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Members of the LSU Board of Supervisors

From: Katrice A. Albert, Task Force Chair
Members of the LSU System Diversity Task Force

Subject: Submission of White Papers addressing Improving Campus Climate; Recruitment & Retention; and Education & Training

With excitement, the LSU System Diversity Task Force submits the initial three white papers.

Reconstituted in March, 2009, the Task Force was established to serve as an advisory council to the LSU Board of Supervisors and the LSU System to address specific and tangible ways to enhance diversity, campus climate, cultural competence, and community outreach.

The reconstituted LSU System Diversity Task Force is charged with the following:

- Update their campus portion of the diversity self study
- Determine guiding principles for the LSU System
- Develop an LSU System diversity statement
- Determine promising practices around diversity issues such as student and faculty recruitment and retention, curriculum infusion, supplier diversity, community outreach, and accountability measures among other relevant topics

The Task Force is comprised of the following members:
Katrice Albert, LSU
Ray Diamond, Herbert Law Center
Gena Doucet, Pennington Biomedical Center
Kenna Franklin, LSU-Shreveport
Torri Freeman, LSU AgCenter
Peggy Gaffney, UNO
Joseph Moerschbaecher, LSUHSC—New Orleans
Shirley Roberson, LSUHSC—Shreveport
Dessie Williams, LSU-Alexandria
Margaret Young, LSU-Eunice

Over the past year the Task Force has examined three issues important to LSU System: 1) Improving Campus Climate, 2) Recruitment and Retention of diverse students, and 3) Education and Training of LSU Campus Employees. In each case, the Task Force has thoroughly reviewed the professional literature about these issues, researched national pacesetting models, consulted with other peer institutions regarding their practices, and conducted research in the LSU System around current practices and perspectives.

The Task Force has produced three white papers, one on each topic, summarizing their work and making recommendations for future policies and practices at the LSU System. We invite you to review these white papers and welcome your comments and feedback.
DIVERSITY TASK FORCE

Improving Campus Climate

June 4, 2010
INTRODUCTION

The “Improving Campus Climate” Subcommittee of the LSU Diversity Task Force was charged with identifying promising practices in improving campus climate in the LSU System. The subcommittee worked, researched, and compiled data to support provisions of campus climate issues and initiatives in the LSU System.

What is campus climate and why is improving campus climate important? Campus climate is a term used to discuss the environment relative to the inclusiveness of a college or university campus (Virginia Tech, n.d.). It is “a measure—real or perceived—of the campus environment as it relates to interpersonal, academic, and professional interactions.” (University of California-Riverside, 2007, p.1) Research has found the key benefits to improving campus climate are that in a healthy campus climate, individuals and groups generally feel welcomed, respected and valued by the university. (UC-Riverside, 2007, p. 1) Also, Hurtado, et al, have shown that a hostile campus directly impacts a student’s ability to transition successfully into college (UC-Riverside, 2007, p. 2) The Diversity Study Group at UC-Riverside reported that Milem, Chang and Antonio have also shown a link between climate and educational outcomes, both for minority as well as majority students (UC-Riverside, 2007, p. 2) In addition, the climate of a campus directly impacts student learning, and therefore the very mission of the university. (UC-Riverside, 2007, p. 2) “Climate impacts the recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty and staff as well as the productivity and success of the academic community.” (UC-Riverside, 2007, p. 2) And finally, campus climate also has an effect on students after they leave the university. UC-Riverside, 2007, p. 2)

This white paper focuses primarily on recommendations made by the subcommittee toward improving the campus climate of LSU System campuses, with an emphasis on determining best practices, assessing the climates of each campus through surveys and other measures, designing a system-wide theme, and training campus employees. The following recommendations for a plan of action are a result of a broad review of diversity literature and the literature on campus climate illuminated throughout this white paper.

It is recommended that the LSU System should assess promising practices and models at benchmark systems and institutions and use these models to formulate LSU System policies and procedures. It is recommended that each LSU campus should assess its own climate through surveys in order to define the gaps that exist so that appropriate training and education can be developed. In addition to campus surveys, each campus should conduct community focus groups to assess these constituent groups’ perception of campus climate. It is recommended that the LSU System should consider hiring a national campus climate consultant to design and evaluate system surveys and focus group transcripts so that general and more specific recommendations may be offered. Following this assessment, it is recommended that an LSU System diversity statement (and a parallel System-wide mantra, theme, and/or logo) should be created in order to promote campus inclusion and diversity. Finally, the subcommittee recommends the creation of a System-wide diversity handbook for all campus employees.
BACKGROUND/HISTORICAL OVERVIEW
For decades, a focus on improving campus climate of colleges and universities has been a part of the national higher education landscape. The inception of this ideal coincides with the initial increases of diverse students and faculty enrolling in and teaching at predominantly white institutions. As the number of disgruntled employees and disenfranchised students grew as well as the number of federal lawsuits related to desegregation, diversity, and cultural inclusion; so did university efforts to seek possible solutions. These groups found that elementary steps in the solution process would include fully understanding all components of the problem.

Invaluable to this process was Hurtado’s (1998) common framework for understanding the campus climate. This early inquiry offered a four dimensional model of possible explanations for the phenomenon. They are as follows:

- An institution’s historical legacy of inclusion or exclusion of various racial/ethnic groups.
- The structural diversity, or the numerical representation of various racial/ethnic groups.
- The psychological climate of perception and attitudes between and among groups.
- The behavioral climate, of campus intergroup relations.

In each of these dimensions, advisory members to the LSU System Diversity Task Force shared examples of a very negative and limited past that has given way to a current opportunity for positive growth.

Central to most discussions was the federal court imposed higher education desegregation consent decree in which implementation that has lasted many years. Contemporary distinctions find universities postured in selective behavior but ready to assume responsibility and take ownership in order to make bona fide progress in this area.

After the collection of numerous forms of data from every campus in the LSU system, many spirited discussions ensued and a direction was birthed. We identified the need to streamline our efforts in exploring various ways campus climate could be improved and best practices incorporated.

Being consistent with other campus climate assessments, a simple analysis of variance from several benchmark institutions revealed a variety of concerns. Extrapolating the most relevant questions and fine tuning them to meet the specific and unique needs of the LSU System produced an effective assessment instrument (See attachment 1).

During this process, many lessons were learned. All inquiry proved to be valuable and supported the unifying theme that improving campus climate would benefit all constituents. Aligned with this genuine desire to better serve our faculty, staff, students, and community, the LSU System is at a crossroads and is poised to become an educational powerhouse, worthy of emulation.
CHALLENGES/OPPORTUNITIES
A significant challenge on each of the campuses is the development of a strategic plan that will foster and cultivate diversity education and multicultural awareness. On each campus, the administration must play an active role, advocating for the development and success of ongoing diversity initiatives, promoting multicultural awareness and creating opportunities and avenues for cross-cultural competence. This top-down approach is vital and necessary.

Congruent with LSU System objectives, it is recommended that each campus design and deliver programs that promote a campus climate that is free from bias and welcomes, nurtures and equally respects the contributions of all members of the community. Each campus must acknowledge the uniqueness and interrelatedness of all its members. Because civic engagement is a part of the LSU System’s mission, this plan should also be seen as an opportunity to involve campus community service programs. The perception of the campus by the community is a critical aspect of the strategy to improve the campus climate across the system. As with any strategic plan, a major challenge involves evaluation. Inherent in the plan must be a strategy to quantify and evaluate changes in campus climate.

To that end, each campus in the LSU System must tailor specific outcome measures or performance indicators that will be used to evaluate various aspects of their campus climate.

Another challenge to the implementation of a strategic plan to improve campus climate is to ensure full participation and “buy-in” of the entire campus community. Not only should faculty and students be involved, but the involvement of staff is critical to a plan’s success. Involvement of the entire campus community represents an opportunity for the creation of unique development programs that are inclusive of all segments of the community. This unique opportunity will be further addressed and expanded in the national models and best practices section of this white paper.

A final challenge to the LSU System campuses in the development and implementation of a plan to improve campus climate directly relates to available resources. The campuses differ in terms of financial resources which are available for the planned activities. The LSU System must recognize that on certain campuses, economic constraints will influence the size and feasibility of any plan to improve campus climate. Similarly, the current financial outlook and budgetary forecast at all campuses are bleak. However, it is essential that appropriate resources (financial, human capital, national consulting, etc.) be made available in order to be successful.

NATIONAL MODELS/EMERGING PRACTICES
Campus climate, by its nature is fluid and distinctive from one university setting to another. Further it cannot be compartmentalized. Thus campus climate should be addressed in numerous university planning efforts, involving individual colleges and academic departments/disciplines, administrative units, residence halls, student/faculty recruitment and retention efforts, and on-campus and off-campus social communities. It is vital to communicate the importance of an inclusive campus climate by incorporating and infusing the concept into all pertinent strategic planning efforts. The resulting goals, objectives, and strategies of these planning endeavors must be implemented, evaluated and then incorporated into new planning efforts.
After a thorough and comprehensive review of those systems and institutions with national prominence around inclusive campus climate, listed below are some of the promising practices associated with building an inclusive campus climate.

- Communicate the importance the System and campuses place on inclusive campus climate internally and externally by identifying campus climate as one of the System’s highest priorities, key strategic initiatives, and core values.

- Have support from the highest levels (i.e., Board of Supervisors, President, Chancellors, Vice Chancellors, Provosts, Vice Provost, Deans, Department Chairs, Directors, and Faculty/Staff/Student Governance) set the tone for an inclusive climate and apply appropriate resources realizing that leadership in all sectors and levels of the university is also a critical component to achieving positive change.

- Formalize a Campus Climate Plan with measurable action steps; define leadership roles in the plan; and incorporate the plan into the institution’s Strategic Planning Document.

- Make a strong and substantive commitment to assessing campus climate, utilizing inclusive processes to conduct the assessment, taking positive action when the results of the assessment are published, and then repeating this process on a regular basis.

- Identify and apply adequate budgetary, human capital, and national consulting resources for the development of campus climate assessments and their ongoing implementation.

