatives. More people are aware of the challenges inherent in fostering a truly multicultural campus. More students, staff, and faculty have felt empowered to raise and discuss issues in an informed way. In one instance a dramatic decrease in tension on campus was reported. Reports of a reduction in prejudicial behavior in and outside of the classroom are anecdotal and not based upon any research.

Other respondents have expressed the concern that in many instances “diversity work” has only scratched the proverbial surface. With regards to students, beyond students of color and other students who are passionate these issues, diversity work must compete for time and resources like other student led initiatives. Without concerted effort it may not get the degree of attention or support to make it a transformational experience for all students.

In a similar fashion, among staff and faculty, training and diversity programs have expanded the conversation. Although in many instances the entire campus has been invited to participate in diversity related activities and discussion, there are still reported pockets of resistance within the faculty and staff. Faculty has been generally supportive of the need to diversify their ranks. However, as one respondent suggests, the reality is that very little change will occur in the near future.

Therefore, it is not surprising that when asked in the future where additional consortium resources might be best placed; many respondents felt that the recruitment and retention of students and faculty of color ought to be a high priority. Other suggestions included more resources for Multicultural Affairs offices and an effort at connecting diversity education programs at each ACS schools. The future success, if not survival, of these diversity programs rests with greater institutional engagement and consortium funded special efforts.

NEXT STEPS

Institutional Opportunities:

Present demographics concerning high school graduation suggests that an increasing number of students of color will be attending and graduating from high school. This is in contrast to a predicted decline in the number of white students who are currently attending and graduating. If existing institutions of higher education wish to retain or increase their market share of this national pool, an increased targeting and enrollment of students of color will be an economic necessity. Campuses will need to assure cultural sensitivity and the curriculum must appear to be more inclusive. Alumni will demand better training for successfully engaging in a workforce composed of diverse elements.

ACS colleges may wish to adopt the following:

- Establish “Diversity Enrichment Committees” charged with the development of a systematic institutional approach for creating a more diverse teaching and learning community. Such a plan should be woven into the larger 3-5 year strategic plan for the institution and funded appropriately. Accordingly, each campus should have an office of Multicultural or Diversity Affairs to coordinate the daily work and annual collegiate goals relating to diversity.
- It would strengthen collegiate resolve to engage this very difficult and challenging work if the board of Directors/Trustees, the President and senior members of the administrative team, and influential members of the faculty publicly endorsed this imperative (diversity multi-year plan).
- The recruitment and hiring of new administrative officers, faculty, staff and the recruitment students from diverse socio-economic and ethnic/racial/cultural backgrounds will be important to transforming the campuses. Encouraging existing faculty of color to take on administrative responsibilities as a form of service to the academic discipline or campus may bring forth fresh voices to the councils of decision making.

There is abundant literature on the practice of cohort hiring of minority faculty. Studies have shown that group hiring of faculty of color is more likely to result in greater retention. (See attachment –Advertisement on Keeping Faculty of Color Conference.)

There is abundant research and literature of programs designed to meet the academic support and social needs of students of color, Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender (GLBT) students as well as students with physical disabilities and learning disabilities.

- Campuses may wish to find ways to assist their faculty in developing programs around diversifying their ranks and retaining new scholar/teachers.

Consortium Opportunities:

Representing 16 institutions the ACS consortium could engage in additional grantsmanship to provide most needed resources to support the following initiatives.

