

**Campus Climate, Diversity Initiatives and Culturally Competent
Practices
Assessment Project
Charles Stewart Mott Foundation-Funded Grant
Final Report of Findings, Recommendations, and Next Steps
University of Michigan-Flint
October 23, 2005**

Submitted by Mark Brimhall-Vargas, M.P.P., Christine Clark, Ed.D., and William
Sedlacek, Ph.D.,
Grant Consultants

Table of Contents

	TITLE	PAGE
I.	Executive Summary	3-4
II.	Background	5-18
	• Phase 1: May – December 2004	5-9
	• Phases 2 and 3: December 2004 – March 2005	9-13
	• Phase 4: March – April 2005	13-17
	• Phases 5 and 6: April – October 2005	17-18
	• Conclusions	18
III.	Results	19-29
	• Across All Stakeholder Groups	20
	1. Supportive of Educational Benefits of Diversity, Diversity as Everyone’s Responsibility and Campus-Community Relations	20
	2. Challenging of Educational Benefits of Diversity	20
	3. Challenging of Diversity as Everyone’s Responsibility	20
	4. Challenging of Campus-Community Relations	21
	• Students Overall	21-23
	1. Supportive of Educational Benefits of Diversity	21
	2. Supportive of Diversity as Everyone’s Responsibility	21-22
	3. Supportive of Campus-Community Relations	22
	4. Challenging of Educational Benefits of Diversity	22
	5. Challenging of Diversity as Everyone’s Responsibility	22
	6. Challenging of Campus-Community Relations	22-23
	• Students Disaggregated by Race and/or Gender	23-26
	1. Supportive of Educational Benefits of Diversity	23
	2. Supportive of Diversity as Everyone’s Responsibility	23
	3. Supportive of Campus-Community Relations	23
	4. Challenging of Educational Benefits of Diversity	23-24
	5. Challenging of Diversity as Everyone’s Responsibility	24
	6. Challenging of Campus-Community Relations	24
	• Faculty, staff, Administrators, Alumni	24-26
	1. Supportive of Educational Benefits of Diversity	25
	2. Supportive of Diversity as Everyone’s Responsibility	25
	3. Supportive of Campus-Community Relations	25
	4. Challenging of Educational Benefits of Diversity	25
	5. Challenging of Diversity as Everyone’s Responsibility	25-26
	6. Challenging of Campus-Community Relations	26
	• Faculty, Staff, Administrators, Alumni Disaggregated by Role, Race, and/or Gender	26-27
	1. Supportive of Educational Benefits of Diversity	26
	2. Supportive of Diversity as Everyone’s Responsibility	26
	3. Supportive of Campus-Community Relations	26-27
	4. Challenging of Educational Benefits of Diversity	27
	5. Challenging of Diversity as Everyone’s Responsibility	27
	6. Challenging of Campus-Community Relations	27
	• Flint Community	27-29
	1. Supportive of Educational Benefits of Diversity	27
	2. Supportive of Diversity as Everyone’s Responsibility	28
	3. Supportive of Campus-Community Relations	28
	4. Challenging of Educational Benefits of Diversity	28
	5. Challenging of Diversity as Everyone’s Responsibility	28
	6. Challenging of Campus-Community Relations	28-29
IV.	Recommendations and Next Steps	30-35
	• Immediate	30-32
	• Intermediate	32-33
	• Longer Term	33-35
	• Realization, Actualization, Implementation	35
V.	Research Bias	36-37
VI.	Appendices	38-39

Campus Climate, Diversity Initiatives and Culturally Competent Practices Assessment Project

Final Report of Findings, Recommendations, and Next Steps

Executive Summary

Introduction

The University of Michigan-Flint's (UM-F) Charles Stewart Mott Foundation-funded Campus Climate, Diversity Initiatives and Culturally Competent Practices Assessment Project grant was a collaborative undertaking of UM-Flint's Office of Educational Opportunity Initiatives (EOI), School of Education and Human Services (SEHS), and School of Health Professions and Studies (SHPS).

Background

The Project was comprised of six phases: Phase 1 — *Pre-Assessment*; Phase 2 — *Development of Assessment Instruments*; Phase 3 — *Assessment Implementation*; Phase 4 — *Data Analysis, Preliminary Report Preparation, and Dissemination of Preliminary Results and Recommendations*. This report has been developed for presentation in Phase 5 — *Dialogue Sessions to be held with Stakeholder Groups*, and Phase 6 — *Determination and Preparation of Implementation Steps*, to be carried out October 25 through October 29, 2005. Each phase was comprised of several activities. The activities in Phases 2 and 3 and 5 and 6 were grouped and completed together.

Results

Building on the preliminary results and recommendations reported in Phase 4, the full results from all three assessments (with students, with faculty, staff, administrators, and alumni, and with Flint community members) are summarized under three organizational headings: 1) The Educational Benefits of Diversity; 2) Diversity as Everyone's Responsibility (a community responsibility, something that includes everyone); and, 3) Campus and Community Relations (relationship building). Under each heading, supportive and challenging findings are reported across all three stakeholder groups, for each stakeholder group, and where relevant, within stakeholder groups disaggregated by race, gender, and/or role.

Recommendations

In culling and sifting the voluminous body of Project findings, three clear recommendation areas emerged: 1) diversity training and education; 2) campus image and identity; 3) and community outreach, broadly conceptualized. These recommendations are organized into three sections: 1) those that should be undertaken immediately (with current resources); 2) those that should be undertaken in an intermediate timeframe (with modest additional resources; and, 3) those that should be undertaken over a long-term (with more substantive additional resources). The formation of a high-profile and institutionally

empowered campus-community committee charged with bringing these recommendations to fruition is identified as the next step in the Project's process.

Research Bias

During Phases 3 and 4 of the Project, questions regarding the assessment instruments, participation in the assessment, and the impact of the assessment itself on campus climate for diversity were raised. These questions are discussed as forms of resistance to the Project, as well as legitimate critiques of it that future assessments can pick up.

Campus Climate, Diversity Initiatives and Culturally Competent Practices Assessment Project Final Report of Findings, Recommendations, and Next Steps

BACKGROUND

This section will briefly detail the major activities of the first four of the six phases of the Campus Climate, Diversity Initiatives and Culturally Competent Practices Assessment Project. Phase 1 was the *Pre-Assessment* phase; Phase 2 was the *Development of Assessment Instruments* phase; Phase 3 was the *Assessment Implementation* phase; Phase 4 was the *Data Analysis, Preliminary Report Preparation, and Dissemination of Preliminary Results and Recommendations* phase. This report has been developed for presentation in Phase 5, the *Dialogue Sessions to be held with Stakeholder Groups* phase; and Phase 6, the *Determination and Preparation of Implementation Steps*, to be carried out October 25 through October 29, 2005.

Phase 1: May – December 2004

The activities of Phase 1 were: 1) the development of a draft proposal for consultation for a UM-F Cultural Competency and Diversity Center Project; 2) the development of a draft proposal for consultation for a UM-F Climate Assessment Project; 3) a competitive interview with UM-F's grant committee co-chair (co-principal investigator); 4) e-mail correspondence with the grant committee co-chairs and members (co-principal investigators and co-investigative team); 5) a conference call with the grant committee co-chairs and members (co-principal investigators and co-investigative team); 6) review of requested materials from and about UM-F and the Flint community; 7) pre-assessment interviews with UM-F and Flint community grant stakeholders; 8) consultant team meetings, task delegation, and task completion timeline development.

Activity 1: *Development of Draft Proposal for Consultation for a University of Michigan-Flint "Cultural Competency and Diversity Center" Project*

In the Fall of 2003, UM-F Associate Professor of Education, Dr. Traki Taylor, invited Mr. Mark Brimhall-Vargas and Dr. Christine Clark—Assistant and Executive Directors, respectively, of the Office of Human Relations Programs, the equity compliance and diversity education arm of the Office of the President at the University of Maryland, College Park—to conduct an all-day diversity “training of trainers” workshop for interested members of the UM-F faculty, staff, and student body, especially members of the School of Education and Human Services (SEHS) Diversity Projects Committee. That workshop was well received by attendees. Resultantly, between May 18, 2004 and June 15, 2004, Dr. Taylor, Mr. Brimhall-Vargas, and Dr. Clark corresponded via e-mail about UM-F's interest in establishing a “Cultural Competency and Diversity Center.” Dr. Taylor asked Mr. Brimhall-Vargas and Dr. Clark to collaboratively develop and submit a proposal detailing the consulting expertise they could offer UM-F on this endeavor. This proposal was submitted on May 19, 2004.

Activity 2: Development of a Draft Proposal for Consultation for a University of Michigan-Flint “Climate Assessment” Project

Between June 16, 2004 and October 19, 2004, Dr. Robert Hahn, Interim Dean of the School of Education and Human Services (SEHS), Mr. Mark Brimhall-Vargas, and Dr. Christine Clark corresponded via e-mail about UM-F’s interest in undertaking a campus-wide and surrounding community-wide “Climate Assessment” to gauge the need for a Cultural Competency and Diversity Center and, presuming a significant need, identify the array of programs such a center should offer to be uniquely responsive to that need. Dr. Hahn asked Mr. Brimhall-Vargas and Dr. Clark to collaboratively develop and submit a proposal detailing the consulting expertise they could offer UM-F with respect to this venture. Mr. Brimhall-Vargas and Dr. Clark invited a third colleague, Dr. William Sedlacek, to collaborate with them on this venture. This proposal was submitted on July 8, 2004.

Activity 3: Competitive Interview with University of Michigan-Flint’s Charles Stewart Mott Foundation-Funded Grant Committee Co-Chair (Co-Principal Investigator)

On October 24, 2004 at 1 p.m., Mr. Mark Brimhall-Vargas, Dr. Christine Clark, and Dr. William Sedlacek—now one of three teams being considered by UM-F for the role of external consultants on UM-F’s newly Charles Stewart Mott Foundation-funded Campus Climate, Diversity Initiatives and Culturally Competent Practices Assessment Project grant—were interviewed by Mr. Tendaji Ganges, Executive Director of UM-F’s Office of Educational Opportunity Initiatives and grant committee co-chair, at the Jurys Hotel at 1500 New Hampshire Avenue, NW in Washington, D.C.

Activity 4: E-Mail Correspondence with the University of Michigan-Flint’s Charles Stewart Mott Foundation-Funded Grant Committee Co-Chairs and Members (Co-Principal Investigators and Co-Investigative Team)

Between October 29, 2004 and November 11, 2004, after being selected as the grant consultants, Mr. Mark Brimhall-Vargas, Dr. Christine Clark, and Dr. William Sedlacek corresponded via e-mail with UM-F’s grant committee co-chairs and members in order to get the first phase, the *Pre-Assessment* phase, of the grant off the ground. That correspondence generated a list of questions, comments, and concerns for discussion via a conference call.