- Secure adequate funding and human capital to operationalize the program and policy changes that the assessments will ultimately and continuously identify.

- Include campus climate on the agenda for meaningful discussion at executive management retreats, town hall meetings, faculty/senate meeting, etc.

- Engage the faculty by soliciting their expertise in creating knowledge and scholarship and developing curriculum related to inclusion and campus climate.

- Provide information about the System and Institutional commitment to campus climate on the System and Campus websites, in its recruiting materials, and in community-wide communications.

- Conduct community outreach in the form of internships, shared social functions and networking to help expand the borders of the university and improve town-gown relationships, which directly increases a more inclusive university-community partnership.

- Involve cross-functional teams to address campus climate issues; added benefit of cross-divisional teamwork is that it leverages resources, expertise, and time toward accomplishing the desired goal of inclusion.
• Improve mechanisms to detect, prevent, and correct overt and more subtle forms of harassment, racism, and discrimination.

*These outstanding approaches and contemporary promising practices were adapted from the following:

- *Developing, Implementing and Assessing Effective Strategies to Build an Inclusive, Campus Climate*, 2004, [http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1022&context=pocpw9](http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1022&context=pocpw9)

**KEY BENEFITS TO THE LSU SYSTEM**

The benefits of improving campus climate in the LSU System are enormous and uniquely different for each campus. There is no one neither recipe nor “one size fits” all model of constructing, implementing or maintaining an inclusive campus climate. Each campus must engage in a sweat equity approach of listening, appreciating, and working toward a campus climate that is free from institutional bias and that benefits all its members.

The research is unambiguous. In order for inclusive campus climate to be improved and successful, it must be of highest priority. Evidence of this is reflected in LSU System’s leadership (i.e., Board of Supervisors, President) establishing a Diversity Task Force and charging this Task Force with assessing and recommending strategies for inclusive excellence. No institution of higher education can afford to be left behind on these critical issues related to inclusion and cultural competence. Leaders, who have the courage, should take advantage of every opportunity to learn as much as they can about ensuring the right environment exists for everyone to maximize learning.

Unfortunately, too many institutions have only focused on increasing minority numbers, and have paid too little attention on how to better serve these constituent groups through transforming institutional climate. It is in the analysis of how an institution can do better for all of its members that it grows to be a place worthy of national prominence.
The research clearly identifies several types of benefits that can be realized by improving campus climate. They include the following:

- **Individual Benefits**: Ways in which the educational experiences and outcomes of individual students are enhanced by the presence of diversity on campus
- **Institutional Benefits**: Ways in which diversity enhances the ability of colleges and universities to achieve their missions—particularly related to the mission of teaching, research, and service
- **Economic and Private Sector Benefits**: Ways in which diversity enhances the economy and functioning of organizations and business in the private sector
- **Society Benefits**: Ways in which diversity in colleges and universities impact quality of life issues in the larger society


Institutional transformation is projected as a value-added educational benefit associated with diversity. According to Chang (2002) there are critically important questions that must be addressed. The way these questions are answered, constructs both an institution’s public image and the heart of its purpose. They include the following:

- Who deserves an opportunity to learn?
- How is the potential for learning evaluated?
- What is learned?
- Who oversees learning?
- What conditions advance learning for all students?
- Who decides what is important to learn?

Engaging in the rigorous exercises required to improve campus climate, allows an institution to fine-tune and align its strategic goals with its basic mission. These self-correcting opportunities provide great insight and broaden an institution’s ability to meet the needs of the diverse faculty, staff, students and community.

Lastly, the benefits of an inclusive campus climate extend far beyond graduation. For students where their academic, social, and leadership development needs were met and environmental challenges minimized are more likely to be active/supportive members of the university’s alumni association. These individuals become ambassadors for the university that project positive communication, offer assistance with recruiting efforts, and invest eagerly in the university’s future.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Because an inclusive, healthy campus climate benefits all members of the university community, the subcommittee developed several recommendations that would assist the LSU System in improving campus climate and emphasizing its importance in the overall message of inclusive excellence for the LSU System:
It is recommended that the LSU System’s Office assess the promising practices and models of System policies and procedures from benchmark campuses.

It is recommended that each campus should assess its own climate through surveys designed to define gaps in a healthy and welcoming campus climate so that appropriate training and education can be developed.

It is recommended that the campuses conduct focus group meetings with various campus constituencies and community partners to further assess perceptions of the campus climate.

It is recommended that the LSU System consider hiring a nationally-recognized campus climate consultant to help evaluate the System surveys and focus group transcripts so that general as well as specific recommendations might be offered.

It is recommended that the LSU System develop an LSU System diversity statement that promotes and highlights the priority of cultural inclusion. This diversity statement should be on the System homepage and distributed widely.

It is recommended that the LSU System develop recommendations for a System diversity handbook for all campus employees.

We believe these significant steps and others will begin the process of assessing and evaluating and ultimately improving campus climates throughout the LSU System. This will help define the LSU System’s diversity vision that it wishes to exemplify across its various campuses.

**TIMELINE**

The LSU System’s Diversity Timeline must operationalize numerous best intentions, face to face meetings, countless hours of research, days of spirited discussions, conference calls, and finally a deliberate game plan to become better at being an inclusive, diverse, culturally competent System.

In light of current economic challenges, the campus climate timeline takes on a prioritized phase in approach that is both realistic and pragmatic. The entries listed as immediate goals represent what is elementary to the process and feature low to no economic institutional commitment. The items as short term goals represent cautionary “next steps” that offer opportunities to both secure and sustain the initial investments of inclusive excellence. Last, but certainly not least, are the items listed as long term goals. These economically weighted items represent activities and system wide projects that will highlight institutional strengths, identify weak areas, and provide rich opportunities of data mining. Collaboratively, if this timeline is given the consideration that it deserves, it will honor the LSU System’s desire to improve campus climate by serving all of its constituents in a manner that is exemplary, inclusive and sustained.

**Immediate Goals**

- At the LSU Chancellor’s retreat, have system President present Diversity Task Force information and organize leadership goals
Improving Campus Climate

- Identify benchmark systems and institutions on diversity, campus climate, and inclusive excellence
- Track the transparency of benchmark institutions progress of best practices
- Develop a system wide Diversity statement featured on the LSU System webpage and disseminated widely

Short Term Goals
- Create/Design a System wide theme or mantra on Diversity and Inclusive Excellence
- Develop a system Diversity Handbook for ALL campus employees.
- Incorporate a commitment to diversity and cultural inclusion into every employees evaluation process, especially academic and administrative leadership

Long Term Goals
- Hire a national campus climate consultant to develop a survey instrument appropriate for each campus in the LSU System
- Assess Campus Climate through surveys to find gaps so that appropriate training and education can be developed
- Accommodate appropriate training from top to bottom of LSU System’s employees
- Conduct a community focus group
- Develop and maintain a consistent (bi-annual) Campus Climate assessment cycle

PROJECTED BUDGET
There are three basic problems that make obtaining budget information related to campus climate difficult.

- Nationally recognized institutions with inclusive campus climate initiatives are supported by numerous programs housed in a wide range of administrative offices and academic departments.

- It is difficult to sort out exactly how much of the money budgeted for programs that serve all students/faculty/staff or community outreach goes toward building an inclusive campus climate, free from bias.

- Officials often do not track how much of their budget goes toward promoting diversity and inclusion which improve campus climate, because they may not want to provide ammunition to critics of affirmative action.

All three of these issues are discussed in an article in the January 26, 2007 Chronicle of Higher Education titled “U. of Colorado Assailed for Its Spending on Diversity.” In the article, Mr. Bud Peterson, Chancellor of the Boulder campus, said that the line between expenditures on diversity and expenditures on education in general is blurry, and he likes it that way. "My goal is to have diversity be so pervasive and such an integral part of what we do, we can't tell where the boundaries are," he said.
Since diversity is only one component of Campus Climate, this article demonstrates the tremendous difficulty of collecting budget information in this area. However, below is a table that includes major categories and percentages of a campus climate budget that might be allocated to this necessary and vital process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Climate Budget</th>
<th>Percentage of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey(s)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement/Promotion</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Launch Event</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker(s)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships/Journals</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resources Used:
- Diversity Plan 2008-2013, Daemen College, [http://www.daemen.edu/about/policies/Pages/DiversityPlan.aspx](http://www.daemen.edu/about/policies/Pages/DiversityPlan.aspx)

CONCLUSION
This white paper outlined best practices, challenges and opportunities, and key benefits as well as recommendations, a pragmatic timeline and budget information for improving the campus climate on every LSU System campus. All campuses will have an opportunity to share in the benefits of an improved campus climate throughout the System, which will bring the LSU educational system closer to this shared, far-reaching goal of an LSU System that, as a whole, truly reflects and embraces inclusive excellence.

The Campus Climate Subcommittee of the LSU System Diversity Task Force reviewed the literature on how campus climate impacts the students—prospective, current, and graduates. It also reviewed literature on how faculty and staff are impacted by the existing campus climate in terms of the breadth and depth of inclusivity. The subcommittee researched and benchmarked campuses that have been successful in their diversity efforts, in particular, those that have demonstrated improvements in their campus climate. These best practices served to guide the recommendations offered to the LSU System as the Diversity Task Force structures a diversity initiative that creates a system of authentically inclusive and responsive campus environments.
The words of Hazel Symonette, Senior Policy and Planning Analyst at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, serve as a cogent reminder:

“On many fronts, higher education is being challenged to transform its teaching, learning and working environments so that they are not only multiculturally diverse in appearance but also authentically inclusive and responsive in their acknowledgment, validation and full development of the diverse gifts and talents of all. Multicultural development requires moving beyond tolerance, accommodation and pressures to ‘fit in’ towards a focus on changes in policies, processes and practices in order to genuinely invite and engage diverse voices, perspectives, experiences and peoples. Educators move beyond simply being expert information disseminators and master performers to also being master communicators and life transformers. Educators create a responsive and respectful university environment that embraces, builds upon and engages the many dimensions of diversity.”
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APPENDIX

**Campus Climate Survey**

Please respond to the following statements on a continuum from A to E:

- A= agree strongly
- B= agree
- C= no opinion
- D= disagree
- E= disagree strongly

Mark A if you are female; mark B if you are male.