- Funding for new initiatives based upon past success of campus students, staff or faculty groups. (See examples below)
- 4. Major fund raising for campus initiatives designed to increase the number of faculty of color.
- 5. Funding for specific student led initiatives designed to engage larger numbers of students in diversity related discussions, leadership training and perhaps forms of community service

- Major fund raising to support the institutionalization of Multicultural Affairs and Diversity Affairs offices on every campus.
- Sponsorship of workshops designed to bring ACS diversity officers together for increased networking, problem solving and sharing of ideas.
- It may be of importance that for the next two years that the ACS consortium hire someone to coordinate this initiative and provide assistance to the campuses as their individual plans unfold.
- Create a 5 year Consortial Diversity Action Plan incorporating the above

June 2008

Diversity Evaluative Survey Final Report

Final Report
Associated Colleges of the South
Diversity Initiative Evaluative Survey

Introduction

During the academic years 2006-2008 the Associated Colleges of the South (ACS), a consortium of sixteen distinguished liberal arts colleges and universities located in the South, issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) designed to enhance/promote the discussion of diversity and support for diversity programs on its member campuses. The RFP delineated two categories for funding: (1) Mini-grants for Campus Diversity Leadership Models, and (2) Mini-grants for Student Led Collaboration with Faculty/Staff. The former was intended to support the ongoing development of “models for training and maintaining active diversity leadership teams on campuses,” as well as, “support for diversity leadership models that already exist or are newly being implemented on campuses. The latter was intended to encourage opportunities such as workshops, research, internships, service projects, leadership projects, conferences and other activities designed to engage two or more campus groups in a collaborative effort to affect climate change on campuses.

Usually, under the aegis of multicultural awareness, these grants were intended to foster better campus climates with respect to diversity within the student body and to prepare students, as part of their educational experience, for the challenges they will experience in the culturally diverse world and work force. These grants were also intended to serve as a catalyst for additional initiatives including opportunities for the recruitment and retention of students of color (SOC) and faculty of color (FOC). Competitive in nature, the proposals were reviewed and selected upon the basis of anticipated positive impact on existing campus climates. Funding for these mini-grants was provided through a generous gift from the Robert W. Woodruff Foundation

Twelve campuses submitted proposals for funding with several campuses being awarded two or three grants each. The participating campuses were asked to complete a survey requesting information about the perceived impact of the ACS mini-grants as well as other diversity initiative activities that were not supported by these mini-grants. Although not a recipient of grant funding, one campus had developed its own campus climate student survey and had embarked on an ambitious plan for enhancing campus wide dialogues on diversity. Thirteen campuses participated in the survey questionnaire and twenty-one responses are summarized in this document.* The survey questionnaire consisted of thirty response items, undifferentiated by type of mini-grant received, intended to record the degree of campus impact and the potential need for continued programmatic funding support.

Survey Responses

The first seven questions of the survey pertained to informational items relating to the institution and the persons completing the survey form. Of particular note is the fact that nine (9) of twenty-one (21) respondents were from office or programs with the titles incorporating the words diversity or multicultural. Four (4) responses were completed by administrative officers such as director, dean, provost, and chaplain. Eight (8) responses were submitted by persons holding faculty rank and actively engaged in instruction. **

Question #8: This question asked if the institution was the recipient of mini-grant funding. Twelve (12) institutions out of 13 respondents were recipients.

* Birmingham-Southern College, Centenary College of Louisiana, Centre College, Furman University, Hendrix College, Millsaps College, Rhodes College, Rollins College, Sewanee: The University of the South, Southwestern University, Trinity University, University of Richmond, Washington and Lee University.

** The disciplines represented were psychology, communications, foreign languages, romance languages, sociology/anthropology, theatre, religious studies, and business.

The following is a brief description of project activities:

The concepts of diversity and multiculturalism for this survey were undifferentiated by definition. They encompassed racial, ethnic and cultural affinity groups, religious beliefs, sexual

orientation, the disabled, socio-economic class, and English as a Second Language (ESL) speakers/learners. The expressed intent of these programs was to bring constituencies on campus together for meaningful discussion and dialogue concerning differences in order to create a more inclusive and inviting campus community, and learning environment

Faculty: Those grants geared primarily for faculty development emphasized training and skills for facilitating conversations on sensitive subjects, pedagogies/strategies for creating positive classroom environments, and training to enhance the ability of faculty to understand issues affecting Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender (GLBT) students. One grant in particular focused on ways to integrate diversity and multi-cultural education into the curriculum and co-curriculum. Participation in these workshops and training programs were voluntary except in cases where the activity was a part of a mandatory faculty conference/retreat.