List of Committee Co-Chairs and Members

Mr. Tendaji Ganges, Co-Chair
 Dr. Suzanne Selig, Co-Chair
 Ms. Charlene Acker, Member
 Dr. Augustine “Austin” Agho, Member
 Dr. Susanne Chandler, Member
 Ms. Crystal Flynn, Member
 Dr. Traki Taylor, Member
 Ms. Elizabeth Tropiano, Member

Activity 5: Conference Call with the University of Michigan-Flint's Charles Stewart Mott Foundation-Funded Grant Committee Co-Chairs and Members (Co-Principal Investigators and Co-Investigative Team)

On November 12, 2004 at 10:30 a.m., members of the grant external consultant team and internal committee "met," via conference call, to answer the questions and respond, in greater detail, to the comments and concerns generated in the preceding e-mail correspondence. Dates for the team's first campus visit were established, the list of materials from and about UM-F and Flint community that the team hoped to review prior to that visit was developed, and the job of compiling those materials and getting them to the team was divided up among committee co-chairs and members.

Activity 6: Review of Requested Materials from and about University of Michigan-Flint and the Flint community

Between November 30, 2004 and December 7, 2004, in preparation for their first UM-F campus visit, the external consultant team reviewed the materials forwarded by the internal committee.

List of Materials Reviewed

- Lt. Governor's *Commission on Higher Education and Economic Growth* progress report (9.15.04)
- Human Resources and Affirmative Action (HRAA) Office (University of Michigan-Ann Arbor) Mission, Vision, and Confidentiality Statements and *Standard Practice Guide for Grievance Procedure and Dispute Resolution*
- UM-F Mission Statement
- UM-F Organizational Chart
- UM-F Campus Profile (constituent demographics)
- UM-F 2003-2005 Catalog
- UM-F Campus Map
- Key Stakeholder Groups (for the grant)—UM-F/Flint community
- UM-F Chancellor's *Toward A Shared Vision: A Campus Conversation on the Future of the University of Michigan-Flint* speech
- *Voices Shared* report—follow up to the Carnegie Communications 2000 *Enrollment Market Analysis* and the 2001 *Campus Conversation* response (focus group and town hall meetings) to the Chancellor's *Toward a Shared Vision* speech
- UM-F Chancellor's Testimony, *State Senate's Sub-Committee on Higher Education* meeting (5.16.03)
- UM-F Chancellor's *The Future of the University, the University of the Future* address to the campus community (3.24.03)
- UM-F Chancellor's *Agenda for Action* message (follow up to the 3.24.03 address) to the campus community (12.9.03)
- UM-F Chancellor's *University Budget* address to the campus community (12.17.03)
- UM-F Chancellor's *Purpose and Direction* message to the campus community (11.4.01)

- UM-F Student Learning Taskforce *Our Fundamental Commitment* report (follow up to the 11.4.01 message) (5.19.02)
- UM-F Chancellor's address to the campus community (9.7.01)
- UM-F Chancellor's message to the campus community (1.31.01)
- UM-F Financial Aid and Scholarship publications
- Student Life publications
- *Women's and Gender Studies Winter 2004 Newsletter*
- Office of Educational Opportunity Initiatives (Educational Opportunity Initiatives)
 - *Overview* (mission, programs, services, projects)
 - *Interracial Community Project: Beyond Boundaries* brochure, program materials and activity description, project participant survey and results
- School of Education and Human Services (SEHS)
 - *Education 303* syllabus
 - *Diversity 101 Workshop* overview, evaluation, and results
- School of Health Professions and Studies (SHPS)
 - *Faculty Code*
 - *Standing Rules*—Student Appeals Committee Policy and Procedures
 - Prevention Research Center of Michigan *Overview*
 - Prevention Research Center of Michigan *Speak to Your Health Community Survey* results
 - Genesee Area Skill Center *Building Careers in Healthcare* PowerPoint
 - REACH 2010 11.16.04 *Undoing Racism Workshop* program summary and overall program evaluation results
 - Broome Team *Abstract*
 - *The Uncommon Senses*—Flint community free paper
 - *Flint and Genesee County Visitors Guide* November 2004-April 2005

Activity 7: Pre-Assessment Interviews with University of Michigan-Flint and Flint community Grant Stakeholders

On December 8, 9, and 10, 2004, Mr. Mark Brimhall-Vargas and Dr. Christine Clark met with sixty-four members of the UM-F and Flint community communities to identify a range of perspectives about the UM-F/Flint community climate—especially racial and ethnic climate. The purpose of these pre-assessment interviews was to develop a set of UM-F-Flint community-specific questions for the assessment surveys and focus groups that will appropriately dovetail with the nationally benchmarked questions also utilized.

List of Pre-Assessment Interviewee Stakeholder Affiliations

Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (1)
 Vice President for Administration (1)
 Interim Vice President for Student Services and Enrollment Management (1)
 UM-Flint Director of Public Safety (1)
 Director of Admissions (1)
 Director of Financial Aid (1)
 Director, Campus Recreation Services and the Recreation Center (1)
 Interim Director of Human Resources and Affirmative Action (1)

Physical Therapy faculty (2)
 Nursing faculty (1)
 Health Science and Administration faculty (1)
 University Relations staff (1)
 Office of Educational Opportunity Initiatives (EOI) staff (10)
 African American student organization members (Students for Black Achievement) (21)
 School of Health Professions and Studies (SHPS) Community Outreach Group (5)
 (Community Health Educators and Advocates)
 Flint Area Citizens to End Racism (F.A.C.T.E.R.) members (8)

Activity 8: *Consultant Team Meetings, Task Delegation, and Task Completion Timeline Development*

On December 16, 2004 at 8 a.m. and December 20, 2004 at 2 p.m., the external consultant team met to review the pre-assessment interview findings and, subsequently, to divide tasks and assign completion time deadlines for the subsequent phases of the grant.

Phases 2 and 3: December 2004 – March 2005

The activities of Phases 2 and 3 were: 1) consultant team progress report check-ins via e-mail, telephone, and face-to-face; 2) the development and implementation of a comprehensive plan for assessing racial and ethnic climate on the UM-F campus and in the surrounding community; 3) the development of three climate assessment instruments; 4) e-mail correspondence and telephone communication with the grant committee co-chairs and members (co-principal investigators and co-investigative team) and grant committee administrative assistant; 5) site-based (campus) executive technical and executive administrative support for on-line and paper survey implementation; 6) site-based (community) focus group interviews with Flint residents; and, 8) campus and community receptions with members of the UM-F and Flint stakeholder groups.

Activity 1: *Consultant Team Progress Report Check-Ins*

Between December 17, 2004 and March 19, 2005, the consultant team—Mr. Mark Brimhall Vargas, Dr. Christine Clark, and Dr. William Sedlacek—communicated on an at least weekly basis via e-mail, telephone, and/or face-to-face to check in on each other's progress and their collective team progress in completing all of the tasks related to Phases 2 and 3 of the grant.

Activity 2: *Development and Implementation of Comprehensive Assessment Plan*

Between December 16, 2004 and January 11, 2005, the consultant team—Mr. Mark Brimhall Vargas, Dr. Christine Clark, and Dr. William Sedlacek—developed a comprehensive plan for executing Phase 3 of the grant. This plan and supporting publicity document drafts were forwarded (the plan via e-mail on January 12, 2005, and the publicity documents via Federal Express on January 13 and 14, 2005) to the grant committee co-chairs and members (co-principal investigators and co-investigative team) and grant committee administrative assistant for their feedback and action toward

implementation. Between January 12 and March 7, 2005, the consultant team and grant committee communicated via e-mail and telephone to refine and implement the plan, and refine and disseminate publicity materials. Between March 13 and 19, 2005, the consultant team and grant committee worked together carrying out the assessments and related activities.

Activity 3: *Development of Assessment Instruments*

Between January 6 and March 7, 2005, the consultant team—Mr. Mark Brimhall Vargas, Dr. Christine Clark, and Dr. William Sedlacek—developed and refined the three assessment instruments: 1) an on-line survey for administrators, faculty, staff, and alumni; 2) a paper survey for students; and, 3) focus group questions for community residents.

Dr. Sedlacek developed the first draft of all three instruments using benchmarked questions from his body of research on campus climate assessments at higher education institutions across the country over the last twenty years. Dr. Clark produced a second draft of all three instruments that refined the benchmarked questions and integrated questions specific to the UM-F campus and Flint community based on findings in the pre-assessment interviews. Mr. Brimhall-Vargas created the on-line ready version of the survey from the second draft of the on-line survey document, and worked with UM-F Information Technology Services staff person, Mr. Sidney Horton, to get the on-line survey on-line and easily accessible through its URL <www.umflint.edu/climateassessment>. Mr. Brimhall-Vargas also created a camera-ready version of the paper survey document and translated the focus group questions and demographic data forms (used with all three instruments) into Spanish.

Between March 7 and March 13, 2005, the grant committee co-chair, Mr. Tendaji Ganges, and member, Ms. Crystal Flynn, made small final edits to the surveys to make them as UM-F user-friendly as possible.

Activity 4: *E-Mail Correspondence and Telephone Communication with the University of Michigan-Flint's Charles Stewart Mott Foundation-Funded Grant Committee Co-Chairs and Members (Co-Principal Investigators and Co-Investigative Team) and Grant Committee Administrative Assistant*

Between December 16, 2004 and March 7, 2005, the consultant team—Mr. Mark Brimhall Vargas, Dr. Christine Clark, and Dr. William Sedlacek—and the grant committee co-chairs—Mr. Tendaji Ganges and Dr. Suzanne Selig—and members—Dr. Augustine “Austin” Agho, Dr. Susanne Chandler, Ms. Crystal Flynn, Dr. Traki Taylor, Ms. Elizabeth Tropiano (co-principal investigators and co-investigative team) and grant committee administrative assistant—Ms. Barbara Bassett—communicated, in various configurations, at least bi-weekly via e-mail, and by telephone on February 16, 2005, and March 7, 2005, to check-in on the assessment plan implementation and publicity material dissemination progress.

The grant committee made significant changes to the focus group schedule and publicity materials. The consultant team had proposed thirteen different focus group sites over a seven-day period in order to connect to a wide variety of Flint residents. The grant committee determined that several of the proposed sites would be difficult to gain access to and/or to attract participants. Thus, four focus group sites were organized over a three-day period. This decision also reduced resource expenditure for refreshments. The

consultant team also originally proposed posters, flyers, leaflets, newspaper ads, press releases, and e-mail announcements for *each* assessment instrument constituency (i.e., for administrators, faculty, staff, and alumni; for students; and for residents), in addition to a postcard for alumni and a Spanish version of all the resident documents. All of these materials were developed around an integrated visual and graphic community-building theme. The grant committee, working in partnership with UM-F university relations and marketing staff people, refined the theme to make it more appealing to all three stakeholder groups, and streamlined the number of publicity materials in order to maximize their impact, at the same time reducing costs. A major impetus for refreshments and publicity cost reduction was so that expenditures on incentives for participant involvement in all three assessments could be increased. Getting the word out about the assessments was weighed against getting those aware of the assessments to participate in them. Rather than giving a group of participants a chance at a single incentive (i.e., a raffle ticket for a possible gift certificate), the decision was made to give a guaranteed single incentive to each participant. This decision paid off as evidenced by the rate of return/number of participants in all three of the assessment arenas.