Mark A if you are a student; B if staff; C if faculty; D if administrator.

Mark A if you have been at [campus name] for less than one year; B if 5-10; C if greater than 10 years.

Mark A if you work days; B if you work evening; C if you work both days and evenings.

1. The cultural/ethnic background of the Board of Supervisors reflects that of the student population.
2. The cultural/ethnic background of the administration reflects that of the student population.
3. The campus is responsive to the needs of the [city name] community.
4. The college initiates links with the community.
5. There are clear procedures for addressing instances of discrimination based on race and ethnicity.
6. There are clear procedures for addressing instances of discrimination based on gender.
7. There are clear procedures for addressing instances of discrimination based on sexual orientation.
8. There are clear procedures for addressing instances of discrimination based on physical challenges or special needs.

9. The campus community is aware of the grievance procedures.

10. The outcomes of the grievance procedures are trusted.

11. Student clubs, organizations, and activities reflect the diverse student body of [campus name].

12. Culturally diverse students regularly participate in college activities.

13. Differently abled students regularly participate in college activities.

14. Efforts are made to increase culturally diverse student participation in these activities.

15. Efforts are made to increase differently abled student participation in these activities.

16. On-campus events (exhibits, plays, movies, and other performances) reflect the interests of diverse student groups.

17. Student publications and promotional materials are screened for racist, sexist, and homophobic content.

18. Have you met, had a conversation, or studied with someone from a different culture?

19. [Campus name]'s commitment to celebrate cultural diversity is communicated to new faculty, staff, and students.

20. Training on diversity issues is regularly provided to all faculty and staff.

21. [Campus name] is a comfortable and secure place for differently abled students.

22. [Campus name] is a comfortable and secure place for people regardless of gender.

23. [Campus name] is a comfortable and secure place for people of all sexual orientations.

24. [Campus name] is a comfortable and secure place for culturally diverse students.

25. The campus is accessible to physically challenged individuals.
26. Culturally diverse students are represented equally in all of the programs provided by [campus name].

27. Differently abled students are represented equally in all of the programs provided by [campus name].

28. When new employees we interviewed, their skill, commitment, and aptitudes in promoting cultural pluralism are assessed.

29. Faculty members are regularly evaluated for their ability to promote diversity.

30. Departments are regularly asked to summarize their work in enhancing equal opportunity.

31. People who are in management positions are skillful in working with diverse workforce.

32. The student evaluation of faculty forms includes items on promoting diversity.

33. Materials used in classes at [campus name] are drawn from a culturally diverse body of literature.

34. Courses are regularly taught from a culturally diverse perspective.

35. Courses on race, culture, ethnicity, and other issues of diversity are regularly offered.

36. An ethnic studies (multicultural) course should be a core requirement.
INTRODUCTION
The Recruitment & Retention Subcommittee (R&R Subcommittee) of the LSU Diversity Task Force was charged with identifying ways to increase recruitment and retention of a diverse student body in the LSU System. While R&R Subcommittee realizes that diversity, in all its forms (i.e., race/ethnicity, gender, age, disability status, veteran status, sexual orientation, religious perspective, etc.), is necessary and vital; racial/ethnic recruitment and retention strategies were assessed. Similarly, while formalized recruitment and retention efforts are critical for all campus community members (i.e., administrators, faculty, staff, and students); only student recruitment and retention strategies were assessed. Therefore, the R&R Subcommittee compiled data to support provisions of recruitment and retention related to racial/ethnicity diversity issues and initiatives in the LSU System. Further, the Subcommittee study also affirmed the importance of broadening the scope of recruitment and retention other diverse demographics and to other types of constituents are in university communities.

Diversity among students has been recognized as a compellingly important in higher education. As the United States Supreme Court recognized in Grutter v. Bollinger, 539 U.S. 306 (2003), “numerous studies show that student body diversity promotes learning outcomes, and ‘better prepares students for an increasingly diverse workforce and society, and better prepares them as professionals[,]’ . . . [for] the skills needed in today’s increasingly global marketplace can only be developed through exposure to widely diverse people, cultures, ideas, and viewpoints.” The Court emphasized that these benefits are “not theoretical but real” and that these benefits accrue not only to students themselves but to the sectors of productive activity in which students engage, in business, the military, government, and civic life.

Such realizations represent the starting point for this discussion of student diversity in recruitment, admissions, and retention efforts among the institutions in the LSU System. Diversity enhances the education produced within the LSU System, and consequently it benefits the communities, businesses, and people that our graduates ultimately serve. Diverse student populations enhance the production of leadership, and the perception of legitimacy of such leadership. It is important, as the court in Grutter put it, “that the path to leadership be visibly open to talented and qualified individuals of every race and ethnicity.”

Although this white paper is narrowly focused on racial/ethnic recruitment, admissions, and retention, race and ethnicity are not the only important aspects of diversity. Genders, sexual orientation, geographic diversity, among other demographics, are critical to creating a diverse university setting.

In a legal and cultural environment less constrained by gender stereotype, gender diversity is important. At the undergraduate level, female students are well represented, though significant questions remain both at the undergraduate as well as the graduate/professional levels as to how to enhance the interest of women students in the STEM (science, technology, engineering, and math) disciplines.
So, too, is there importance to sexual minority diversity, for cultural acceptance of discrimination against those who are gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender is lessening. Yet, even if the assumption is that number of gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgender students mirror those in the general population, there are no accurate statistics kept.

Geographic diversity represents an important aspect of diversity which is honored by recruitment efforts and outcomes at nearly all of the campuses in the LSU System. As a rule, students from across the state, from other states in the nation, and from foreign countries are to be found across the student populations in the LSU System. Nor are campuses at a loss for diversity of student interest and talent necessary to populate athletic teams, student government, bands and orchestras, theater productions, or other activities that render university campuses places of rich exposure.

Despite the importance of these characteristics that create diversity, race and ethnicity stand in contradistinction to these other aspects of diversity. At nearly every campus of the LSU System, African-American and, to a lesser, but significant extent, Hispanic students do not provide the critical masses necessary to enhance the sort of diversity the Court in *Grutter* recognized as so important. As a consequence, this discussion of diversity in recruitment, admission, and retention focuses on race and ethnicity.

**BACKGROUND/HISTORICAL OVERVIEW**

LSU was founded as an exclusive, all white, all male, military university. It did not lose this status until after the Civil War and the ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment, which commands that no state should deny any person equal protection of the law.

Soon after the war, Southern University was established as an all black institution, and like LSU, a land grant institution, thus maintaining LSU’s segregated status. This separation of the races in higher education was effectively ratified by *Plessy v. Ferguson*, 163 U.S. 537 (1896), which suggested racial separation to be acceptable so long as equal facilities were provided.

Twentieth century litigation spearheaded by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) first challenged the “equal” portion of the separate but equal formula, including cases against LSU. As a direct result, LSU saw its first black students admitted in 1950. *Brown v. Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954), directly overruled Plessy, holding that separate educational facilities are “inherently unequal.” There was no shortage of recalcitrant state decision makers, however, who actively maintained segregation.

By way of example, the University of New Orleans began classes in 1958 as part of the LSU System. Since this was after *Brown v. Board of Education*, the University was open to black students. But contemporaneous to legislative provision for the University of New Orleans, the legislature would provide for the establishment of Southern University at New Orleans, and classes would begin there in 1959 - less than a mile away from UNO - thus encouraging black students to matriculate there and not at UNO. These dual campuses held to the pattern in Baton Rouge, where Southern University is only six miles away from LSU, and these campuses are suggestive of what would happen later, the establishment of an LSU campus in Shreveport and the contemporaneous establishment of a Southern University campus as well.

Louisiana’s dual system of higher education came under attack by the federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1964, with a desegregation lawsuit by the Department of
Justice eventually filed in 1974 under Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act as well as under the Fourteenth Amendment’s equal protection clause. Settlement negotiations resulted in a 1981 consent decree which expired in 1987, resulting in further litigation. Ultimately a settlement of the case was reached in 1994. This settlement expired in 2004.

Under the consent decree and the settlement agreement in *U.S. v. Louisiana*, the LSU System had been obligated to undertake a number of race conscious actions with respect to admissions and the award of scholarships, intended to remedy the present effects of the segregated system of education in which its campuses had engaged. These actions were intended to and in fact did ameliorate some of the disparity in the proportion of black students in Louisiana and black students on historically white campuses, including those of the LSU System. However, with the expiration of the settlement agreement, the LSU system is no longer considered to be part of a dual system of segregated education. Louisiana is recognized to have a “unitary” system now, and as a result, the race conscious measures previously employed are unavailable - unless they meet the restrictive test outlined by *Grutter* and its companion case, *Gratz v. Bollinger*, 539 U.S. 248 (2003).

Under this test, race conscious admissions measures are constitutional if they are undertaken in the interest of broadly defined diversity and if such measures do not exclude the consideration of other factors in admissions decisions. To so exclude other such factors would be to sweep too broadly and to give the beneficiaries of such “affirmative action” a definable and thus unconstitutional racial advantage.

This formulation disadvantages the LSU System campuses in recruiting minority students, but no more than other universities who have been adjudged to have overcome a history of racial discrimination or who have not been adjudged to have such history or practices at all. Indeed, race conscious admissions *can* be undertaken - the *Grutter* case represents a successful example - but the campuses of the LSU System have not undertaken them; choosing instead to utilize race neutral admissions methods. One result is a relatively low proportion of minority students at the LSU System campuses, a predictable result given the statistically significant tendency of minority standardized test takers to perform worse than white students. Especially given the last decade’s advances in admissions requirements with respect to standardized test scores, as well as anticipated advances, this effect is exacerbated.