Students: Those grants with a student focus consisted of leadership development opportunities, training in multicultural dialogue facilitation, discussion within the Greek letter community about diversity, efforts to create a more affirmative living/learning environment across all “isms,” and in one instance focused discussions concerning demographic shifts in student body composition. Some campuses had requested assistance from the National Coalition Building Institute (NCBI) to train selected students from campuses as trainers for diversity discourse. Several campuses pooled their resources and sponsored an African American Student Leadership Development Conference.

Faculty/Students/Staff

Other grants were clearly geared to encompass the entire campus community. These include a specific ethnicity workshop, an inclusion training model workshop for multicultural organization student leaders, faculty, staff and administrators, multicultural retreats to discuss identity, awareness and community building, a Theatre for Social Justice production relating to disabilities, training for fall orientation advisors on diversity, an International

Bazaar showcasing diverse food and cultural entertainment, and a Multicultural Resource Library.

Others: One campus was engaged in a minority student recruitment initiative [Posse Plus] that required a multi-year commitment and the development of a receptive campus community to facilitate integration, retention, and graduation of these selectively recruited minority students.

Question #9: Non-Grant Related Activity

Rhodes College is the only respondent that had launched a comprehensive diversity initiative without mini-grant funding. The initiative included but is not limited to the following elements:

- General campus climate survey for faculty, staff and students
- A new curriculum with foundational requirements for cultural perspectives.
- New African American Studies Program
- Becoming a campus affiliate of NCBI and sponsoring NCBI workshops
- GLBT Safe Zone Training
- Creation of a new position, Special Assistant to the Provost for Faculty Diversity.

Question #10 – 11: This question asked who was responsible for implementing diversity initiatives and information concerning name, title, department and e-mail address.

Question #12: Desired Outcomes for the Mini-grant

The expressed intent of all of the programs funded was primarily to create opportunities for discussion and dialogue on campuses about diversity. This included the raising of general awareness around issues of race, privilege, gender, sexual orientation, interfaith understanding, socio-economic class perspectives, disabilities, and language barriers. These initiatives were designed to be broad in scope and reflected in discussions inside and outside of the classroom. Of necessity, these initiatives required the training of a cadre of student leaders, faculty, administrators, and staff sensitive to and supportive of this transformational work. Once trained this cadre would be responsible for on going workshops, symposium, conferences, and

programming designed to extend and perpetuate on going engagement. Although not the expressed intent of this grant, many campuses have extended this discussion to efforts to recruit and retain more students and faculty of color.

Question# 13: Were successful grant-related outcomes achieved?

While acknowledging that “diversity work” is long term and requires continuous efforts with respect to education, continued training, and engagement, all of those who responded to this question item felt that they had achieved the short term objectives delineated in their proposals. One respondent acknowledged that the lack of financial resources was the obstacle to specific initiatives being accomplished.

Question# 14: Was the mini-grant a catalyst for other initiatives or changes on campus?

Most of the respondents felt the mini-grant and related activities did gather support for other related diversity initiatives as follows:

- Monthly scheduled meetings of multicultural student organizations
- New Latin American and Caribbean Studies Program
- Foreign language methodology courses in Teacher Education Program
- Funding for a long term approach to faculty diversity training
- Africa Awareness Week Program
- African American Student Gospel Choir
- Increased efforts to hire faculty of color
- Submission of a second mini-grant proposal
- Institutionalization of retreats, workshops and training sessions

Question# 15: Planned follow-up activities after the grant period

The response to this question fell into three categories:

- **Continuing the work already begun:** Several of the funded initiatives expressed the need to build upon the current successful efforts by expanding the training programs for

students and faculty, encouraging more student led diversity organizations while strengthening those pre-existing ones, expand the discussion beyond those communities currently represented to a broader spectrum of students, and actively engaged in exploring other funding sources including the commitment of institutional resources. One campus expressed a need to assist students in developing an “Action Plan” around issues discussed. Another, a need to pursue a diversity strategic plan.