Activity 5: On-Site Support for Survey Implementation

Between March 14 and March 17, 2005, from 9 a.m. to 6 p.m., three centrally located sites were chosen for the “open space” walk-in areas for UM-F students to complete the paper survey. These sites were monitored by UM-F staff members and/or graduate students. Close to 1,000 students completed the paper survey. Immediately after completing the survey, each student received a thank-you note, note pad, two movie passes, and a meal coupon (nearly a \$20 value).

Between March 14, 2005 at 9 a.m. and March 18, 2005 at 5 p.m., administrators, faculty, staff, and alumni were able to complete the on-line survey from any computer with Internet access. Those without personal or professional Internet access were welcomed to use a variety of public or semi-public Internet-connected computers on campus. Close to 250 administrators, faculty, staff, and alumni (combined) completed the on-line survey. At the conclusion of the survey, respondents were directed to print out a survey completion verification page and take it to the Diversity Education Services office on the UM-F campus to collect the same incentive package students received.

The incentives proved to be so motivational that a small number of students (less than twenty), and even fewer administrators, faculty, staff, and alumni (less than five) identified minor weaknesses in the survey administration processes and took advantage of them to secure additional incentive packages by completing, or going through the motions to appear to complete, the surveys more than once. The consultant team was made aware of this “fraud” and has accounted for its potential impact on the survey findings. Toward the end of the assessment execution period, certain pieces of the incentive packages ran low. To compensate for this, the number of other pieces was proportionally increased. The value of all the incentive packages passed out was comparable, but the shift in their components late in the assessment execution period prompted a few inquiries about whether or not all participants were getting the same incentive. Once it was confirmed that the value of all the incentives was equitable, the inquiries subsided.

A fair amount of resistance to the assessment project as a whole was manifest largely as faculty and administrator resistance to participation in the survey. Here again,

the consultant team has accounted for the possible impact of this in their analysis of the on-line survey findings.

The consultant team members responded, directly and indirectly, to technical and administrative concerns that came up during the assessment execution period—March 14 through March 18, 2005—in any way that they were able to, including: 1) meeting with UM-F institutional assessment personnel; 2) responding to inquiries, questions, and concerns about the assessment as a whole, the surveys, and/or the focus groups via e-mail, telephone, and/or face-to-face; 3) assisting UM-F Information Technology Services staff people with glitches in, or last minute changes to, the on-line survey; 4) meeting with the grant committee graduate student about the focus groups' tape transcription and the student survey SPSS data entry; 5) passing out incentive packages to on-line survey completers from the Diversity Education Services office on campus; and, 6) monitoring the student survey open space site tables.

Activity 6: *On-Site Focus Group Interviews*

On March 14, 2005 at 12 p.m. and 6 p.m., on March 15, 2005 at 6 p.m., and on March 16, 2005 at 6 p.m., consultant team members conducted four focus group assessments with Flint residents. Two meetings were scheduled at the International Institute, one at the Hispanic Technology Center, and one at the Broome Community Center.

Prior to and/or following the focus group meetings, consultant team members assisted the grant committee administrative assistant in copying focus group assessment demographic data forms, and in setting up and breaking down focus group room arrangements, refreshments, and tape recording devices.

Each focus group had between eleven and fourteen participants for a total of close to fifty participants. The last focus group attracted a reporter from the local newspaper, *The Flint Journal*, whom participants agreed could stay (provided he honor certain research protocols) so that he could write a story about the grant project. Each focus group participant in all four focus groups received the same incentive package distributed on campus containing a thank-you note, note pad, two movie passes, and a meal coupon (again, nearly a \$20 value). While focus group turnout was lower than hoped, it was considered significant when measured against turnout for comparable endeavors.

Activity 7: *Campus and Community Receptions with Stakeholder Groups*

On March 17, 2005 at 12 p.m. and 6 p.m., two receptions were held on the UM-F campus—the first for campus constituents and the second for community constituents. The receptions celebrated the efforts of assessment participants and provided them with the opportunity to ask questions of, and express concerns to the consultant team and grant committee about the grant project as a whole, as well as the assessment plan and instruments, in particular. The first reception drew close to fifty attendees, the second close to twenty, including the grant's Charles Stewart Mott Foundation program officer, Ms. Kimberly Roberson.

At the first reception, a number of questions/concerns were raised and discussed. These included queries about: 1) the grant's intentional focus on race and ethnicity; 2) the surveys' perceived exclusive focus on black/white race relations; 3) the adaptability, or lack of adaptability, of some of the survey questions to Likert scales; 4) the impact of

stakeholder asymmetrical knowledge bases and/or personal/professional biases on the assessment findings; and, 5) the appropriateness of the location of the transgender identity box under the sexual orientation category on the demographic forms. At the second reception the same query about the impact of stakeholder asymmetrical knowledge bases and/or personal/professional biases on the assessment findings was raised and discussed.

It is important to note that UM-F institutional assessment office staff members expressed great support for the grant project, indicating that it will assist the campus in meeting various diversity-related accreditation requirements. It is also important to note that even criticism of, and/or resistance to, the grant project is quite positive given the grant's long-term goal of opening up and stimulating meaningful campus-wide and campus-community dialogue on racial and ethnic climate, as well as a host of other diversity-related concerns, in moving toward the establishment of a comprehensive cultural competency center.

Phase 4: March – April 2005

The activities of Phase 4 were: 1) e-mail and telephone “check-ins” with the grant committee co-chair and member (co-principal investigator and co-investigative team member), grant committee administrative assistant, and related grant administrative and technical support staff; 2) consultant team task delegation and development of preliminary evaluation highlights reports; 3) campus and community preliminary evaluation findings report out receptions with members of the UM-F and Flint stakeholder groups; and, 4) consultant team and grant committee co-chair meeting with UM-F Chancellor, Dr. Juan Mestas.

Activity 1: E-mail and Telephone “Check-Ins” with the Grant Committee Co-Chair and Member (Co-Principal Investigator and Co-Investigative Team Member), Grant Committee Administrative Assistant, and Related Grant Administrative and Technical Support Staff

Between March 20, 2005 and April 19, 2005, the consultant team—Mr. Mark Brimhall-Vargas, Dr. Christine Clark, and Dr. William Sedlacek—grant committee co-chair, Mr. Tendaji Ganges, grant committee member, Ms. Crystal Flynn, grant committee administrative assistant, Ms. Barbara Bassett, as well as UM-F graduate student, Ms. Amy Thompson, and UM-F Information Technology Services staff person, Mr. Sidney Horton, communicated via e-mail and telephone to compile and transmit, in various formats, the assessment raw data. Mr. Horton worked with Mr. Brimhall-Vargas and Mr. Sedlacek on the transmission of the Administrator, Faculty, Staff, and Alumni Survey data from its on-line format on the UM-F website, into an SPSS database file. Ms. Thompson and Ms. Flynn worked with Dr. Clark on the transmission of the Student Survey data from its paper format, into an Excel spreadsheet, which Mr. Brimhall-Vargas then converted into an SPSS database file with Dr. Sedlacek's assistance. Ms. Bassett and Ms. Flynn worked with Dr. Clark on the transmission of the Community Focus Groups' tape transcriptions into a Word file, which Mr. Brimhall-Vargas converted to a bulleted summary Word file. Finally, Mr. Brimhall-Vargas and Dr. Clark worked together to cull their handwritten notes from the Community Focus Groups into a bulleted summary Word file, which they then dovetailed with the bulleted summary Word file created from the tape transcriptions

Activity 2: Consultant Team Task Delegation and Development of Preliminary Evaluation Highlights Reports

The consultant team—Mr. Mark Brimhall-Vargas, Dr. Christine Clark, and Dr. William Sedlacek—had determined at the outset of the grant process that Dr. Sedlacek would manage the raw survey data, and that Mr. Brimhall-Vargas and Dr. Clark would manage the raw focus group data. Based on this task delegation, between March 20, 2005 and April 19, 2005, Dr. Sedlacek worked with the Administrator, faculty, Staff, and Alumni Survey and the Student Survey data to create draft documents highlighting the general areas of agreement of all the respondents on each survey. During this same time period, Mr. Brimhall-Vargas and Dr. Clark met to review the Focus Groups' data. Based on this review, Mr. Brimhall-Vargas created a draft document highlighting the general areas of agreement of all the respondents in all four focus groups. Dr. Clark standardized the format of all three draft documents, creating the three "Preliminary Highlights of Results" hand-outs. Dr. Clark forwarded these documents to grant committee co-chair, Mr. Tendaji Ganges, grant committee member, Ms. Crystal Flynn, and grant committee administrative assistant, Ms. Barbara Bassett for final editing and copying for distribution at the campus report out sessions on April 20th and 21st, 2005.

Activity 3: Campus and Community Preliminary Evaluation Findings Report Out Receptions with Members of the UM-F and Flint Stakeholder Groups

On April 20th, 2005 at 12:30 p.m. and 5:30 p.m., and on April 21st, 2005 at 12 p.m. and 6 p.m., the consultant team—Mr. Mark Brimhall-Vargas, Dr. Christine Clark, and Dr. William Sedlacek—hosted members of UM-F campus and Flint community stakeholder groups at four report receptions. The first reception was held on the UM-F campus in the Tuscola Room of the William S. White building. Twenty-five individuals—community residents, organizational representatives, and alumni, as well as campus faculty and staff—attended. The second reception was held off campus in the Joy Room of the Sylvester Broome Center. Five individuals—community residents, organizational representatives, and alumni—attended. The third reception was held on the UM-F campus in the Riverview Room of the University Center building. Thirty-two individuals—community residents, organizational representatives, and alumni, as well as campus faculty and staff—attended. The fourth reception was held off campus in Room 205 of the Flint Public Library Main Branch. Ten individuals—community residents, organizational representatives, and alumni, as well as campus faculty and staff—attended.