Moreover, a significant number of Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) compete with LSU System campuses for this black student population. Southern University has campuses in Baton Rouge, New Orleans, and Shreveport. Grambling State University, like Southern University, has a loyal fleet of alumni whose children tend to matriculate at the same universities. This same statement is true for Southern University Law Center, which competes directly with the Hebert Law Center for black students. Xavier University and Dillard University in New Orleans are private universities of similar description. Significantly, Xavier has a stellar reputation for educating students in the sciences, and sends more African-American students to medical school than any other single university in America.
CHALLENGES/OPPORTUNITIES

Over the last three decades, increasing institutional support of recruiting and retaining underrepresented minority students in academic settings. Yet, recruiting students who are racially and ethnically different alone does not ensure the desired educational benefits of diversity. It often presents both challenges and opportunities. Research has shown that having a diverse student population enhances learning in a campus climate, and most campuses agreed that they value diversity. However, the minority and majority perspectives on how to achieve diversity differ.

There are numerous challenges that hinder recruitment and retention of underrepresented students. These include:

- Underrepresented minority high school dropout rates (male and female)
- Lower standardized tests scores
- Poverty
- Low academic expectations such that students are not encouraged to pursue higher education
- Limited financial resources
- Racialized tracking into technical school training
- History of Racism on LSU campuses
- Perception of Racism on LSU campuses
- Political hostility to race conscious admissions and scholarship decisions
- Legal hostility to race conscious admissions and scholarship decisions
- Competition from HBCU’s

Opportunities to enhance diversity by recruitment and retention of underrepresented minority students include:

- Federal and other research funds to support research and academic courses of study that may appeal to minorities.
- Collaborative opportunities with HBCU’s.
- Service learning, civic engagement and research opportunities in the geographic area impacted by Hurricane Katrina.
- Local, state, and national interest in and funding of charter schools, especially for campuses with schools or colleges of education.
- LA Governor Bobby Jindal’s proposed Granting Resources and Autonomy for Diplomas (GRAD) Act allows for freedom for campuses to increase their tuition if they raise their graduation rates. Decreasing minority student attrition will contribute to the financial advantage that campuses will seek under the GRAD Act.
- The planned state-wide articulation program between community colleges and four year universities represents an opportunity with respect to recruitment, retention and graduation, as students who are better prepared because of their community college experience matriculate to LSU System campuses.
NATIONAL MODELS/EMERGING PRACTICES
Certain practices are fairly consistent among universities with effective programs to enhance student diversity.

These practices are organized into three major categories: Recruitment, Retention, and Other.

Recruitment
- Recruitment of underrepresented students is the subject of activity not only of the admissions staff but also of deans, faculty, minority students and alumni.
- Recruitment efforts should reach churches, community centers, military, etc.
- Partnerships with targeted middle and high schools to help students get ready for college.
- Strengthen minority scholarships.

Retention
- Deans and Chairs should be charged with increasing minority graduation rates.
- Establishment of advisory boards to assist with recruiting and retention.
- Enhanced academic support services for under-prepared students.
- Utilization of peer and faculty/staff mentors.
- Emphasis on cultural diversity in first-year orientation programs.
- Involve parents of freshmen to become active partners in their students' academic success.

Other
- Diversity as a priority or commitment is articulated of the president or chancellor of a campus and extends to all subordinate officers of constituent schools and colleges and to subordinate officers, including the vice chancellors, provost, vice provosts, deans, departmental chairs, unit directors, faculty, and staff.
- All promotional materials and websites are inclusive and support diversity.
- Curricula should be reviewed to eliminate bias and make sure that content enhances multicultural awareness and understanding.
- Promotion of international student exchange and study abroad programs.
- Promotion of diversity, cultural and international initiatives/programs on campus.

RECOMMENDATIONS
These recommendations consider that diversity in Higher Education is not at all “a faddish slogan of the cognoscenti,” as Justice Thomas suggested in his opinion in Grutter v. Bollinger; but instead a matter of compelling value to the LSU System and its constituent campuses. In order to not only achieve greater diversity but to maintain it, it is necessary to construct diversity efforts to last. Campuses must develop curricula, programs, and funding sources that render continued, sustained, diversity efforts. Diversity among the student population is best achieved when diversity as a general value is mainstreamed within each university, when diversity is incorporated into the curriculum, into faculty and staff appointments, and in all institutional events.
General

- The production and maintenance of a diverse student body should be a responsibility of appropriate administrators in the LSU System, from the president of the system and the chancellors of the campuses to subordinate administrators, including the vice chancellors, provosts, vice provosts, deans, department chairs, and unit directors. It is recommended that the creation and maintenance of a diverse student body should be one measure of the performance of such administrators.

- It is recommended that the curricula should be reviewed to eliminate bias and assure that content enhances multicultural awareness and cultural competence. Campuses should offer courses, at both undergraduate and graduate/professional levels, that appeal to the interest of racially, economically, and culturally diverse students. These offerings may take the form of majors, interdisciplinary programs, and courses, inclusive of international student exchange and study abroad programs.

- It is recommended that the appointments of faculty and staff should be considered so as to recognize the importance of enhancing diversity in the classrooms and laboratories. Similarly, these diverse faculty members will serve as role models whom students may emulate.

- It is recommended that diversity should not simply be a value to be achieved but an accomplishment to be publicized. Recognizing and publicizing campuses that have a successful track record in the recruitment, retention, and graduation a diverse population of students encourages further diversity on those campuses. Thus, diversity achievements, including statistical data about the diversity of the student body and the successes of minority students (i.e., awards won, jobs received after graduation, etc.), should be publicized widely, both internally and externally (i.e., websites; university print materials like brochures, catalogs, and annual reports; local newspapers; national press; industry and education publications; professional groups, etc.). Campuses should promote diversity not only in recruitment specific materials, but also across all promotional materials, for while diversity requires maintenance, recognition is self-perpetuating.

Recruitment

- It is recommended that recruitment efforts of a diverse student population are aggressive and innovative. It should involve not only the admissions and recruitment staff but also of deans, faculty, minority students, and alumni. As part of this effort, it is recommended that campuses establish recruitment advisory boards including representatives from administrative, faculty, student, and alumni constituencies.

- It is recommended that recruitment efforts involve not only traditional feeder institutions like high schools and, for four year campuses, junior colleges; but also should involve contact with target student populations through churches, community centers, military, etc. Graduate and profession programs should target not only students attending Historically Black Colleges & Universities (HBCUs), Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs), and Tribal College, the military and professional arenas.
Recruitment & Retention

- It is recommended that campuses should establish collaborative academic programs with feeder institutions (i.e., HBCUs, HSIs, and Tribal Colleges) that have large minority populations and that are geographically proximate. Pipeline programs or partnership programs with high schools and other colleges should also be considered.

- It is recommended that campuses should actively pursue minority students and other students of diverse background by attending and exhibiting at conferences where such students are likely to be present in large numbers including but not limited to career fairs, graduate school fairs, and programs sponsored by professional and civic minority organizations such as like Association of Black Communicators, Society of Hispanic Women Engineers, sororities and fraternities.

Admissions and Scholarships

- It is recommended that campuses develop stronger scholarship programs available to students from diverse background. The research is clear. Scholarship assistance not only makes matriculation less financially burdensome, but also delivers the message that recipients are valued. Scholarships based on need should certainly be considered, as well as a pool of scholarships intended to enhance diversity among the student population.

- It is recommended that campuses institute a full file review, both for admissions decisions and for scholarship decisions. It is strongly suggested that campuses end their reliance on criteria under which objective criteria are the sole or most highly weighted basis of admissions and scholarship decisions. The establishment of full file review should include a review of admissions criteria that do not unnecessarily exclude and, in fact, ensure the admission of those who can succeed. Biases against part time or split career students should be reconsidered and to the extent possible eliminated. Campuses should consider relevant standardized test scores, grades, strength of recommendation letters, life and work experience, extra-curricular activities, maturity, and other relevant considerations including the maintenance and enhancement of student diversity.

Retention and Graduation

- It is recommended that Deans and Department Chairs be charged with increasing graduation rates in general and minority graduation rates in particular.

- It is recommended that campuses establish advisory councils; including faculty, student, and administrative constituencies, that continuously address retention issues.

- It is recommended that campuses establish and continue first year orientation programs. As part of this effort, campuses should emphasize multiculturalism and cultural competence. At the undergraduate level, it is recommended that a Parents Association be created. Parents should be encouraged to be active partners in their student’s academic success.

- It is recommended that campuses strengthen academic support for all students, particularly for first year students and for under-prepared students. As part of this effort,
Recruitment & Retention

campuses should strengthen individualized faculty advising programs. Advisors should meet first year students and discuss curriculum requirements, assist students in evaluating degree requirements, and assist students in selecting course that focuses them toward an on-time graduation. Similarly, faculty should assist students in identifying their academic shortcoming that could derail them from completing course requirements. Faculty advisors should assist students to form reasonable goals and objectives for educational advancement and should provide ongoing individualized counseling.

- It is recommended that guidelines be created which enlist culturally competent faculty member advisors who understand diversity issues and experiences faced by minority and other diverse students.

- It is recommended that campuses establish mentoring programs consisting of peer and faculty/staff mentors. Such mechanisms can be of great benefit for minority students, as well as first generation students and others who may require affirmative efforts to overcome a sense of unfamiliarity or estrangement.

- It is recommended that campuses support student affinity groups that network and support minority and other diverse populations of students. Campuses can assist students by providing facilities and resources so that students feel safe and comfortable meeting among themselves. Important to this effort is the establishment and furtherance of cultural centers which may act as umbrellas and clearing houses for student groups and campus activities that may further the comfort level and acculturation of diverse student populations.

- It is recommended that campuses facilitate attendance for students whose financial circumstances require them to work. Such students may require more flexibility with respect to course schedules, time-to-complete requirements, and the resumption of financial aid when financial circumstances require the interruption of their studies.

KEY BENEFITS TO THE LSU SYSTEM
To the extent that the LSU system can enhance diversity by expanding the numbers of minority students on its campuses to a point of critical mass, LSU accomplishes certain key benefits for its students, the State of Louisiana, the communities in which they live, and the business and other entities who hire LSU system graduates.