- **Expanding and Exporting the Dialogue:** Several institutions have engaged the National Coalition Building Institute to develop various components of their diversity initiative. Some expressed an interest in continuing that relationship while inviting other private liberal arts schools to dialogue with them. One respondent suggested that their institution would be interested in sharing results with other ACS schools and use feedback to build more effective programs on campus.
- **Recapture missed opportunities:** One institution reported that several projects suggested at their diversity workshop were never developed i.e., efforts to increase minority student enrollment. Others suggested revisiting in more depth the difficult dialogues around gender, faith communities, disability accommodations and GLBT identity and needs.

Question #16: Activities that could be planned but that have not occurred

- Hoping to have a multicultural student organization leadership conference to allow freshman and sophomores to maintain/improve current organizations.
- Follow-up sessions for action plans
- Monthly organized brown bag luncheons
- Classroom presentation, discussions with faculty and student organizations.
- Creating discussion groups more representative of the wide spectrum of student on campus
- Longer and more in-depth programs
- Other diversity-related speakers and forums; an on-line multicultural center; a place on campus for discussion and posting diversity events; more PR around diversity-related

events; summer program for high school minority students and other efforts to recruit and retain diverse students and faculty.

Question #17: Has the Diversity Initiative led to discussions about new administrative position within the organization dedicated to diversity affairs?

On the campuses of most respondents such offices already exist. One campus reported that their five year plans includes developing a position of chief diversity officer. Another campus reported renewed discussion about a diversity office. A third doubted that such a discussion is likely to occur any time soon.

Question #18: Has the Diversity Initiative led to discussions within the organization about recruiting of diverse faculty?

Given the nature of this question, and the position of the respondent within the organizational structure, not everyone was able to answer this informatively. Those that could indicate that the training which took place allowed for such discussion to surface. Others offered that this has been a subject of concern for their Faculty Diversity Concerns Committee, provost and other senior administrative officers. One campus reported recently interviewing two candidates for faculty positions. Another offered that in spite of having no faculty of color and very little diversity, it is a high priority.

Question # 19: Discuss how your diversity efforts have resulted in the recruitment of Faculty of color or those from diverse backgrounds.

Many did not respond to this question. Of those that did one campus indicated that a consultant had been hired to assist the search process. Another stated that their [faculty] personnel committee members attended an ACS workshop on faculty recruitment. Two campuses indicated active searches that have led to the hire of faculty of color in one instance and the possibility in another. It was difficult to discern from the responses as to whether these efforts pre-dated or were enhanced by the diversity initiative.

Question #20: Discuss how your diversity effort has increased the recruitment and/or retention of students of color.

Many respondents did not answer this question. They may not have been in a position to know of specific initiatives or that their mini-grant did not address this issue directly. Of those responding to the question the following initiatives were noted:

- Monthly meetings of the multicultural organization has positively engaged students of color, encouraged their persistence, and offered them an active role in the recruitment of others.
- Partnership between students of color and the admissions office has allowed these students to connect with perspective students and to share with them multicultural activities on campus.
- Although the Black Student Leadership Conference was a positive experience, it was not directly tied to recruitment efforts.
- Faculty training has helped to improve classroom climate for students of color.

One respondent stated that the diversity initiative had a big impact on student of color claiming a 90% retention rate among African American students and a palpable decrease in campus tension among student groups.

Question #21: Describe the opportunities and challenges that have come to light as a result of the Diversity Initiative on your campus.

Opportunities:

- More students impute in leadership development and more GLBT (Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender) representation in NCBI (National Coalition Building Institute) organized workshops and conferences.
- More networking opportunities for SOC's (Students of Color) and more intense recruitment efforts.
- Enhance the potential for collaboration among all multicultural student organizations on campus.
- More opportunities for students to have "healing, open, and honest" discussions about being a part of a dynamic academic community [living together harmoniously].