Report out receptions began with grant committee co-chair, Mr. Tendaji Ganges, welcoming attendees, introducing the consultant team, and providing a brief overview of the grant and its progress to date. Next, Dr. Clark provided a brief summary of primarily the racial/ethnic demographic data on the survey respondents and focus group participants. This data is as follows:

Administrator, Faculty, Staff, and Alumni Survey

249 Surveys Completed, 700 Employees Total =36%

53% White, European American, European, Caucasian
30% Black, African, Afro-Caribbean, African American

4% American Indian, Indigenous, Aboriginal
 2% Asian, Asian American, Pacific Islander
 2% Latina/o, Latin American, Hispanic
 2% Biracial/Multiracial

Student Survey

771 Surveys Completed, 5500 Students Total =14%

73% White, European American, European, Caucasian
 21% Black, African, Afro-Caribbean, African American
 2% Asian, Asian American, Pacific Islander/Latina/o, Latin American,
 Hispanic/Biracial/Multiracial

Focus Groups

43 Participants

51% Black, African, Afro-Caribbean, African American
 26% White, European American, European, Caucasian
 23% Asian, Asian American, Pacific Islander/Latina/o, Latin American,
 Hispanic/Biracial/Multiracial

Dr. Sedlacek then reviewed the Student and the Administrator, Faculty, Staff, and Alumni Survey Preliminary Highlights of Results handouts; followed by Mr. Brimhall-Vargas' and Dr. Clark's review of the Focus Group Preliminary Highlights of Results handout. Reception attendees were encouraged to interrupt these review processes at any time with questions or comments, and did so in all four sessions in ways that led to quite robust dialogue. This dialogue was focused in three areas: 1) stakeholder issues related to the assessment instruments and/or data analysis; 2) stakeholder concerns based on the Preliminary Highlights of Results; and, 3) stakeholder hopes for recommendations and next steps based on their experiences on campus/in the community—especially as these experiences relate to #1 and #2.

Representative questions raised and/or comments made in each of these three areas were as follows:

Stakeholder Issues Related to the Assessment Instruments and/or Data Analysis

- Where did the survey/focus group question come from?
- Were Flint community officials invited to participate in the focus groups?
- How were respondents/participants secured?
- How were (or will) the following terms defined (be defined)?
 - Multiculturalism/Diversity
 - People of Color
 - Outreach

- Cultural Competence
 - Community
- Why did the Administrator/Faculty/Staff/Alumni Survey questions force choice instead of giving respondents the opportunity to opt out of answering by marking N/A?
 - How will the data from the comments sections of the surveys be reported?
 - How will the demographic data be disaggregated—by race?, by role/function?, etc.
 - How will data reliability/integrity be established, triangulated?
 - Why wasn't an importance versus satisfaction gap analysis survey format used?
 - How does the Diverse Orientation Scale measure behavior, attitude, and knowledge?
 - To whom will the final report be disseminated and formally submitted?
 - What does the data mean?
 - How do you interpret racial/ethnic climate from the data?

Stakeholder Concerns Based on the Preliminary Highlights of Results

- Will the university take the recommendation seriously if the data is seen to represent perception versus fact?
- How will recommendations be reported?
- What might the recommendations look like?
- How will accountability for action on/implementation of recommendations be ensured?
- Why are the students so ambiguous about diversity?
 - Why did the students make so little probative effort to understand diversity?
- How can white administrator, faculty, staff, student, non-Flint resident buy-in to the city's circumstances be created?
- Why doesn't the community "see" the campus' outreach (not research) efforts?
- Why are the campus' marketing efforts to the community having so little impact?
- How does the community experience student civic engagement/service learning?

Stakeholder Hopes for Recommendations and Next Steps Based on their Experiences on Campus/in the Community

- Strong recommendations for the Chancellor, Dr. Juan Mestas', careful consideration:
 - Mr. Tendaji Ganges should be a full participant in the university's current strategic planning efforts
 - Grant recommendations and next steps should be integrated into current strategic planning discussions, not held until after this planning process has concluded
 - The campus must build strong accountability measures to ensure that recommendations are implemented and next steps are taken (can Mott help to ensure institutional accountability?)
 - Dr. Mestas' Diversity Committee should be actively involved in accountability discussions
 - Members of the community should hold key seats on Dr. Mestas' Diversity Committee

- Dr. Mestas should role model what a high degree of involvement in diversity-related campus and community life looks like through full and active participation in both arenas
 - All members of the university community need to be more involved in campus and community life, not just Educational Opportunity Initiatives staff
 - Performance Evaluation/Tenure and Promotion need to be explicitly tied to campus and community involvement

In both the first and third report out receptions, a student editorial written in the UM-F student newspaper about the assessment project was mentioned in relationship to the discussion of the Student Survey results. Additionally, at the conclusion of the third report out reception, a UM-F faculty member gave the consultant team members copies of his e-mail correspondence with the editor of the Flint newspaper in which he (the faculty member) expressed concerns about very negative and inaccurate racial attitudes expressed by one of the paper's regular editorial contributors. The assessment project is mentioned in this correspondence.

Activity 4: Consultant Team and Grant Committee Co-Chair Meeting with UM-F Chancellor, Dr. Juan Mestas

On April 20, 2005, the consultant team—Mr. Mark Brimhall-Vargas, Dr. Christine Clark, and Dr. William Sedlacek—and grant committee co-chair, Mr. Tendaji Ganges, met briefly with UM-F Chancellor, Dr. Juan Mestas to discuss the assessment project. On both previous visits to UM-F, the team had met Dr. Mestas by chance, but had not met with him formally. It is important to note that Mr. Ganges made valiant effort to get the consultant team on Dr. Mestas' calendar, as well as to get Dr. Mestas to attend any one of the consultants' meetings with stakeholder groups prior to this time, but was unable to do so. Dr. Mestas' willingness to meet with the consultant team on April 20th, 2005 represents a positive step with respect to his involvement with and commitment to the assessment project. At the meeting, the consultant team gave Dr. Mestas copies of the Preliminary Highlights of Results hand-outs and asked how he might envision the development of accountability measures for responding to forthcoming recommendations for the campus based on these findings. Dr. Mestas committed himself to the development of a campus-wide Diversity Committee that could include a role for Flint residents on it. He also committed to having the consulting team meet with him and his administrative council when they return in September. Both of these commitments hold the potential for building grant findings-related accountability measures. Two such measures that were discussed with Dr. Mestas were connecting grant recommendations and next steps with the campus' strategic planning efforts, and delegating responsibility for following through on grant recommendations and next steps to appropriate members of his administrative council.

Phases 5 and 6: April – October 2005

The activities of Phases 5 and 6 already completed and to be completed were/are:
1) e-mail and telephone "check-ins" with the grant committee co-chair and member (co-

principal investigator and co-investigative team member), grant committee administrative assistant, and related grant administrative and technical support staff; 2) consultant team task delegation and development of this final report of findings; 3) campus and community final report of findings report out receptions with members of the UM-F and Flint stakeholder groups; 4) consultant team and grant committee meetings; and, 5) consultant team and grant committee co-chair meetings with UM-F Chancellor, Dr. Juan Mestas, as well as with Dr. John Matlock, Associate Vice Provost and Director of Academic Multicultural Initiatives, and Dr. Lester Monts, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, both from the UM-Ann Arbor campus. The details of these activities will be reported in the consultant team's Campus Climate, Diversity Initiatives and Culturally Competent Practices Assessment Project Charles Stewart Mott Foundation-Funded Grant Report #4, to be submitted to the grant committee on or before November 4, 2005.

Conclusions

The University of Michigan-Flint's (UM-F) Charles Stewart Mott Foundation-funded Campus Climate, Diversity Initiatives and Culturally Competent Practices Assessment Project grant started slightly behind schedule. However, with the completion of the activities in Phase 1, the grant got back on its originally projected schedule. In Phases 2 and 3, the grant continued to progress on schedule. The data collected during these phases provided meaningful findings concerning racial and ethnic climate on campus and between the campus and the community. In Phase 4, the grant continued to progress on schedule. Preliminary feedback on the Preliminary Highlights of Results collected during the period related in this report will aid in the development of meaningful recommendations and next steps for building positive racial and ethnic climate on the UM-F campus and between the broad array of UM-F and Flint community stakeholder groups. In Phases 5 and 6, the grant got slightly behind schedule again. However, with the completion of the activities for which this final report was prepared, it will be back on its originally projected schedule once again. Campus and community stakeholder engagement with the recommendations this report makes will direct the course of action taken by the grant committee to ensure that these recommendations are carried out.

RESULTS

Building on the preliminary results and recommendations reported in Phase 4, the full results from all three assessments (with students, with faculty, staff, administrators, and alumni, and with Flint community members) are summarized under three organizational headings: 1) The Educational Benefits of Diversity; 2) Diversity as Everyone's Responsibility; and, 3) Campus and Community Relations. Under each heading, supportive (gives positive results) and challenging (gives negative results) findings are reported across all three stakeholder groups, for each stakeholder group, and where relevant, within stakeholders groups disaggregated by race, gender, and/or role.

The organizational headings were suggested by the clustering of results. This clustering is, in and of itself, a significant finding of the project, particularly because it affords the opportunity to situate UM-Flint's campus diversity data relative to national data on campus diversity. National research on the educational benefits of diversity in higher education describe three conditions that must exist on a campus for students to reap these rewards: 1) student, faculty, and staff demographic diversity; 2) informal interaction between and among the demographically diverse members of the campus community; and, 3) formal interaction between and among the demographically diverse members of the campus community through the curriculum and through co-curricular programming (Milem, 2003). When these conditions are present and students are inspired to avail themselves of the third, they are hired first, promoted faster, and earn more money sooner than their peers who attend colleges and universities where these conditions are not present, as well as peers on their own campus who do not take advantage of opportunities for formal interactional diversity. It is important to emphasize that it is not enough for students, faculty, and staff to be demographically diverse, nor to interact informally across this diversity. They must also come together in formal manners. An explicit requirement for this third requirement to be realized is the campus community's recognition that diversity *requires* community. Thus, it must include everyone in order to be everyone's responsibility, and in being everyone's responsibility, it becomes a community responsibility.

The UM-Flint diversity data suggest UM-Flint to be well-positioned—in fact, far more well-positioned than the majority of its institutional peers—to enable its students to reap the full educational benefits of diversity. The potential for UM-Flint to realize a high degree of demographic diversity on campus is, without a doubt, an advantage UM-Flint has over most other historically white institutions. As a public institution, by definition its mission requires UM-Flint to be uniquely responsive to the community in which it is hosted. Building a meaningful relationship with its Flint stakeholders, UM-Flint can, at once, create a demographically diverse campus and fulfill the immediate community responsiveness component of its public institutional mission.

Generally speaking, the UM-Flint diversity data illustrate that all UM-Flint constituencies, as well as its Flint community stakeholders, agree that diversity is a good thing. Further, a substantial number of members from each of these groups demonstrate support for building a more demographically diverse campus community through an array of both curricular and co-curricular initiatives, where both include important attention to relationship building with Flint community-based campus stakeholders. Where the UM-Flint diversity data generally show disagreement, and offer challenges to the establishment of the three conditions required for UM-Flint students to garner the educational benefits of diversity, is with respect to what diversity means—how it is or should be defined, who it

includes, and based on its conceptualization and spheres of influence, how meaningful curricular and co-curricular diversity initiatives could be developed and implemented. As the ensuing specific results are considered, it is important to keep these overarching findings in mind as they strongly suggest that UM-Flint constituent groups and its host community stakeholders do seek to chart a shared diversity path, provided that they are facilitated in becoming competent and collaborative diversity path navigators.