First, it must be recognized that LSU campuses, like other government institutions, exist at present in a financial milieu that is uncertain, and perhaps even unstable. Maximizing tuition revenue is an important facet of campus financing, and it may become crucial in years to come. Thus, enhancing diversity by maximizing the recruitment, admission, and retention of minority students contributes to the financial stability of the LSU campuses.

Moreover, diversity among the student bodies of the LSU system helps to enhance the perception of the LSU system as a worthwhile and legitimate recipient of financial largess from the state. Such perception is important as well to the creation, maintenance, and success of relationships between individual campuses and other actors in private and public spheres.
Thus diversity is an important factor all around in enhancing the LSU system’s base of support, both financial and otherwise.

Second, enhancing student diversity enables the university to serve not only more students, but also to serve them better. We recognize, as has the Supreme Court in Grutter v. Bollinger, “numerous studies show that student body diversity promotes learning outcomes, and ‘better prepares students for an increasingly diverse workforce and society, and better prepares them as professionals[,]’ . . . [for] the skills needed in today’s increasingly global marketplace can only be developed through exposure to widely diverse people, cultures, ideas, and viewpoints.” Indeed, both before and after Supreme Court decision in Grutter, recognition of such benefits has been widespread in the educational, business, and public service/governmental sectors.

Moreover, such benefits are not simply theoretical, but also supportable by a mass of empirical research undertaken both prior to and after Grutter.

A diverse education at the university level helps students to take account of alternative points of view and to look for insight from outside their comfort zones, and thus promotes leadership. A diverse education thus prepares students to undertake the shared responsibility of achieving civically virtuous interactions in all aspects of social and business intercourse. This is also to say that enhancement of student diversity serves employers of LSU graduates and serves the communities in which those graduates live.

Of more immediate concern to students is that diversity among the student body has been shown to improve educational outcomes. Research has shown that diversity improves the classroom environment, challenges students to think critically, and increases not only satisfaction with the university environment but also retention.

Third, enhancing diversity of students serves to enhance the reputation of LSU campuses. In spite of their efforts under the consent decree and the settlement agreement in U.S. v. Louisiana, LSU campuses are almost uniformly - the Eunice campus is a major exception - considered to be “white” campuses. Many students of African descent presume that they are not welcome and/or that they will not be comfortable. Enhancing diversity helps to overcome this present effect of past racism, and helps to establish LSU campuses as firmly in the mainstream of American education, not only enabling LSU campuses to recruit better students but also to recruit faculty for whom diversity is a decisional factor.

**TIMELINE/PROPOSED BUDGET**

Recommendations are included as a chart in the Appendix. While we conceive of the recommendations as a coherent plan to increase diversity among the students educated in the LSU system, we understand that system finances are uncertain. For that reason, we have indicated which recommendations are without budget impact. The budget impact of other recommendations is uncertain and depends in significant measure on whether recommendations are undertaken on a piecemeal or incremental basis or instead all at one.
CONCLUSION
In many ways, our nation is more diverse than at any time in its history, but at the same time, in many ways, the nation is divided. Distrust and ignorance of the other is palpable facet of the white/black divide, and yet, the nation has a president of African descent. Many today consider Asians in America the “model minority.” Yet, Asians historically have been an outcast group, to the point that Justice Harlan, dissenting in *Plessy v. Ferguson*, recognized the Chinese “as a race so different . . . that we do not permit those belonging to it to become citizens.” This was also to the point that Japanese American citizens were interned in concentration camps in World War II. Hispanics have risen to the point that they are the largest minority group in the United States, with representatives in high places in government, and yet a state has recently passed legislation inviting its police forces to engage in racial profiling.

A nation of immigrants, the United States is marked by a continuing flow of immigration, its culture in many ways a rich gumbo, melding practices and experience from across the globe into the American experience. Leaders of important sectors in higher education, government, business, and the military agree that managing and taking advantage of diversity is important to national welfare, and the nation’s highest court has declared that in higher education the interest in diversity is compelling. A diverse education is a qualitatively more substantial education, and concomitant with this, the LSU system must place a high priority on diversity.

Practice must be consistent with priorities, however, and resources sufficient to maximize the LSU system’s achievement of diversity must be so directed. In some instances, the furtherance of diversity is a matter of continuing current practice, and no additional monies need be spent. In other instances, a firm statement from the leadership of the LSU System commanding action consistent with the system’s need for diverse education can change focus in ways that can achieve different results without the expenditure of additional monies. Yet for some measures, additional expenditures will be necessary. The interest of the LSU System, its students, the education the system would have them achieve, and the larger interests of our nation make it so.
### Recruitment & Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>TIMETABLE</th>
<th>BUDGETARY IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The production and maintenance of a diverse student body should be part of the job description of appropriate administrators in the LSU system, from the president of the system and the chancellors of the campuses to subordinate administrators, including the provosts, deans, departmental chairs, and program heads. Production and maintenance of a diverse student body should be one measure of the performance of such administrators.</td>
<td>immediate</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricula should be reviewed to eliminate bias and make sure that content enhances multicultural awareness and understanding. Campuses should undertake curricular offerings, at both undergraduate and graduate/professional levels, that appeal to the interest of racially, economically, and culturally diverse students. These offerings may take the form of majors, interdisciplinary programs, and courses, and include international student exchange and study abroad programs.</td>
<td>immediate</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgetary impact depends on whether courses replace others or instead represent additional offerings undertaken by new professors, and the extent to which new majors and programs make use of pre-existing resources. See attached table of salaries of professors by rank.</td>
<td>1 to 3 years</td>
<td>Budgetary impact depends on the extent to which external and internal publicity resources are extended to include diversity materials and the extent to which new resources are required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointments of faculty and staff should be undertaken so as to recognize the importance of the maintenance and enhancement of diversity in the classroom and the laboratory and of role models whom students may emulate.</td>
<td>immediate</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity should not simply be a value to be achieved but an accomplishment to be publicized. Recognizing and publicizing campuses that have a successful track record in the recruitment, retention, and graduation a diverse population of students encourages further diversity on those campuses. Thus, diversity achievements, including statistical data about the diversity of the student body and the successes of minority students (awards won, jobs received after graduation, etc), should be publicized in local newspapers and national press, to industry and education publications and to professional groups, and in university materials such as catalogs and internet websites. Campuses should promote diversity not only in recruitment specific materials, but also across all promotional materials, for while diversity requires maintenance, recognition is self-perpetuating.</td>
<td>immediate</td>
<td>Budgetary impact depends on the extent to which external and internal publicity resources are extended to include diversity materials and the extent to which new resources are required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recruitment & Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>TIMETABLE</th>
<th>BUDGETARY IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment efforts of a diverse student population should be aggressive and</td>
<td>immediate</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>innovative. It should involve not only of the admissions and recruitment staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but also of deans, faculty, minority students and alumni.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As part of this effort, campuses should establish recruitment advisory boards</td>
<td>immediate</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including representatives from administrative, faculty, student, and alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constituencies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment efforts should involve not only traditional feeder institutions</td>
<td>immediate</td>
<td>Budgetary impact depends on the extent to which additional admissions staff is necessary to undertake this effort. The estimated salary of an additional assistant dean runs from $48,000 to $65,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>such as high schools and, for four year campuses, junior colleges, but efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>should involve contact with target student populations through churches,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community centers, military, etc. Graduate and profession programs should</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>target not only students from their own campuses and traditional feeder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institutions, but should also target perhaps nontraditional campuses among</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>historically non-white campuses, the military and professional arenas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campuses should establish collaborative academic programs with feeder</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>$150,000 - $200,000 per year, depending on the numbers of programs in each institution and students in each program, stipends if any, and personnel and other administrative expense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institutions that have large minority populations and that are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geographically proximate.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline programs or partnership programs with high schools and other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colleges should be part of this effort as well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campuses should actively pursue minority students and other students</td>
<td>immediate</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of diverse background by attending and exhibiting at conferences where such</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students are likely to be present in large numbers, such as the career fairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and programs sponsored by professional minority organizations such as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sororities, fraternities, and minority student and professional organizations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td>TIMETABLE</td>
<td>BUDGETARY IMPACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Admissions and Scholarships</strong></td>
<td>Campuses must develop stronger scholarship programs available to students of diverse background, for scholarship assistance not only makes matriculation less financially burdensome but also delivers the message that recipients are valued. Scholarships based on need should certainly be part of the mix, as well as a pool of scholarships intended to enhance diversity among the student population.</td>
<td>immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campuses should undertake full file review, both for admissions decisions and for scholarship decisions, moving away from reliance on criteria under which objective criteria are the sole or most highly weighted basis of decision. The establishment of full file review should include a review of admissions criteria that do not unnecessarily exclude and in fact ensure the admission of those who can succeed. Biases against part time or split career students should be reconsidered and to the extent possible eliminated. Campuses should consider relevant standardized test scores, grades, strength of recommendation letters, life and work experience, extra-curricular activities, maturity, and other relevant considerations including the maintenance and enhancement of student diversity.</strong></td>
<td>immediate</td>
<td>Budgetary impact depends on the extent to which additional staff are necessary, estimated at $40,000 in salary from viewing the LSU salary database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Timetable</td>
<td>Budgetary Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retention and Graduation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans and Chairs should be charged with increasing not only general graduation rates, but also minority graduation rates.</td>
<td>immediate</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campuses should establish advisory councils, including faculty, student, and administrative constituencies, to address retention issues, particularly of underrepresented students, on a continuing basis.</td>
<td>immediate</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campuses should establish and continue first year orientation programs, making them mandatory. As part of this effort, campuses should emphasize cultural and other diversity in the life of the university. At the undergraduate level, parents should be encouraged to be active partners in their children’s academic success and to communicate regularly with them along these lines.</td>
<td>immediate</td>
<td>None, if each campus has an orientation program. To make it mandatory will require additional staff/faculty to teach the additional orientation courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campuses should strengthen academic support for all students, particularly for first year students and for at risk students.</td>
<td>immediate</td>
<td>The LSU-BR First Year Experience office was originally budgeted at $481,400 for 2009-10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As part of this effort, campuses should strengthen individualized faculty and staff advising programs. Advisors should meet entering students to discuss curriculum requirements, and to assist students in evaluating information found in the student handbook. They should assist students in identifying their academic shortcoming that could spell trouble in completing course requirements. Advisors should assist students to form reasonable goals and objectives for educational advancement and should provide ongoing individualized counseling. Enlist as advisors faculty members who are interested in and familiar with diversity issues and experiences facing minority and other diverse students.</td>
<td>immediate</td>
<td>None if devoted faculty can be found. Otherwise monetary incentives could be made available for participants to do a good job.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