Challenges:

- The need for continued dialogue beyond the surface level and those already committed to the experience. It is perceived that this discussion is not being embraced by the entire student body.
- Difficulty for a majority Christian campus to engage in honest interfaith dialogues
- Assessment and identifying barriers around issues of race/ethnicity and sexual orientation.
- How difficult it is to recruit/retain students, staff, and faculty of color.
- Difficulty in keeping diversity issues as a high priority among the competing issues of time and resources.
- Not a full buy-in from all faculty
- Not having sufficient personnel dedicated to the work of facilitating programs and taking charge.
- Adapting physical barriers on campus to facilitate the needs of students with disabilities as well as continued education of student organizations about ways to improve the social lives of student with disabilities.
- Developing an intentional systematic approach to diversity programming through goal-setting, planning, and evaluation.

Question #22: What are possibilities for new directions [ideas or categories of new initiatives]?

One concern that surfaced was the fact that most of the program initiatives were geared primarily to engage students. There are issues that are only relevant to staff and faculty that required exploration. The entire academic community needs to be engaged. Another respondent suggested in the next round of funding perhaps the focus could be shifted to involving students, faculty, and staff in intergroup dialogues.

It was suggested that the residential halls be engaged in issues and discussion around diversity. Perhaps complimentary programming initiatives could be developed working in tandem with other campus programs. Student panels were thought to have been the best vehicle for delivery.

One respondent suggested multi-year programming [year 1, 2, 3 etc.] with distinctive program outcomes. For instance the second year might move the campus wide discussion of diversity to quarterly coffeehouse forums with open-mic nights.

The idea of an “on-line” multicultural center was offered without any supporting details.

Some offered the suggestion that campuses could explore the potential of establishing 501c3 educational organizations, independent of the campus, to raise resources in support of diversity programs.

Question #23: Describe the campus climate surrounding initiatives relating to diversity.

Most of the campuses reported that the climate pertaining to diversity initiatives remain optimistically supportive. More people are now aware of the challenges inherent in promoting a more diverse community of teachers and learners. That being said some respondents expressed concern that people have accepted the rhetoric of inclusion but the real discussion does not go beyond students of color and other interested parties. One respondent describe the campus climate prior to their initiatives as naiveté. Although their project helped in raising awareness and the climate has improved considerably, there are still “pockets of resistance and competing objectives.”

Mention was made that when diversity initiatives are initiated by student leadership they are more readily received than if created by staff and administrators. Moreover, issues of diversity among the staff, does not always “resonate” with students.

One respondent observed that on their campus there is recognition of the importance of hiring more diverse faculty. Another campus indicated that while the campus climate is very positive and theoretically the faculty has embraced the concept of being more representative, “realistically” the faculty will remain fairly homogeneous.

Most campuses have reported an increase in programming under the auspices of multicultural offices. One campus confirmed additional programming efforts apart from their multicultural affairs office. Funding for these offices remains a critical factor to their continued success.

One respondent rather cogently summed-up their feeling of cautious optimism by stating; “there are a lot of people who do not really care about diversity. There are people who do care, but do not believe that anything will ever change, and a few who are passionate about making things better.”

Question #24: How have these initiatives reduced a prejudicial climate on campus?

Most respondents have stated their belief that the diversity initiatives have empowered students to be more aware and vocal about affirming diversity work on campus. However, some have stated that it would be difficult to measure the degree or perceived reduction in prejudicial behavior. Hidden prejudice is often difficult to detect particularly if it appears to be antagonistic to the mainstream of campus life. One respondent offered that faculty training has decreased the instances of unintentional discrimination that could have occurred in the classroom. Another offered that training has improved tolerance and reduction of incendiary statements.

One campus that had recently completed a diversity impact survey reported that, although there has been a positive change on campus, their survey informed them of work yet to do. Another campus testified to a “dramatic increase in cross-group interaction, especially in the social arena with a corresponding decrease of tension on campus.”