Across All Stakeholder Groups

Supportive of Educational Benefits of Diversity, Diversity as Everyone's Responsibility, and Campus-Community Relations

As discussed above, all assessment stakeholder groups expressed a general sense that diversity had positive characteristics; there was no unanimity of specific opinion with regard to this positive feeling. These differences were primarily related to differences of how respondents defined diversity (either broadly conceptualized or narrowly understood by topic or scope) and/or how respondent's thought diversity programming should be implemented in the university (immediate/large scale v. incremental/pilot projects). Essentially, the campus community was more cautious about implementing diversity programs on campus, particularly because they articulated an awareness of particular issues that implementation of these programs would create. The Flint community, however, was much more holistic in its approach to what diversity could look like inside and outside the university. They spoke from personal experience of the university and also gave key insights into how the university was currently perceived, regardless of various collaborations the campus had with the community.

Though the stakeholder groups did not have unanimity regarding diversity efforts that they supported, they did have some level of agreement on some of the challenges they perceived in implementing diversity programs and initiatives, particularly with the issues related to preparing all UM-F students for the diverse global workforce and the influx of new international students.

Challenging of Educational Benefits of Diversity

Perhaps one of the most important findings related to the educational benefits of diversity is the notion that there exists a general agreement that the University of Michigan-Flint is not sufficiently preparing its students for the global economy's diversity, because the overall curriculum and cultural experience of the campus does not provide these students cultural competency skill development during their undergraduate years (and that this needs to change soon). In addition, there is a growing sense that the students that UM-F attracts from international locations are being targeted to fill the new dormitory space to create more diversity on campus, but that the campus is not yet prepared to adequately acclimate these students to the community.

Challenging of Diversity as Everyone's Responsibility

In the same vein as above, there is also a general sense that the lack of preparation for this influx of international students is shared across the campus' faculty, staff, and domestic students. Because residential halls create a "24/7" atmosphere at a university, people at UM-F share a concern that many levels of the campus need proactive development to ensure a good transition experience for these new students. This will be particularly challenging for current staff who are unfamiliar with resident life programming

and services—especially in meaningfully developing campus “life” after 5 p.m. and on weekends.

Challenging of Campus-Community Relations

The concern about meeting the needs of international students inside the campus is also met with some level of skepticism that the campus is unprepared, and perhaps unwilling, to develop the kind of relationship with Flint community needed to support 24-hour programs, services, and/or off-campus college “life.” Comments about the new residence hall residents indicate an awareness that it is unrealistic to expect that these students will never have a need or desire to venture off campus. If the broader Flint community is not involved with the campus’ plans, students may not find their needs met in the way that they would in another university setting with a more thriving “college town” environment.

Students Overall

As the largest respondent group among the various surveys, students generally showed a certain level of awareness of the importance of diversity, but were not certain about how they make use of this knowledge. Additionally, students generally have a positive impression of the university with respect to diversity. It is also important to note that the responses attributed to students overall is highly influenced by the overwhelming presence of white students who represented in the survey at by a rough ratio of 5 to 1 relative to black students.

Supportive of Educational Benefits of Diversity

Generally, students felt positively about the concept of diversity, particularly when it was framed in a ‘non-threatening’ manner. Specifically, there exists a general sense that students are interested in learning about other cultures at the University of Michigan-Flint, particularly through academic activities that promote experiential participation and a sense of fun in the classroom. This understanding was corroborated by a somewhat positive interracial climate on campus.

Additionally, most students felt strongly that they did *not* feel as though their race was a factor in the expectation of their academic performance. In a complementary fashion, they also felt that it did not have a particular impact upon whether they would do well academically either. Though this finding is positive for most students, it is also highly influenced by race as discussed below.

Faculty also received fairly good responses from students. In general, students felt that they did not reinforce stereotypes of racial groups and that they paid attention to the concerns and questions of students. There was also a general sense that faculty had some level of skill in addressing the issues of diversity in the classroom, though they indicated there is room for growth in this area.

Lastly, though black students felt this more strongly, all students (regardless of race or sex) supported the idea that a multicultural space should be created on campus.

Supportive of Diversity as Everyone’s Responsibility

Though several of the pre-assessment focus groups noted a ‘culture of rudeness’ on campus, the data did not substantially bear that out. Overall, students disagreed with the notion that UM-F had a rude culture, or one that was particularly focused on race.

Though there were slight variations between white and black students, both of these groups still assessed the UM-F campus as not having an overwhelmingly 'rude culture.'

In addition, most students generally felt that UM-F promoted a respect for diversity, though the depth of feeling for this issue was not uniform and there were differences based on race. They also generally felt that they have been treated fairly by almost all areas of the campus administration, faculty, and other students.

Supportive of Campus-Community Relations

A particularly important point related to diversity is that students overall felt that coming to the UM-F has improved their understanding of racial/ethnic differences and has provided good programming to help this process along. Students also expressed a desire to have experiences that went beyond the classroom as well. Specifically, they were interested in learning about diversity through extracurricular events, particularly those that overtly supported the concept of diversity as inclusive of the whole UM-F campus. Overall, students in the survey responded that they felt they were able to be open about their racial and ethnic identities when coming to UM-F, and that this openness did not hurt their ability to fit in with other students.

One of the most encouraging pieces of the survey related to the notion of racial conflict on campus. Overall, students strongly disagreed with the idea that there were serious conflicts on campus based on race.

Additionally, there was also a general sense that UM-F needed to continue its efforts to be more involved in the Flint community by developing partnerships with local businesses and organizations.

Challenging of Educational Benefits of Diversity

There were also some general impressions of different student experiences based on race. There was a general sense that students from some racial/ethnic groups participate less in class than others, and that this difference in participation may be due to race. Additionally, students generally have a sense that diversity is important, but do not understand how diversity can have a value within the curriculum beyond using specific racial examples where appropriate.

Challenging of Diversity as Everyone's Responsibility

One particularly surprising result under this category was the fact that most students do not know whether there is a 'multicultural office' on campus. This lack of awareness of the existence of offices like Educational Opportunity Initiatives indicate that marketing to students about multicultural programs may not be reaching students across race. This lack of understanding about different offices is also underscored by the lack of awareness that students have about the general structure of the university.

Challenging of Campus-Community Relations

Though students expressed a sense that the UM-F environment has helped to improve their understandings of racial/ethnic differences, they did not have an overall experience of having that understanding translate into social interactions across race. Essentially, students recognize that there is value in cross-group interaction, but lack the necessary skills or 'space' in which to seek out these interactions. In order to create these opportunities, the students would like to see UM-F be more proactive in bringing students together across race and other forms of difference.

It is of the utmost importance to note that in relationship to the aggregated student data, the responses of all students are weighted by a five-to-one ratio to the responses of white students. Likewise, it is important to point out what college student development theory emphasizes: that the types of responses students across race will offer on diversity-related questions, may also indicate the degree to which their racial identities are well-formed.

Students Disaggregated by Race and/or Gender

Supportive of Educational Benefits of Diversity

In looking at the effects of diversity in and out of the classroom, there are distinct differences based on race and gender. With respect to race, white students reported more diversity in their contacts and had more appreciation of differences in the Universal Diverse Orientation Scale than black students. Conversely, however, black students found it easier to get to know students from other racial/ethnic groups and also found it easier to approach faculty outside of class than white students. Additionally, though other students cited a general appreciation of the diversity at UM-F, black students were more likely to cite diversity as a reason to come to the university.

With respect to gender, male students scored higher on the Universal Diverse Orientation Scale, indicating that male students were more oriented toward diversity than female students. Conversely (and unexpectedly given the previous results), female students were more likely to favor the recruitment of domestic students of color and international students. This could be related to the result that female students reported a more positive classroom climate overall, and thus, are more likely to have had positive interactions with diverse students in their classes.

Supportive of Diversity as Everyone's Responsibility

Black students were much more likely to understand the necessity of everyone getting involved in diversity issues on campus. This general sense of diversity across campus is likely related to the notion that black students had an increased sense of racial/ethnic identity in comparison to white students, and thus, would have a belief that racial identity is important in daily interactions. Moreover, black students were more likely to feel that the campus paper was balanced in their coverage than was previously indicated in the pre-assessment focus groups.

With respect to differences in gender, female students reported a more positive campus experience/atmosphere than men overall. This corresponds to their general impression that there are more positive classroom climates.

Supportive of Campus-Community Relations

Most likely due to their very positive impressions of their academic and social experiences at UM-F, female students said that they were more likely to still recommend the campus to their family and friends. This recommendation is linked to female students' educational opportunities, including those related to diversity and cross-group interaction.

Challenging of Educational Benefits of Diversity

One finding that indicates a certain level of skepticism around diversity issues is that white students were more pessimistic about the ability to develop cross-race social

interactions that black students. Black students, however, indicated concerns that may give insight into the difficulties around extending themselves into these cross-race experiences. Black students were more likely to feel that 1) students were resentful of students from “different” racial/ethnic groups (i.e., them), 2) academic expectations for them were based on race (while white students felt it had little to no impact on expectations placed on them), and 3) that black students were more likely to feel that faculty were also unfair to them based on their race. If black students have these kinds of impressions of UM-F, their willingness to be open to white students or faculty could be diminished.

Additionally, black students were more able to understand the value of diversity in the curriculum and believed that graduation from UM-F should require a course in diversity. Conversely, white students generally thought that diversity did not necessarily make sense in the curriculum and did not support a diversity course requirement. Related to this previous point, female students were more likely to feel that diversity should only be learned through celebration with international food, music, and dance.

Challenging of Diversity as Everyone’s Responsibility

With respect to the general non-academic experiences that students have on campus, black are more likely to have some serious complaints about the climate for them. Specifically, black students were more likely to feel that the university does not promote respect for diversity as much as white students do, and that they are more likely to feel “profiled” based on their race while on campus.

There were also general gender differences with respect to climate. Specifically, women had a sense that they ‘belonged’ in the campus community more than men did, regardless of race.

Challenging of Campus-Community Relations

Black and white students had a distinctly different impression of the role of international students at UM-F and their impact on diversity. White students felt that the university was open to diversity whether it was from international students or domestic students of color. Black students, however, felt that the university was much more open to international students as opposed to people of color from the U.S. This difference of opinion was particularly distinct when white and black students assessed the value the institution placed on black students, which black students ranked lower than white students.

White students were also much more likely to see the campus as wholly independent of the surrounding Flint community than black students, which black students expressed having more connection to than white students. Conversely, white students perceived that UM-F was trying to build or sustain a positive relationship with Flint, while black students did not feel that UM-F was trying to build or sustain such a relationship.

Faculty, Staff, Administrators, Alumni

Though faculty, staff, and alumni did not respond in the same numbers that students did, they did provide very good insights into the nature of diversity in the curriculum, across administrative offices, and the ongoing relationship the campus has with the community of Flint.