| Retention and Graduation Cont. | Campuses should establish a system of peer and faculty/staff mentors. Such mechanisms can be of great benefit for minority student, as well as first generation students and others who may require affirmative efforts to overcome a sense of unfamiliarity or estrangement. In this connection, campuses should support student groups that network and support minority and other diverse populations of students. Campuses can assist students by providing facilities and resources so that students feel safe and comfortable meeting among themselves. Campus support is particularly important for minority students who may believe that their presence is due solely by virtue of diversity requirements, or who simply feel different from their counterparts. Important to this effort is the establishment and furtherance of cultural centers which may act as umbrellas and clearing houses for student groups and campus activities that may further the comfort of diverse student populations. Campuses should facilitate attendance for students whose financial circumstances require them to work. Such students may require more flexibility with respect to course schedules, time-to-completion requirements, and the resumption of financial aid when financial circumstances require the interruption of their studies. | 1 year | Budgetary impact depends on whether supplemental pay will be required for faculty staff peers. immediate $10,000 per student group. |
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APPENDIX

Diversity Plans from other Universities Reviewed

The Ohio State University
http://www.osu.edu/diversityplan/index.php

Cultural Diversity at Salisbury University
http://www.usmd.edu/usm/workgroups/diversity/

The California State University (CSU)

University of Florida
http://www.admissions.ufl.edu/grad/diversity.html

University of California Los Angeles (UCLA)
Overview of UCLA’s Diversity Plan Fall 2009
http://www.diversity.ucla.edu/strategicplan/index.htm
UCLA Student Retention Center: Providing Academic and Personal Support
http://www.communityprograms.ucla.edu/src.html
UCLA Student Initiated Access Center: Working Toward Equal Academic Access
http://www.communityprograms.ucla.edu/SIAC.html
UCLA Campus Strategic Plan for Diversity
http://www.diversity.ucla.edu/strategicplan/index.htm

The University of Alabama
2008-2009 Strategic Diversity Report

The University of Mississippi
University of Mississippi Career Center Alumni Diversity links
http://career.olemiss.edu/diversity_links.html
Students Envisioning Equality through Diversity
http://www.olemiss.edu/orgs/seed/news.html

Mississippi State University
Office of Diversity and Equity Programs
http://www.msstate.edu/president/odep/home.html
Holmes Cultural Diversity Center
http://www.hcdc.msstate.edu/
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<td>LSU A&amp; M</td>
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<td>Hebert Law Center</td>
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<tr>
<td>Roberto Diaz del Valle</td>
<td>Former Director of Diversity Affairs</td>
<td>University of New Orleans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad Jones</td>
<td>Institutional Liaison Officer Office of Student Affairs &amp; Enrollment Services</td>
<td>LSU at Eunice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Loup</td>
<td>Associate Director of Admissions</td>
<td>Hebert Law Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James McCoy</td>
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INTRODUCTION
The Education & Training Subcommittee (E&T Subcommittee) of the LSU Diversity Task Force was charged with identifying areas of education and training related to diversity and cultural competence for faculty and staff; however, the focus expanded beyond that initial charge to include the necessity and valuable information regarding students. The Subcommittee compiled data to support provisions of employee education and training related to diversity issues and initiatives in the LSU System. Further, the Subcommittee study also affirmed the importance of incorporating education and training initiatives in general education curriculum for students.

At the onset of the LSU System Diversity Task Force’s work, a high priority was to reach the concept of “inclusive excellence.” Better defined, inclusive excellence is defined as “the active, intentional, and ongoing engagement with diversity; increased self awareness; empathy for others; and a greater understanding of the complex ways in which individuals interact and collaborate within communities and institutions” (Association of American Colleges & Universities, Making Excellence Inclusive).

After understanding inclusive excellence, the members of the E&T Subcommittee collaborated on development of a working definition of the term, “diversity,” relative to identity, beliefs, and experiences. Among many attributes listed were:

…individual, group, and social differences that can be engaged in the service of learning. Individual differences might include personality, learning styles, and life experiences. Group and social differences might include race/ethnicity, economic class, gender, sexual orientation, country of origin, cultural, political, or religious affiliations.

The E&T Subcommittee approached its charge by employing a variety of methods.

First, an assessment of the LSU System “in-house” awareness of education and training initiatives was conducted. In so doing, each member of the broader LSU Diversity Task Force served as a resource and contributed research conducted at their individual campuses. Four LSU System institutions—the Ag Center, LSU-BR, LSUHSC, and UNO—reported formal education and training initiatives, while other institutions indicated little or no provisions.

Survey results reflected challenges in the form of fiscal responsibilities, staffing, and resistance to change. Among opportunities were understanding of one’s own cultural norms as a way of better understanding others and creation of an inclusive work environment.
Second, the E&T Subcommittee further delineated several perceived challenges and opportunities. These included the following:

- assembling a multicultural community
- educating members about the value of multicultural education
- realizing the benefits of cultural diversity
- integrating lessons and insights across diverse disciplines
- developing and invoking the best of one’s (diverse) possible selves.

Third, a comprehensive and thorough review of national models with emerging and best practices was conducted. The E&T Subcommittee reviewed national pace setters—those universities making significant strides toward offering culturally competent education and training. Results and success stories are documented.

Fourth, considerable attention was given to the key benefits to the LSU System. Obvious benefits were acknowledged, from recruitment and retention of faculty and staff to the same end result for the students served. Others included tolerant and inclusive viewpoints; reduced intergroup prejudice; improved intercultural competence; enhanced critical thinking and integrative complexity; more creativity and intellectual confidence; and more productive workplace relationships with diverse groups.

Details of the Subcommittee’s findings, recommendations, and a budgetary proposal follow.

**BACKGROUND/HISTORICAL OVERVIEW**

Today, the United States is more diverse than at any point in its history. Yet, despite this diversity, many Americans still live in segregated communities and interact socially with people most like themselves. For most, the workplace offers the only opportunity to interact with people culturally distinct from themselves. Similarly, the workplace also represents microcosm of the larger society, where many constantly struggle for respect, equitable treatment and inclusion.

Since the 1960’s and the affirmative action/civil rights legislation; many American religious, governmental, civic, big business, non-profit, and higher education institutions have been conducting some form of diversity education. Further these entities began offer diversity and sensitivity training since the late 1970’s and 1980’s in response to federal legislation related to desegregation decrees, EEO issues, gender diversity and sexual harassment, and the American with Disabilities Act. Today, many organizations realize the bottom line effects of diversity and now assume that diversity education can boost productivity and innovation in an increasingly diverse work environment. The assumptions about the value of diversity training, as a result of its changing functions and uses, have evolved over the decades (Diversityofficermagazine.com, History of Diversity Management, Billy E. Vaughn, PhD).

For employers, securing and respecting a diverse workplace is beneficial for all employees—regardless of an employee’s positions in the organization. By using the knowledge and life experiences that each employee brings to the workplace, employers can improve communication, create a more inclusive climate, and foster teamwork and innovation.
In these organizations and institutions, more focus is on multiculturalism. Multiculturalism refers to the inclusion of the full range of identity groups in education. The goal is to take into consideration each of the diverse ways people identify as cultural beings. This perspective has become the most widely used approach today in diversity education. This approach expands the difference quotient beyond race and gender, to communication styles, personalities, social status, and regional influences and beyond (Diversityofficermagazine.com, History of Diversity Management, and Billy E. Vaughn, PhD).

Further, the reality of global mobilization has required an even broader view of diversity education and training due to working with an increasingly international audience and transcontinental relationships. The complexity of identity groups needs professional trainers to focus on promoting inclusion. The objective is to remove the barriers to productivity for every member of the institutions with particular concern for historically excluded group members.

Higher educational work environments that are less equipped to meet diversity and inclusion challenges stand to fall short of their missions. Thus, the E&T Subcommittee surveyed all of the LSU System campuses gaining critical feedback regarding their current diversity education and training programs (see survey in attachment 1). The responses varied across the System. However, one major theme emerged from all campuses. That theme was that more culturally competent education and training is vital and necessary. Further, this training should be valued and should be incorporated consistently throughout the institution such that diversity and inclusion are valued added parts of the institution’s mission.

Most institutions within the LSU System do not have a formal program with the exception of diversity training offered through the Division of Administration’s Comprehensive Public Training Program (CPTP).

Below are examples of other program currently offered by some of the LSU System campuses?

- The Ag Center includes diversity training during orientation and supervisory training series which are conducted by HRM
- The LSU Baton Rouge campus includes diversity training in the LEAD…Emerge Leadership program and through their Fall Retreat for Deans, Department Chairs, and Directors
- LSUHSC – Shreveport semi-annually conducts diversity presentations for employees
- UNO offers a diversity workshop for employees

Although there is effort and interest across the LSU System, critical feedback was garnered regarding the lack of human capital, lack of time, and minimal resources available to those that are responsible for diversity and cultural inclusion training. Up to this point, diversity education and training has been the responsibility of one department or a subunit of one department.
Each of the campuses in the LSU System has its own specific and distinct mission. Similarly, with a flagship, research one institution; four year regional campuses, a two year community college, two medical school, a law school, a vet school, an agricultural center, and an biomedical research center; the role, scope and mission is different for each. This collective diversity among institutions is one of the great strengths of the LSU System, and has helped make our institutions competitive. However, creating a comprehensive, static System-wide Education and Training program would prove difficult.