Question #25: How has your diversity efforts resulted in the recruitment of students and faculty of color or those from diverse backgrounds.

Most campuses have reported some initiatives, fledgling or otherwise, designed to attract more faculty and students of color. In some instances new promotional materials have been developed for recruiting faculty and students. Other efforts have included students in the prospective student admission process. One campus has shared with prospective faculty and students the events that they have planned around celebrating and sharing diversity. Although clear-cut goals

have not been articulated in many instances nor evaluations of current efforts undertaken, there is a belief that some gains are being made in this area.

While several respondents suggested that they are awaiting the end results of the 2008-2009 recruitment season to assess their efforts, one candidly pointed out that “we haven’t focused much on recruitment yet because we believe that we need to have a [campus] culture that supports diverse students when they arrive.”

Question #26: Differentiating between student and faculty concerns, list areas where assistance is still required.

Students:

- Funding for additional training for student leadership
- More programming for all students in diversity related issues
- Engaging students of color to delve more deeply into issues of diversity and multiculturalism beyond simply cultural celebration.
- Improving campus climate for GLBT students
- Improving campus climate for female students
- Improved access to campus social activities for disabled students
- More aggressive recruitment and retention of students of color
- Enhanced funding for multicultural organizations
- Targeting and developing an alumni network for students of color

Faculty:

- Recruitment and retention of faculty of color – all students need diverse faculty role models.
- Need continuously to educate search committee chairs and members about the necessity of finding/employing diverse faculty.
- Need to specifically target the hiring of African American female faculty
- Need for full or part-time advisors/leaders for campus ministries
- Perhaps develop a “diversity” job fair in order to recruit diverse faculty members

Other:

- Providing greater access to campus buildings for disabled persons

- More training around issues relating to disabled persons
- Hiring and deploying more “diversity officers” on ACS campuses.

Question #27: What were the anticipated outcomes of the institution’s diversity initiatives?

It seems to have been a general consensus that those campuses engaged in diversity initiatives desired three outcomes. First to create a campus environment that is welcoming to all students, encouraging them to explore their identity while engaging in cross-cultural discussion through educational programs, forums and conferences. There was an articulated desire to demonstrate the college/ university’s commitment to diversity education in part by making the campus community reflect the diversity of the world in which students will live. One respondent succinctly stated, “we hope to educate students towards global citizenship and responsible leadership. Without a good understanding of the intricacies of multiculturalism and diversity, it would be very difficult for [our] college to meet its mission with excellence.” Second, was to enrich campus communities by actively engaging in the selection, recruitment of students, staff, and faculty of color and others whose diverse backgrounds would help to recreate a more diverse campus community. It was hoped by engaging in cross-cultural discussion about similarities and perceived difference that such activities may enhance students’ feelings of belongingness to the particular campus thereby also ensuring the greater probability of student retention. Third, to accomplish all of the above in a more systematic and planned way. As an example, one campus had set a goal of 16% of their student body being students of color. Another stated that their Diversity Enrichment Committee had developed a very detailed blueprint for enhancing diversity “in all areas on campus.” Yet another is pushing for the hire of a director of diversity and the establishment of a multicultural center to accomplish part of their articulate goals.

Question #28: Have you shared your results with other ACS institutions or at meetings/conferences?

Of those responding to this question nine (9) offered no response. The remaining twelve listed the following:

- Shared information with other ACS schools through Dean’s meetings, A Diversity Gathering at Hendrix College, an ACS conference at Sewanee, climate survey initiated by ACS, a Diversity Planning Committee meeting at Sewanee in 2007.

- Preparing an article for Palladian
- Panel presentation at the National Pedagogy and Theatre of the Oppressed Conference at Omaha, Nebraska in May 2007 (?).
- Presentation of Black Student Leadership Conference at ACS Fall 2007 Diversity meeting
- NCBI presentation at Fall SACS meeting

Question #29: Where might additional consortium resources in support of Diversity Initiatives be best placed?