Supportive of Educational Benefits of Diversity

Faculty, staff, administrators, and alumni were generally supportive of UM-F's programs and resources dedicated to improving the educational experiences of students on campus. Specifically, they support the use of non-cognitive variables are being used in admissions of graduate students, and the dedication of a 'family room' area for students of color. They also expressed clear support for the campus' efforts to develop and implement policies to increase the representation of people of color, regardless of race and sex.

Supportive of Diversity as Everyone's Responsibility

Faculty, staff, administrators, and alumni also had a sense that diversity was not something that could be undertaken by the Educational Opportunity Initiatives office alone. They cited specific examples of where UM-F was also making inroads in supporting students of color. They felt that are being supported by offices in student affairs in developing culture-specific organizations, and that they are simultaneously encouraged to participate in "mainstream" events, programs, organizations, and committees.

This group also felt that the campus was living up to their expectations around diversity. Specifically, they felt that the institution expects faculty, staff, and graduate students to be successful and has begun to develop strategies to encourage this success, and that the campus enforces policies against discrimination, harassment, and "stone-walling" to ensure that success. Moreover, they had the impression that campus resources and curriculum were open to diversity. They cited that holdings in the library reflect expanding support for multicultural curricula and that general education courses show a basic sensitivity to multicultural issues.

Supportive of Campus-Community Relations

When it came to developing and/or maintaining a relationship with the broader Flint community, there was a general sense that UM-F was involved in the community to some degree and that further involvement would be beneficial to the campus and the community. They specifically supported joint ventures between the campus and business and organizational leaders in the community.

Challenging of Educational Benefits of Diversity

Though faculty, staff, administrators, and alumni generally had positive impressions of UM-F's diversity efforts, they did have some suggestions for improvements. First, they noted that the ethnic minority student representation does not adequately reflect their proportion in the local or national population and that this was a noticeable concern. They also noticed that students are aware of diversity as an issue, but that they are unclear about what diversity is and ambivalent about why diversity is important. They also expressed a concern that students are not probing or making a probative effort to seek out diversity experiences.

Challenging of Diversity as Everyone's Responsibility

There was also a general sense among faculty, staff, administrators, and alumni that white students need as much support and development with the issue of diversity as students of color. Specifically, they said that white students appear uninterested in diversity, they do not appear to dwell on diversity because they do not believe it affects them, and that they are not being assisted in understanding why the "family room" area is important for students of color.

They also add that faculty, staff, administrators also need assistance in becoming aware of the important nuances to better serve students of color. Specifically, they said that there are not sufficient mechanisms in place to screen potential faculty and staff for their ability to work with diverse student populations, and that faculty in particular are not rewarded for working with students of color and/or diversity topics. The most often cited example of this was related to the need to promote discipline specific/relevant diversity-related teaching, research, and/or service activities that are not currently considered in tenure and promotion decisions.

Faculty, staff, and administrators also had a sense that the campus experienced a 'silo' effect with respect to cross-campus diversity programming. Specifically, they cite the fact that input is not usually sought from a broad cross-section of constituents on campus before programs are put into place, especially those that affect many of the different communities on campus.

Faculty, staff, administrators and alumni had one particular difference than the students with respect to the overall climate at UM-F. Unlike students, this group (across race and gender) did perceive that there is a 'culture of rudeness' on campus that permeates the campus climate, though it is not directly exclusive toward people of color.

Challenging of Campus-Community Relations

There was also a broad sense that the campus does not offer a comprehensive '13th year' program, and that this lack of support for differential access programs affects the racial composition of the campus and the climate students of color have while at UM-F due to their lower numbers. Faculty, staff, and administrators felt that inclusion of such a program could make a dramatic difference in recruiting a diverse student body.

Faculty, Staff, Administrators, Alumni Disaggregated by Role, Race, and/or Gender

Supportive of Educational Benefits of Diversity

With respect to supporting the educational experiences of diversity, alumni had the most positive reactions to institutional initiatives that are developed and implemented to promote racial awareness and sensitivity to multicultural issues. Staff also supported these endeavors, but also had a sense that these programs were not supported institutionally as much as they could be. Faculty also expressed a desire to have more flexibility to pursue research related to diversity, especially in the Flint community, but also had a sense that they might not be supported in that process.

Supportive of Diversity as Everyone's Responsibility

Female faculty, staff, administrators, and alumni were also more aware of the activities that students of color undertook. They expressed a sense that students of color are active in "mainstream" organizations, including student organizations and the campus newspaper. They also expressed a sense that students of color hold leadership positions in these "mainstream" organizations, including many student organizations and the campus newspaper.

Supportive of Campus-Community Relations

There was a broad sense that the campus wants and needs to improve its relationship with the Flint community, but this was especially so for faculty and women. In pursuing this improved relationship, faculty and alumni felt that the campus should

encourage campus-community partnerships with local schools, health and human services organizations, and civic groups that will, in turn, provide interested and talented would-be students from the Flint community.

Additionally, though many faculty, staff, and administrators felt that the campus had a cordial relationship with Flint, women especially felt that the relationship between the campus and community is quite friendly and otherwise mutually supportive and beneficial.

Challenging of Educational Benefits of Diversity

Staff, in particular, feel that the educational benefits of diversity are not being implemented to the fullest extent possible. They said that institutional initiatives are not developed and implemented to promote racial awareness and sensitivity to multicultural issues.

Challenging of Diversity as Everyone's Responsibility

Staff also had the distinct impression that campus administrators do not provide leadership on, and incentives for the idea of diversity as a community value and responsibility. Specifically, they cited the need for proactive leadership from the upper levels of the university administration in the creation of targets and goals for different university departments and offices around recruitment and retention of diverse faculty, staff, and students.

Challenging of Campus-Community Relations

In general, men had a much more pessimistic assessment of the campus' relationship with Flint. Specifically, men said that the campus is not working to strengthen its relationship with the city and that the relationship between the campus and community is not friendly and otherwise mutually supportive and beneficial.

Additionally, though they were very encouraging about on-campus diversity programs, there was a distinct sense that staff members believed that the campus should not encourage campus-community partnerships with local schools, health and human services organizations, and civic groups.

Flint Community

The Flint community focus groups provide a very promising picture of the future with the UM-F campus, particularly if their observations and constructive suggestions are heeded. As in the on-campus surveys, the Flint community mentioned the various positive and negative issues related to diversity at UM-F. Their primary suggestions are contained below.

Supportive of Educational Benefits of Diversity

The Flint community understands the key role diversity (particularly diversity from Flint) can play in the education of UM-F students. Respondents often said that students at UM-F receive an excellent education and that more racial diversity at the university can only enhance that learning. It is also promising that many respondents in the focus groups stated that they observed positive change in the campus' racial/ethnic climate. In order to continue these improvements, they suggested that the university continue its work to create and strengthen articulation agreements with surrounding schools in the Flint area.

Supportive of Diversity as Everyone's Responsibility

The Flint community has also noted that the university administration has made strides in supporting community organizations. They specifically cite the Administration's ongoing support for Flint Area Citizens to End Racism (F.A.C.T.E.R.) by helping them to find locations for their meetings, provide logistical support for their programs, and advertise their functions within the campus. Community members noted, however, that this support has come primarily through Educational Opportunity Initiatives, and that the campus would benefit from hiring more progressive people, regardless of race. They said that it was important that UM-F hire people with "diverse ideas," and that this is more important than hiring people of color as "tokens."

Supportive of Campus-Community Relations

One basic message that the Flint community wants to make clear is that they appreciate the efforts UM-F is making to do outreach to Flint, and that much more is still needed. Examples of this support and appreciation include: 1) a willingness to recommend the campus to family and friends, 2) positive comments about the outreach efforts done by the Women's Center and the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender Center, and 3) specific mentions of individuals in Educational Opportunity Initiatives and other members of the campus administration (Susanne Chandler, in particular) for their time and outreach efforts. This support of the campus community comes from a deep understanding that the UM-F campus is crucial in the economic and psychological revitalization of Flint. For all these reasons, the community would suggest that UM-F develop pride around a unique identity vested its location in Flint (i.e., Flint Pride).

Challenging of Educational Benefits of Diversity

Despite these positive statements about the campus, the community also had a general sense that UM-F did not have reciprocal positive feelings toward the community and the community's ability to round out the educational experiences of UM-F students. They specifically cited a belief that UM-F viewed the surrounding community as a liability 'to be dealt with,' instead of as an 'asset' in an urban setting. Many of the focus group participants hoped that UM-F would recruit within Flint as heavily as they perceive the campus to be recruiting in suburban locations.

Challenging of Diversity as Everyone's Responsibility

The community also had a strong sense that responsibility for diversity at UM-F has been 'delegated and relegated' far too long, and that this responsibility lay primarily with Educational Opportunity Initiatives. While they adamantly support and appreciate the efforts of Educational Opportunity Initiatives and its staff, the community recognizes that Educational Opportunity Initiatives cannot do this work alone and needs sustained, institutionalized help. Respondents specifically also hoped to have more involvement in the community on the part of Dr. Mestas. Though Dr. Mestas has been doing some community events, many respondents hoped that he could be more available to them as a community partner. Members of the Flint Latina/o community felt this most acutely.

Challenging of Campus-Community Relations

To overcome many of the perceived shortfalls in UM-F's outreach efforts to the community, respondents suggested that UM-F consider new ways of doing outreach that did not specifically involve research of the community. Though they recognized the

obvious reasons why a university would want to do research, respondents felt that this relationship created a dynamic of cool distance that did not build positive relationships between the community and the campus. They also suggested that reaching the community would be easier if they revisited some of their marketing strategies with an eye to mirroring some of the more successful marketing campaigns conducted by other Flint community schools.

The Flint community respondents also recognized that UM-F has a unique ability to change the life experiences of many people in simply by providing employment. They admitted that they did not know specific hiring figures for the campus, but that there is a broad community sentiment that UM-F 'does not want to hire black people.' In order to build better relations with the campus community, this perception needs to be addressed.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND NEXT STEPS

In culling and sifting the voluminous body of Project findings, three clear recommendation areas emerged: 1) diversity training and education; 2) campus image and identity; 3) and community outreach, broadly conceptualized. These recommendations are organized into three sections: 1) those that should be undertaken immediately (with current resources); 2) those that should be undertaken in an intermediate timeframe (with modest additional resources); and, 3) those that should be undertaken over a long-term (with more substantive additional resources).

Immediate

Four major recommendations are suggested for this timeframe. These recommendations are ones that could be undertaken over the next three months with no additional or very little additional resources (though some require moving soft money initiatives to sustaining, permanent, base budgeted, and/or state line ones). The recommendations here directly involve Undergraduate Admissions, Diversity Education Services, University Relations/Marketing, the Office of the Chancellor, and Academic Affairs, though other campus units and departments will need to partner with these offices in order to realize these recommendations in a well-conceived manner.