Thus, the E&T Subcommittee believes it is critical that LSU System-wide programs are developed and instituted at each of the campuses. The research is clear. Diverse and more inclusive environments are far more profitable than those that are not. Diversity enriches the educational experience. Others learn from those whose experiences, beliefs, and perspectives are different from their own, and these lessons can be taught best in a richly diverse intellectual and social environment. Diversity promotes personal and professional growth creating a healthy, civil society. Diversity challenges stereotyped preconceptions; it encourages critical thinking; and it helps students learn to communicate effectively with people of varied backgrounds. Diversity strengthens communities and the workplace. Education within a diverse setting prepares students to become good citizens in an increasingly complex, pluralistic society; it fosters mutual respect and teamwork; and it helps build communities whose members are judged by the quality of their character and their contributions (Statement on Diversity, Seattle University, www.seattleu.edu/policies/diversity).

Diversity also enhances economic competitiveness. Sustaining prosperity in the 21st century will require the State of Louisiana in general and to the LSU System in particular to make effective use of the talents and abilities of all our citizens, especially in work settings that bring together individuals from diverse backgrounds and cultures.

**CHALLENGES/OPPORTUNITIES**

There are many challenges to increasing culturally competent education and training programs in the LSU System. Equally, there are many opportunities that should be considered. The five most relevant challenges are discussed. Similarly, the top four opportunities are considered.

**CHALLENGES:**

**Campus Variations**

Each campus of the LSU System has a set of unique goals and needs. One type of training and education may work on one campus but not for any of the other campuses. Therefore, developing a diversity training and education program to meet everyone’s needs will prove challenging. Determining how to meet these needs through campus climate surveys should be a basic way of resolving this challenge.

**Fiscal Priorities/ Budget Cuts**

The Louisiana state budget recessions in recent and past fiscal years have been a challenge for all campuses in all areas. All campus employees find themselves doing more work with limited resources or with no resources at all. There are more demands on administrative services with
less or little budgetary allocation to provide the services. Thus, a significant and stable financial commitment would be necessary for this educational and training program to be successful.

Efforts of Responsible Parties
There seems to be conflicting efforts for those responsible for developing, educating, and training employees on diversity and cultural inclusion. For many of the LSU campuses, this responsibility is housed within the Human Resource Management Office where limited staff, time, and financial resources are allocated. Similarly, chief diversity officers too often shoulder the burden of all diversity initiatives. Diversity and inclusion should be everyone’s responsibility.

Lack of Leadership Buy In
Top brass institutional leaders’ (i.e., Chancellors, Vice Chancellors, Provosts, Vice Provosts, Deans, and Department Chairs) support and genuine commitment to cultural diversity is critical. Organizational leaders should not only agree to diversity initiatives, but should also demonstrate their commitment by making it a priority, having it as a clear part of their platform agenda, and offer necessary resources for success. Leaders should take strong personal stands on the need for change, role model the behaviors required for change, and assist with the work of moving the organization. The diversity initiative must begin at the top and work its way down in order for true cultural changes to occur.

Resistance to Change
It is a behavior phenomenon that people are resistant to change. Major cultural shifts are often difficult and slow. People are expected to fit into the existing organizational culture. A real organizational change would mean that diversity is accepted as a key business driver, rather than diversity for the sake of compliance.

OPPORTUNITIES:
Population and Workforce Trends
The changing demographics in the workforce reflect a very diverse workforce. The rates of growth for minority groups are projected to be faster than the rate for whites. Between 2002 and 2012 Asian growth rate is 51% compared to white projections of 3%. If U.S. (and Louisiana) population trends continue, minorities are expected to become the majority in 2042. Similarly, the overall population will be older. Available talent is now overwhelmingly represented by people from a vast array of backgrounds and life experiences. Nationally competitive institutions cannot allow discriminatory practices, negative institutional traditions, and employee cultural incompetence to impede them from attracting top talent administrators, faculty, and students.

More Productive Workplace Relationships
Assembling an inclusive multicultural community allows everyone to express their genuine interest and views while being respectful of others interest and views. Increased cultural competence allows civility, respect, and team approaches to problem solving. Inclusiveness also allows validation of others’ experience which results in more trust and confidence within employees on campus. This trust and confidence produces better teams and subsequent better work outcomes.
Legal/Compliance Issues
Many organizations, including higher education institutions are under legislative mandates to be more inclusive and non-discriminatory in their employment practices. Non-compliance with Equal Employment Opportunity or Affirmative Action legislation and others can result in fines and/or loss of contracts with government agencies. In the context of such legislation, it makes good business sense to utilize a diverse workforce.

Market Strategies
Today’s global economy is represented by people with different demographics (ethnicities, races, ages, abilities, genders, sexual orientations, etc.). Hiring and developing a diverse workforce ensures that the products and services provided by the University are appealing to a diverse customer base. This is vital to the competitive nature of recruiting top talent administrators, faculty, and students.

NATIONAL MODELS/EMERGING PRACTICES
There are many national culturally competent education and training models. For the sake of brevity, this white paper will highlight three national pace setters in the area of education and training. These three national models include the University of Illinois, Cornell University, and Diversity Training University International (DTUI).

The University of Illinois
The University of Illinois is studying diversity in the workplace in the context of various demographic trends. Initial findings from case studies of exemplary diversity training programs at large organizations are as following:

- **Barriers**
  Six barriers have been identified as obstacles that inhibit the employment, development, retention, and promotion of underrepresented groups, as well as the successful transition of minority youth into the workforce. These six barriers are discrimination, stereotypes/prejudice, poor career planning, unsupportive work environment, qualification and performance questioned, and lack of mentors.

- **Goals of Diversity Training**
  Training is a widely used strategy in managing diversity in the workplace. Other strategies for managing diversity include: initiatives to change the organizational culture; policy revision to support diverse needs; mentoring programs; nontraditional work arrangements; employees' strategic career planning programs; and communication activities, such as handbooks, newsletters, meetings, and policies about the organization's diversity goals, vision, and successes.
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- **Evaluation Criteria**
  For ease of evaluation, diversity training programs can be grouped into the following categories: awareness-based training, to increase employee knowledge and sensitivity to diversity issues; skills-based training, to provide workers with a set of skills to enable them to deal effectively with workplace diversity; and integrated training, which merge diversity concepts with previous training programs.

- **Effective Diversity Training Programs**
  The most effective workplace diversity training programs are inclusive. These programs aim at enrolling all employees; obtain the support of senior management; keep their definitions broad, in order to include everyone as part of the diversity that should be valued; conduct needs assessment and customize programs to meet organizational needs; follow action plans; and provide accountability.

- **Assisting Students**
  Universities are in the business of educating students. The most appropriate ways for University personnel to assist students are by providing the following: career guidance, work teams/groups activities, mentoring, role models, cultural diversity awareness, and activities to raise educational and performance expectations.

Cornell University
The Essentials of Developing and Delivering Diversity Training
Cornell University offers an interactive course to help organizations develop and deliver diversity training. It explores methods for identifying and planning diversity training needs and training techniques, models, and ideas that get diversity messages across.

The fee is $1,295. This course is designed for human resource officers, EEO/AA, diversity managers, consultants, and those responsible for training. The cornerstone of effective diversity training is ensuring that management and employees have an experience that raises awareness, changes behaviors, and does not reinforce stereotypes and biases.

Increasingly, when diversity training is developed improperly, it is fraught with legal risk and may cause backlash. This interactive course is designed to enhance one’s skill in developing and delivering training sessions related to diversity programs and initiatives by exploring.

Topics addressed include: diversity awareness training; training needs assessment; diversity skills training; deciding whether training is the right intervention; building support for training and minimizing resistance; developing the training plan; selecting the trainers; working through diversity issues at the individual level; inclusive training practices; avoiding backlash; dealing effectively with the difficult issues (e.g., race, gender, sexual orientation, unearned privilege); avoiding the blame game; legal issues in diversity training; using instructional tools, overheads, PowerPoint, etc.; evaluating success and minimizing failure; emerging issues in diversity training; and managing training consultants. Special features include delivery and critique of a training plan; delivery of a diversity training module; training demonstrations, application sessions, and critique.
Diversity Training University International (DTUI)

DTUI is a free-standing corporate university that exists to promote cultural competence and cultural diversity expertise. The institution advocates for credentialing diversity professionals, culturally competent media coverage, among other important issues. They provide certification training, actively voice concerns about the impact of poor cultural competence, and represent cultural competence models.

DTUI collaborates with the Diversity Trainer & Professional Network in providing professionals with opportunities to network, showcase, get referrals, advertise, and acquire resources and information in diversity and cross-cultural training. DTUI provides the knowledge and skills needed to consult as a diversity specialist, coach diversity skill development, and conduct cross-cultural training. The program offers services to a wide range of participants. DTUI instructional technology is based on the teaching experiences and scholarly insights of its faculty.

DTUI fosters a community of learners interested in achieving diversity training competency and promoting diversity globally. They are actively involved in diversity research, scholarly writing, and developing programs in the legal, regulatory, and credentialing areas that serve trainers and their clients.

KEY BENEFITS TO THE LSU SYSTEM

For employees to function effectively in large complex organizations like the LSU System, management and supervisors need to deal effectively with issues such as communication, adaptability, and change. As previously noted, trends in demographic changes will continue to significantly increase in the coming years. Successful organizations, like LSU must recognize the need for immediate action and should stand ready to allocate the necessary resources (financial, human capital, time) on managing diversity in the workplace now.

An organization’s success and competitiveness depends upon its ability to embrace diversity and realize the benefits. When organizations actively assess their handling of workplace diversity issues, develop and implement diversity plans, multiple benefits are reported such as (Diversity in the Workplace: Benefits, Challenges and Solutions, Josh Greenberg, [www.multiculturaladvantage.com](http://www.multiculturaladvantage.com)).

- Increased adaptability

- Organizations employing a diverse workforce can supply a greater variety of solutions to problems in service, sourcing, and allocation of resources. Employees from diverse backgrounds bring individual talents and experiences in suggesting ideas that are flexible in adapting to fluctuating markets and customer demands

- A diverse collection of skills and experiences (e.g. languages, cultural understanding) allows a company to provide service to customers on a global basis
A diverse workforce that feels comfortable communicating varying points of view provides a larger pool of ideas and experiences. The organization can draw from that pool to meet strategic goals and the dynamic needs of students more effectively.