Many of the respondents felt that the recruitment of students, faculty, and staff of color should be a major funding priority. Coupled with that were concerns about the lack of adequate financial aid and scholarship resources to attract minority students, and concerted/innovative efforts to retain minority students and faculty. Other suggestions include the following:

- Funds provided to Multicultural Affairs Offices for more diversity training and programming.
- Funds for connecting diversity education at each ACS institution.
- Summer internship programs for undergraduate and graduate students at each institution or among ACS schools.
- Funding for “town/gown” initiatives around multiculturalism and diversity.
- Hosting ACS meetings where [students of color] would be invited to help us further understand their points of view, their needs coupled with an attempt to help faculty understand the new demographic.
- Funds to support conversations around religious diversity
- Funding for more training opportunities like NCBI

Question #30: Please candidly address any other concerns that you may have.

- Accountability measures need to be in place to help ensure that outcomes are being achieved

- Continued involvement of all constituencies and commitment to diversity at all levels of the college for real change to occur.
- Thank you for mini-grants. We are moving in a much healthier direction than we were two years ago.
- We are interested in hearing more about a gathering of ACS students, staff, and faculty who have worked on similar initiatives.
- Keeping disability issues in the forefront of the minds particularly when it comes to funding.
- This survey did not seem entirely relevant or timely.

SUMMARY

The ACS Diversity Initiative was intended to be a catalytic for fostering candid discussions about diversity on ACS campuses. In keeping with the liberal arts tradition the goal was to “create and to sustain campus learning/teaching and social environments that welcome, value and celebrate diversity.” Funded by the Robert W. Woodruff Foundation, a request for proposals was announced for the award of mini-grants to support Student Led Collaboration with Faculty/Staff and Campus Leadership Models Workshops.

Twenty grants were awarded to twelve of fifteen ACS institutions that comprise the consortium. One campus, not a grant applicant, also responded to the survey, indicating their accomplishments around diversity related initiatives. Initiatives supported by the grant encompassed racial, ethnic, and cultural affinity groups, religious beliefs, sexual orientation, the disabled, socio-economic class and ESL speakers and learners. The expressed intent of these programs was to bring constituencies on campus together for meaningful discussion and dialogue concerning differences in order to create a more inclusive and inviting campus community and learning environment. Essential to the intended programmatic outcomes was the necessity for the training of student leadership and faculty capable of facilitating difficult discussions and navigating organizational change in and outside of the classroom. Ostensibly, such a trained cadre of leaders would be responsible for providing an orientation for future leaders and discussion.

All of the recipients felt that the objectives articulated in their proposals had been accomplished. Most of them could cite instances of additional initiatives outside of the scope of their grant that may have been influenced by grant related activities. Many of the campuses had planned follow-up activities post grant period contingent upon additional institutional or grant funds availability.

When asked if the grant had led to discussion about establishing a new administrative office on campus dedicated to diversity affairs, only a few indicated a possibility within the context of a

larger strategic plan. The majority of responding campuses, however, had pre-existing offices or programs with the title of Diversity Affairs or Multicultural Affairs.

When asked if the diversity initiative addressed the possibility of the recruitment of diverse faculty, some respondents acknowledged that these conversations did take place but they were not aware of any specific outcomes. When asked specifically if their program resulted in such recruitment only two campuses responded with examples of a hire or potential hire.

A similar question was asked concerning the discussion of strategies or programs initiated to increase the recruitment and retention of students of color. Again many did not respond to this question or may not have been in the position to know. A couple did make passing reference to instance of students of color working with admissions offices in meeting with perspective students. Another pointed to new admissions materials that appeared to be more inclusive. No direct references were made to programs designed to retain student of color.

Uniformly, respondents felt that the campus climate around diversity issues has improved as a direct result of these sponsored initiatives. More people are aware of the challenges inherent in foster a truly multicultural campus. More students, staff, and faculty have felt empowered to raise and discuss issues in an informed way. In one instance a dramatic decrease in tension on campus was reported. Reports of a reduction in prejudicial behavior in and outside of the classroom are anecdotal and not based upon any research.