In the area of Undergraduate Admissions, **the major recommendation** is to retool undergraduate admissions protocols to make comprehensive use of a blend of non-cognitive and cognitive variables in determining student acceptance [community outreach]. Because cognitive indicators are only accurate predictors of how well white males will do in the first year of college, they do little to help higher education institutions enroll even a cohort of only white males students who will be successful in completing an entire undergraduate program of study, and less still in identifying a diverse cohort of students with a high degree of four-year graduation rates. However, research on the use of a mix of both cognitive and non-cognitive measures of an array of prospective student attributes has enabled colleges and universities to enjoy tremendous success in admitting and graduating a highly diverse study body in a timely way (Sedlacek, 2003). Further, non-cognitive variables can be used post admission by each and every segment of the University to assess, for example, among a myriad of things, advising and teaching approaches that will support admitted students' strengths and develop areas of challenge. This initiative will facilitate the University in achieving demographic diversity, the first condition required for students to enjoy the educational benefits of diversity.

With respect to Diversity Education Services, **the major recommendation** is to institutionalize its operating budget and staff salary lines so that they may provide three levels of diversity training to key segments of the campus community [diversity training and education]. The first level of training, an "Introduction to Diversity Training," would introduce Diversity as a Community Value and Responsibility, describe the Educational Benefits of Diversity, and then provide an orientation to the university's Non-Discrimination Policies and Grievance Procedures, Sexual Harassment Prevention Policies and Grievance Procedures, and Hate Crime-Bias Incidents Reporting and Response Protocols. This training would be given to new students (and be tied to matriculation), and to new employees (and be tied to payroll). A three year staggered training renewal schedule should be developed to ensure that all employees (including undergraduate work-study students and graduate assistants) are kept up to date on these issues to reduce the

university's vicarious liability should an infraction occur, thus protecting employees from making costly mistakes in the workplace, and, of course, to create a welcoming and affirming educational and workplace climate for all members of the university community. The second level of training, "Advanced Diversity Training," would offer Cross-Cultural Interaction Competence development. This training would be given to employees in "key" units, including, but not limited to, Facilities Management, Counseling, Advising, Admissions, Financial Aid, Security, and all front office/customer service staff. In short, this training would be available to all staff who are likely to have "first contact" and/or potential contentious contact with students and employees, as well as non-student and non-employee members of the Flint community. A yearly staggered training renewal schedule should be developed to keep these employees up to date on new developments in the field of cross-cultural communication and interaction to ensure, once again, that the campus, to the greatest extent possible, has a welcoming and affirming educational and workplace climate, not simply for all members of the university community, but for all visitors to the campus as well, especially those from the local community. The third level of training, a "Leadership Development Institute," would provide preparation for leading a diverse workforce to employees in introductory level leadership positions, mid-level leadership positions, and well as advanced level leadership positions. Employee participation in this Institute could be tied to the career path development discussed below under the **Long-Term** section heading below. (See also additional remarks on this recommendation under the **Intermediate** section heading below.) These initiatives will help build community responsibility for diversity. They will also support the efforts of the committee currently reviewing the cross-cultural interaction practices, procedures, and policies employed by campus safety personnel.

Regarding University Relations/Marketing, the Office of the Chancellor, and Academic Affairs, there are **two major recommendations** [campus image and identity]. The first involves launching a "Meaningful Participation in Campus and Community Life" initiative in which campus and community stakeholders are called to "Be a Good Citizen: Participate in the Diverse Community. The Chancellor, Dr. Juan Mestas, will set an example for this democratic engagement by: 1) substantially increasing his participation in diverse aspects of campus and community life; 2) requiring that people of color from campus and the Flint community are well-represented (as voting members, and not as tokens) on high stakes campus committees and boards (search and selection, strategic planning, accreditation, advisory, etc.); and, 3) offering incentives to students, faculty, and staff for meaningful diverse community engagement (tied to academic achievement and co-curricular involvement recognition, tenure and promotion, performance evaluation, and merit pay increases). Additionally, Flint community members should be involved in the development, supervision, and evaluation of community-based aspects of student community service, service learning, and civic engagement coursework, professional internships, and practica, as well as faculty community-based research projects (so that students and faculty develop a spirit of working *with* the community in meaningful ways—ways that ensure equitable buy-in by, and mutual benefit to, campus *and* community participants). The second involves launching *the first part of a two-part* university image development campaign. This first part of the campaign will focus on aggressively disseminating information about the campus' past and continuing involvements in the Flint community. This dissemination should occur via the University homepage, local papers (especially non-traditional, free, and/or minority papers), and community group leaders and members (like Concerned Pastors and F.A.C.T.E.R.), and should minimally publicize: 1)

the community foundation scholarship and other financial aid options; 2) new faculty and staff hires (especially people of color and women); 3) courses with a community-based component and the number of volunteer hours logged by students; 4) research projects with a community-based component and the number of hours logged by faculty; 5) community-based committees on which Dr. Mestas serves, as well as on which other campus leaders, as well as faculty, staff and students serve (the names of these individuals and their campus roles should be delineated); 6) campus-based committees on which community members serve (with their name and community roles identified); and 7) campus and Flint community collaborations, partnerships, alliances, articulation agreements with Flint area two-year colleges as well as minority-serving institutions, and public school recruitment efforts. These initiatives will facilitate campus-community relationship building.

Intermediate

One major recommendation is suggested for this timeframe. This recommendation is one that could be undertaken over the next three to six months with a modest amount of additional resources. The recommendation here directly involves University Relations/Marketing, though, once again, other campus units and departments will need to partner with these offices in order to realize this recommendation in a well-conceived manner.

The major recommendation here involves *the second part of the two-part* university image development campaign [campus image and identity, diversity training and education, and community outreach]. *This second part* of the campaign will focus on aggressively branding the campus through the development of the “Flint Concept” initiative in which prospective students are called to “Come Here, Be A Flint Student!” and to “Be Proud of Flint!” The idea here is on developing a UM-Flint identity that is separate and distinct from the UM-Ann Arbor. Of particular note, there are almost no products available in the campus store, nor signs posted in common campus spaces that promote the unique value of a UM-*Flint* education without reference to or even over a UM-Ann Arbor one. By focusing on the educational benefits of diversity research, the community of Flint will be developed as a major campus asset. Flint’s diversity will be seen as an opportunity for the campus to articulate that while Ann Arbor *talks* diversity, Flint *walks* diversity, and that at UM-Flint, diversity means that both the campus itself as well as its stakeholders have their own identities. As alluded to above, with respect to the recommendations pertaining to Diversity Education Services, it is important to recognize that UM-Ann Arbor has established a reputation for diversity-related *research*. As an important part of UM-Flint’s distinct diversity-related identity development, through the Diversity Educational Services recommendation, UM-Flint could become known for its diversity-related *practice*. In so doing, an important consortial relationship between Ann Arbor and Flint could be forged through their shared diversity lens, each campus’ diversity efforts both informing and being informed by the other’s in the reciprocal manner described as “praxis.” The campaign will include a “Flint Day on Campus” where members of the Flint community and beyond are invited to the campus to “Explore Our World” by learning about campus programs and participating in interesting activities hosted by each and every unit/department. These activities should be geared for children, prospective students, parents, prospective employees, and prospective collaborators (e.g., prospective committee/board members and/or course/project partners as described above). UM-Flint t-shirts will be given away

and a community recognition ceremony will be held during which members of the Flint community who have made substantive contributions to the campus will be honored. Free shuttle service to and from campus and various community locations should be provided throughout the day. Clearly, this initiative will also facilitate campus-community relationship building.

Longer Term

Five major recommendations are suggested for this timeframe. These recommendations are ones that could be undertaken over the next six to eighteen months with a more substantive amount of additional resources (which, in addition to state monies, might also come from private donations, grants (as seed money to be institutionalized down the road), or a capital funds campaign). The recommendations here directly involve Academic Affairs, Diversity Education Services, Student Affairs, Financial Aid, University Relations/Marketing, Administrative Affairs, and Personnel/Human Resources, though again, other campus units and departments will need to partner with these offices in order to realize these recommendations in a well-conceived manner.

Related to Academic Affairs, there are **two major recommendations**. The first recommendation is to create (or recreate) a Campus Compliance Officer position reporting to the Provost, but with campus-wide scope [diversity training and education]. While pieces of this function exist in Human Resources, the most important components of such a position have been relegated to the Ann Arbor campus. All aspects of campus compliance need to be brought back to the Flint campus, combined under a full-time, permanent Campus Compliance Officer position (not functions distributed across several existing positions adding to those positions' workloads), and housed under Academic Affairs. The Campus Compliance Officer should be charged with the investigation of complaints of discrimination and harassment in accordance with the campus' dispute resolution policies. Concomitant with the establishment of this position should be the development of a tenure and promotion decision grievance process. While compliance functions are often looked at through a punitive lens, in practice they actually lend themselves more toward building an inclusive, welcoming, and affirming campus community. This is because this function: 1) provides the campus vicarious liability reduction; 2) offers well-intentioned but misguided students and employees the opportunity to develop the respectful behavioral norms required in professional educational and workplace settings without have to "lose face" in the process; and, 3) most importantly, ensures that targets of discriminatory and harassing behavior have a vehicle through which they can "be made whole" again. Done well, this function builds campus community by calling all members of the campus to ask themselves the question: If the UM-Flint campus, inclusive of its Flint surroundings, really is **my community**, then why would I ever want to do anything to hurt a member of it? Clearly, then, this function should hear and act upon campus-focused, compliance-related concerns raised by third parties as well as members of the Flint community. In this way this function creates a culture of caring, in place of a culture of indifference or rudeness. This initiative will enhance the building of community responsibility for diversity. The second recommendation is to establish a comprehensive "13th Year" program as an alternative admissions access route for Flint community high school graduates who do not meet all of the University's cognitive variables admissions criteria [community outreach]. Such a program has three primary benefits. First, it will contribute to the development of a demographically diverse campus

community. Second, it will build good will for the campus with members of the Flint community who will recognize this program as an indication that Flint youth are welcomed on, and valued by, the UM-Flint campus. And, third, it will contribute to the University's stated goal to increase its enrollment numbers and, thus, tuition dollars. As the University moves from being primarily state-funded to, increasingly, being tuition driven, this program could become at least a self-sustaining funds initiative, if not also a cost recovery one. Educational Opportunity Initiatives leadership and key Flint community members should serve in a collegial advisory capacity to Academic Affairs in the conceptualization and realization of this program. This initiative should be linked to a review of the Challenge Program's admissions practices—which could be folded into the General Education Reform Committee's work—as well as dovetailed to best act as a complement to this program once those practices are vetted as being in compliance with current University admissions requirements. This initiative will also facilitate campus-community relationship building.

In the areas of Diversity Education Services, Academic Affairs, and Student Affairs, **the major recommendation** is for Diversity Education Services to be expanded into a comprehensive Cultural Competency Center [diversity training and education]. Ample additional operating budget monies and salary lines should be allocated so that Diversity Education Services may, through a partnership with Academic Affairs: 1) train faculty on multicultural curriculum transformation through the Cultural Competency Center with an eye toward instituting an undergraduate student diversity course requirement (such a requirement can not be institutionalized until a critical mass of faculty are prepared to create and teach the courses designed to meet the requirement); and may also, through a collaboration with Student Affairs, 2) train staff on intergroup dialogue facilitation through the Cultural Competency Center with an eye toward instituting an undergraduate student intergroup dialogue program (again, such a program can not be institutionalized until a critical mass of staff are prepared to develop and facilitate the dialogues around which the program will be built. These initiatives will facilitate the University in achieving formal interactional diversity, the third and most important condition required for students to enjoy the educational benefits of diversity. These initiatives should be folded into the General Education Reform Committee's work. These initiatives will also help build community responsibility for diversity. And this should be the focus of the Center—community responsibility for diversity—so that in the event concerns regarding academic freedom emerge in response to this recommendation, it is made clear to faculty that they are not obligated by law or policy to support these initiatives, but, rather, if they are committed to the campus *community*, investing themselves in these activities will bring rich community-focused rewards. Over time, the Cultural Competency Center should expand its purview into the community of Flint by offering training opportunities to community members, by inviting community members to provide training to campus constituencies, and by bringing campus and community members together to foster positive relationship building between and among both through an array of mutually beneficial training and dialogue-based initiatives. Thus, campus-community relationship building will also be enhanced by the establishment of the Cultural Competency Center.

Regarding Financial Aid and University Relations/Marketing, **the major recommendation** is for funding options for undergraduate and graduate students to be augmented through: 1) extended payment plans; and, 2) fundraising for needs based scholarships AND teaching assistantships/fellowships [community outreach, and campus image and identity]. Because so many UM-Flint students need to work while attending

school, providing on-campus employment opportunities will have the effect of keeping students on campus for longer periods of time, and, therefore, creating more opportunities for informal interactional diversity, the second condition required for students to enjoy the educational benefits of diversity, to occur. Clearly, this initiative will also enhance this initiative's campus-community relationship building cache.

Finally, with respect to Academic Affairs, Administrative Affairs, and Personnel/Human Resources, **the major recommendation** is to develop and implement a comprehensive faculty and graduate student of color recruitment and retention/mentorship program to improve graduation rates and tenure and promotion outcomes [diversity training and education]. The use of non-cognitive variables in the admission of graduate students could also be employed here to facilitate the development of mentorship activities that will enhance an array of educational outcomes. In parallel fashion, a framework should be established through which staff at all levels are assisted in developing career paths. This framework should be tied to the performance review process so that staff can be mentored to simultaneously develop knowledge, skills, and abilities in relationship to both their current and aspirational roles and functions. This framework could also be tied to the Leadership Development Institute trainings described above. Taken together, these mentorship initiatives will also contribute to the development of a culture of caring on campus previously mentioned. Research suggests that institutionalizing this culture through these kinds of comprehensive, formal, and sustaining mentorship initiatives creates a mutually reinforcing cycle of mentorship and co-mentorship where a diverse student body attracts diverse faculty who are also interested in diversity and vice versa (Kivlighan, 2003). In the conceptualization and actualization of these initiatives, special attention should be given to domestic partner hiring and benefits plans.

Realization, Actualization, Implementation

The formation of a high-profile and institutionally empowered campus-community committee, charged by the Chancellor, Dr. Juan Mestas with bringing these recommendations to fruition is identified as the next step in the Project's process. Dr. Mestas should appoint a committee of individuals to be co-chaired by the Provost, Dr. Jack Kay, and comprised of a cross section of members of the campus and local community who are highly diverse by social identities, especially race, as well as by campus departments/units, campus and community professional roles, and campus and community stakeholder/constituency groups. Special attention should be paid to including the campus Deans on this committee and to embedding the committee's work in the everyday life of their colleges. The currently forming "Diversity Committee," if appropriately populated, might be the best group to charge with this responsibility. The work of this group should be integrated into the University's strategic planning efforts (which currently make no mention of diversity at all), as well as parallel college, departmental, and unit strategic planning work. This could be most reliably accomplished by having the co-chairs of this committee serve as members of Dr. Mestas' Strategic Planning Committee. It is of paramount importance that the proposed high-profile and institutionally empowered campus-community committee be action-oriented and "have legs" so that the proposed recommendations actually get implemented. As an additional accountability measure, highly visible progress reports to all campus and community stakeholders should take place on a monthly basis.

RESEARCH BIAS

During Phases 3 and 4 of the Project. Questions regarding the assessment instruments, participation in the assessment, and the impact of the assessment itself on campus climate for diversity were raised. These questions are discussed as forms of resistance to the Project, as well as in terms of how future assessments can pick up where this one left off.

With respect to the assessment instruments, concerns were raised about how the terms “diversity,” “multiculturalism,” “people of color,” “outreach,” and “community,” as well as “behavior,” “attitudes,” and “knowledge” were being defined. While these instruments did not expressly state definitions of these terms, implicit definitions were imbedded in the way the terms were used in the instruments. Since instrument respondents may have interpreted these terms differently, questions about response reliability emerged. Similar questions were raised about student critiques of academic courses, suggesting that it was not clear from the instrument if these critiques spoke to course content, pedagogy, professor prowess, and/or aspects of a professor’s identity (for example, the impact of a professor’s race or gender on student perception of their prowess). Parallel critiques were made in relationship to the Likert Scale use of the measures of “how important” and “how satisfied” absent a way to analyze the “gap” between importance and satisfaction (for example, the notion that something is more important to a respondent, than their level of satisfaction with it must be assessed accordingly).

On the issue of participation in the assessment, concerns raised had to do with student participation “fraud” vis-à-vis the incentives offered for participation (a small number of students took the survey more than once to garner additional incentives), the reliability of faculty, staff, administrator, and alumni role representations among respondents (in light of the fact that access to the online survey was not restricted in any way), as well as the reliability of the community focus group data because of the sample size from which it was compiled (a relatively small number).

Regarding the impact of the assessment itself on campus climate for diversity, issues were raised about a student newspaper editorial in which the project was referred to as “Affirmative Action Propaganda” and how this might influence survey responses.

This project was quite comprehensive and produced important, reliable, valid, and relevant data. The UM-Flint campus and Flint community should feel confident about the accuracy and integrity of this research. At the same time, on-going assessment of campus-community climate is an important on-going part of any meaningful campus-community diversity initiative. For this reason, as a secondary level recommendation, the UM-Flint campus should consider developing a Campus Assessment Working Group—again, comprised of a cross section of members of the campus and local community who are highly diverse by social identities, especially race, as well as by campus departments/units, by campus and community professional roles, and by campus and community stakeholder/constituency groups—to undertake periodic diversity-related assessment projects, the first of which can examine the questions and issues raised by the methods and results of this report.

It is important to note that because diversity—though a positive concept—is also controversial, it is not uncommon for resistance to the concept to be expressed indirectly through critique of the vehicles through which it is communicated, the assessment instruments being three such vehicles. This is not to suggest that none of the critiques of the instruments mentioned above are valid, but rather only to encourage thoughtful

consideration of the critiques. Equally important to note is the distinction between perception and fact in diversity work. While facts are crucial in determining reality, in the absence of facts, perception, even erroneous perception, often operates as fact until it is checked by a changed reality. Thus, while there may be a tendency to want to reduce some of the findings of this Project to “only perception,” and on that basis dismiss them without recognizing their probative value for accurately assessing the most intangible elements of campus and community climate.

APPENDICES

Appendices documents (A – C) are available upon request from the UM-Flint Office of Educational Opportunity Initiatives (See Contact Information Below).

A) Survey Instruments

B) Preliminary Summary Reports

C) Raw Data/Data Output

D) Bibliography/References

- Antonio, A.L., Chang, M.J., Hakuta, K., Kenny, D.A, Levin, S., & Milem, J.F. (in press). Effects of racial diversity on complex thinking in college students. Psychological Science.
- Hurtado, S., Milem, J.F., Clayton-Pedersen, A.R., & Allen, W.R. (1999). Enacting diverse learning environments: Improving the campus climate for racial/ethnic diversity in higher education. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports Series, 26 (8). Washington, DC: George Washington University/ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.
- Kivlighan, D. (2003). From comments made at the 2003 Institute on Implementation and Institutionalization regarding the recruitment and retention of minority faculty. Greenbelt Marriott, Greenbelt, MD. July 14, 2003.
- Longerbeam, S. L., Sedlacek, W. E., Balón, D. G., & Alimo, C. (2005). The multicultural myth: A study of multicultural program organizations at three public research universities. *Journal of College Student Development*. 46 (3), 88-97.
- McTighe Musil, C., Garcia, M., Hudgins, C. A., Nettles, M. T., Sedlacek, W. E., & Smith, D. G. (1999). *To form a more perfect union: Campus diversity initiatives*. Association of American Colleges and Universities: Washington, D. C.
- Milem, J.F., Umbach, P.D., & Ting, M.P. (2004). Educating citizens for a diverse democracy: How students learn from diversity in college. In Hampton, R.L. & Gullotta, T.P. (Eds.), Promoting racial, ethnic, and religious understanding in America. Washington, DC: Child Welfare League Press, 87-108.
- Milem, J.F. & Umbach, P.D. (2003). The Influence of Pre-college Factors on Students' Predispositions Regarding Diversity Activities in College. Journal of College Student Development, 44 (5), 611-624.
- Milem, J.F. (2003). The educational benefits of diversity: Evidence from multiple sectors. In M. Chang, D. Witt, J. Jones, & K. Hakuta (Eds.). Compelling interest: Examining the evidence on racial dynamics in higher education. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

- Milem, J.F. (2001) Diversity is not enough: How campus climate and faculty teaching methods affect student outcomes. In G. Orfield (Ed.), Diversity challenged: Legal crisis and new evidence. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Publishing Group.
- Milem, J.F. (2000). Why race matters: The individual and institutional benefits of diversity in higher education, Academe, 86 (5), 26-29.
- Milem, J.F. & Hakuta, K. (2000). The benefits of racial and ethnic diversity in higher education, featured report, In D. Wilds (author) Minorities in higher education: Seventeenth annual status report. Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 39-67.
- Sedlacek, W. E. (2004). A multicultural research program. In F. W. Hale (Ed.). *What make racial diversity work in higher education*. (Pp.256-271). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Sedlacek, W. E. (2004). *Beyond the big test: Noncognitive assessment in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sedlacek, W. E. (2005). The case for noncognitive measures. In W. Camara & E. Kimmel (Eds.). *Choosing students: Higher education admission tools for the 21st century*. (Pp 177-193). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

* * * * *

For Further Information Please Contact:

Office of Educational Opportunity Initiatives (EOI)
 University of Michigan-Flint
 Harding Mott University Center – Suite 280
 303 E. Kearsley Street
 Flint, MI 48502-1950
 Telephone: 810-762-3365
 Facsimile: 810-762-3190
 Website: <http://www.umflint.edu/EOI/>

Mr. Tendaji W. Ganges
 Assistant to the Chancellor and Executive Director
 Email: tganges@umflint.edu