Other respondents have expressed the concern that in many instances “diversity work” has only scratched the proverbial surface. With regards to students, beyond students of color and other students who are passionate these issues, diversity work must compete for time and resources like other student led initiatives. Without concerted effort it may not get the degree of attention or support to make it a transformational experience for all students.

In a similar fashion, among staff and faculty, training and diversity programs have expanded the conversation. Although in many instances the entire campus has been invited to participate in diversity related activities and discussion, there are still reported pockets of resistance within the faculty and staff. Faculty has been generally supportive of the need to diversify their ranks. However, as one respondent suggests, the reality is that very little change will occur in the near future.

Therefore, it is not surprising that when asked in the future where additional consortium resources might be best placed; many respondents felt that the recruitment and retention of students and faculty of color ought to be a high priority. Other suggestions included more resources for Multicultural Affairs offices and an effort at connecting diversity education programs at each ACS schools.

In summary, all of the objectives of this initial round of funding seemed to have been met. The future success, if not survival, of these diversity programs rests with greater institutional support and consortium led special efforts.

POSSIBLE NEXT STEPS

Institutional Opportunities:

Present demographics concerning high school graduation suggests that an increasing number of students of color will be attending and graduating from high school. This is in contrast to a predicted decline in the number of white students who are currently attending and graduating. If existing institutions of higher education wish to retain or increase their market share of this national pool, an increased targeting and enrollment of students of color will be an economic necessity. Campuses will need to assure cultural sensitivity and the curriculum must appear to be more inclusive. Alumni will demand better training for successfully engaging in a workforce composed of diverse elements.

ACS colleges may wish to adopt the following:

- Establish “Diversity Enrichment Committees” charged with the development of a systematic institutional approach for creating a more diverse teaching and learning community. Such a plan should be woven into the larger 3-5 year strategic plan for the institution and funded appropriately. Accordingly, each campus should have an office of Multicultural or Diversity Affairs to coordinate the daily work and annual collegiate goals relating to diversity.
- It would boost the credibility of Diversity Enrichment Committees and/or Offices of Multi-cultural/Diversity Affairs if the board of Directors/Trustees, the President and senior members of the administrative team, and influential members of the faculty publicly endorsed their mission.
- The recruitment and hiring of new administrative officers, faculty, staff and the recruitment of students from diverse socio-economic and ethnic/racial/cultural backgrounds will be important to transforming the campuses. Encouraging existing faculty of color to take on administrative responsibilities as a form of service to the academic discipline or campus may bring forth fresh voices to the councils of decision making.

There is abundant literature on the practice of cohort hiring of minority faculty. Studies have shown that group hiring of faculty of color is more likely to result in greater retention. (See attachment –Advertisement on Keeping Faculty of Color Conference)

There is abundant research and literature of programs designed to meet the academic support and social needs of students of color, Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender (GLBT) students as well as students with physical disabilities and learning disabilities.

- Campuses may wish to find ways to assist their faculty in developing programs around diversifying their ranks and retaining new scholar/teachers.

Consortium Opportunities:

Representing 15 institutions the ACS consortium could engage in additional grantsmanship to provide most needed resources to support the following initiatives.

- Funding for new initiatives based upon past success of campus students, staff or faculty groups
- Major fund raising to support the institutionalization of Multicultural Affairs and Diversity Affairs offices.
- Major fund raising for campus initiatives designed to increase the number of faculty of color.
- Sponsorship of workshops designed to bring ACS diversity officers together for increased networking , problem solving and sharing of ideas.
- Funding for specific student led initiatives designed to engage larger numbers of students in diversity related discussions, leadership training and perhaps forms of community service.
- It may be of importance that for the next two years that the consortium hire someone to coordinate this initiative and provide assistance to the campuses as their individual plans unfold.

May 30, 2008