Institutions that encourage workplace diversity inspire all of their employees to perform to their highest ability. System-wide strategies can be executed; resulting in higher productivity, profit, and return on investment.

Numerous research studies examining the impact of diversity on students and educational outcomes have produced extensive evidence that diversity has a positive impact on all students, minority and majority (Smith et al., 1997). Some examples are as follows: increased cognitive development, satisfaction with the college experience, and amplified leadership abilities.

Students who interact with racially and ethnically diverse peers show greater intellectual growth and academic skills. An analysis of two longitudinal studies [of over 15,000 students] showed that students who interacted with racially and ethnically diverse peers both informally and within the classroom showed the greatest “engagement in active thinking, growth in intellectual engagement and motivation, and growth in intellectual and academic skills” (Gurin, 1999; 2002).

Both in-class and out-of-class interactions and involvement with diverse peers foster critical thinking. Another major study showed both in-class and out-of-class interactions and involvement with diverse peers’ fostered critical thinking. This study also showed a strong correlation between the extent to which an institution’s environment is perceived as racially nondiscriminatory” and students’ willingness to accept both diversity and intellectual challenge (Pascarella et al., 1996).

Many faculty members believe students benefit from diverse environments in many ways. A comprehensive survey of faculty attitudes (Maruyama and Moreno, 2000) found that faculty members believe all students benefited from learning in racially and ethnically diverse environments; [diverse] environments exposed students to new perspectives and encouraged them to examine their own perspectives; and diversity fostered interactions that helped develop critical thinking and leadership skills.

The material above was reproduced and adapted with permission from WISELI, the Women in Science and Engineering Leadership Institute at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. It is based on the following publication: Eve Fine, Benefits and Challenges of Diversity (University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2004). To review the entire document visit http://wiseli.engr.wisc.edu/docs/Benefits_Challenges.pdf.
RECOMMENDATIONS/TIMELINE
The following recommendations are actions that would accomplish a well developed System wide approach to culturally competent educational and training. These recommendations are offered in a phased and staggered approach offers a realistic and pragmatic timeline for implementation. Once these are strategies are complete, then more intermediate and advanced activities can take place for real cultural change.

Phase I – LSU System

- **SURVEY**
  Before beginning any culturally competent education and training program, it is required that a comprehensive assessment is conducted to determine baseline measures of diversity and inclusion. Therefore, it is recommend that the LSU System contract with a national campus climate consultant to conduct System wide campus climate and culture surveys and provide a comprehensive analysis of the campus surveys.

- **STATEMENT**
  It is recommended that an LSU System wide diversity and inclusion statement is created which establishes a code of conduct to serve as a guide for the education and training for all System faculty and staff. This statement should appear on the System homepage and should be disseminated widely, both internally and externally.

- **RESOURCES**
  It is recommended that the LSU System establish a set of resources that each campus might use as needed to implement their training programs. Below are examples of resources that if purchased as a system level would be more economically feasible:

  1. Face to Face Classroom Training: Develop annual or semi-annual mandatory classroom training and contract with professional trainers.

  2. On-Line Training Software: Purchase on-line diversity and inclusion training system that establishes annual compliances for all System employees.

  3. Train the Trainer (Grassroots) Training: Develop a grassroots effort where each campus has a group diversity and inclusion representatives that are trained to assist in educating and making a cultural change on their campus.

  4. Visiting Speaker Series: Hire professional diversity and inclusion speakers that could visit campuses to facilitate training of faculty and staff on each campus.
- **TOP DOWN APPROACH**
  It is recommended that culturally inclusive education and training should begin at the top of the System. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors, System administration, campus administration, and all levels of employees (faculty and staff) should be required to participate in training. Also, have follow up sessions offered for all employees (faculty and staff), as appropriate, to address the LSU System’s policies and procedures related to valuing and leveraging diversity to accomplish the LSU System’s mission and achieve its vision (all employees are expected to attend and participate – leaders model this expectation by their attendance.)

**Phase II – Campus Level**

- **CAMPUS STATEMENT AND STRATEGIC PLAN**
  Once campus climate and culture are determined, it is recommended that each campus develop their unique diversity and inclusion statement. Further it is recommended that each campus should develop a strategic plan that outlines the goals and objectives to increase diversity and cultural competence. This statement and strategic plan should be disseminated widely, both internally and externally.

- **ANNUAL AWARENESS**
  It is recommended that each campus provide annual diversity and inclusion awareness training for all levels of employees (administrators, faculty, and staff). With the assistance from resources at the LSU System, each campus could tailor content and materials to the campus and its culture.

- **PERFORMANCE MEASURES**
  It is recommended that diversity and inclusive excellence be incorporated as a performance measurement within all annual employee performance evaluations for all administrators, faculty and staff. It is especially critical for administrators, academic administrators and faculty whose job responsibilities include hiring or who serve on search committees would include a professional expectation of cultural inclusion.

- **DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES**
  It is recommended that each campus in the LSU System provide progressive diversity and inclusion professional development opportunities for administrators, faculty, and staff. This might include but not limited to supporting travel and encouraging participation in conferences and/or national meetings, supporting research that include transcontinental or international research, etc.

- **NEW EMPLOYEE ORIENTATION**
  It is recommended that diversity and cultural competent education and training are central in orientation for new employees. This “on-boarding” session solidifies that diversity and inclusion is a campus value and is of highest priority for the LSU System.
Phase III – Individual Responsibility
This will prove to be the most important phase. It is recommended that all leaders in the LSU System raise the bar for expectations in delivering results from a diversity initiative. Every person on each campus of the LSU System is accountable for contributing to promoting inclusion – especially administrators, Deans, and Department Chairs. Linking bonuses and merit pay to clear diversity and inclusion metrics is highly recommended.

PROJECTED BUDGET
There are basic problems that make obtaining budget information related to Education and Training difficult. Nationally recognized institutions with inclusive Education and Training initiatives are supported primarily by Human Resource Offices but are supplemented by a wide range of administrative offices and academic departments. Therefore, difficult to sort out exactly how much of the money budgeted for programs that serve all students/faculty/staff or community outreach goes toward culturally competent education and training. However, a basic budget inclusive of the major tenants of a successful, culturally competent education and training System-wide program has been provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education and Training Proposed Budget</th>
<th>Percentage of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey(s)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>No additional cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Down Approach</td>
<td>No additional cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan</td>
<td>No additional cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Awareness</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measures</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Opportunities</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Employee Orientation</td>
<td>No additional cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONCLUSION
From a background perspective, America is more diverse than at any time during its history. With this diversity comes increased interaction among cultures in the workplace, thus necessitating colleges and universities secure and respect a diverse workplace and seek education and training initiatives. Promotion of diversity can improve communication, provide for a more inclusive climate, and foster teamwork and innovation. Further research reveals the profitability of diverse programs versus those that are not. Diversity enriches the educational experience, promotes personal and professional growth, creates a healthy civil society, strengthens communities and the workplace, and prepares students to become good citizens in a pluralistic society. An approach that many institutions take is toward multiculturalism and involves race and gender as well as consideration given to communication styles, personalities, social status, and regional influences. Another consideration is to global mobilization that captures a broader view of diversity to remove barriers for historically excluded group members.
The charge given the E&T Subcommittee of the LSU Diversity Task Force was to compile and report current practices in diversity education and training within the LSU System. Additionally, the E&T Committee was asked to research and report on national and international initiatives and programs and to propose recommendations that might be implemented across the LSU System campuses.

Initially, the E&T Subcommittee conducted a brief “in-house” assessment data related to education and training practices. The questionnaire can be reviewed in the appendix labeled as attachment 1. This was achieved with the help of the LSU Diversity Task Force at-large, whereby individual members were given the responsibility of obtaining data from their specific campuses. The E&T Subcommittee compiled the institutions’ strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and challenges to inclusion of diversity education and training. Responses indicated a system-wide lack of human capital, time to dedicate to education and training, and resources, concluding that implementation of a comprehensive program would prove difficult. Other challenges were noted in the form of campus variations, fiscal priorities and budget cuts, distribution of work efforts, lack of leadership and buy-in, and resistance to change.

The Subcommittee documented opportunities that would include population and workforce trends, more productive workplace relationships, legal mandates and compliance requirements to be more inclusive, and marketing strategies that would recruit talented administrators. Additionally, the following key benefits to enhancing cross cultural education and training to the LSU Board of Supervisors were delineated:

- Strengthening of cultural competence within the System
- Enhancement of the LSU System’s reputation
- Attracting and retaining of highly talented people
- Enhancement of service levels and customer satisfaction
- Enhancement of discovery, learning, and civic engagement
- Enhancement of critical thinking and integrative complexity
- Enhancement of creativity and intellectual confidence
- Enhancement of workplace relationships and performance
- Model programs were studied to consider best practices that have been employed nationwide.
The E&T Subcommittee researched and documented three model programs from national pacesetters and included them in this white paper. The University of Illinois’ program focused on the study of diversity in the workplace in the context of demographic trends. Cornell University offers an interactive course to help organizations develop and deliver diversity training. And Diversity Training University International advocates credentialing diversity professionals and promoting culturally competent media coverage.

The E&T Subcommittee proposed recommendations to the Board of Supervisors in three phases as indicated below.

Phase I: Conducting comprehensive campus surveys; use of a System diversity and inclusion statement that establishes a code of conduct to serve as a guide for the education and training for all faculty, staff, and administrators; establishment of a set of resources; and use of a top-down approach, beginning with top administration in the LSU system.

Phase II: Requirement that each institution include diversity education and training in their campus strategic plan with a specific set of goals, e.g. orientation, search committee leadership certification, annual on-line compliance training; annual awareness; performance measures; development opportunities; and new employee orientation.

Phase III: Individual responsibility of LSU system personnel.

Further research and development resulted in proposed initiatives that would be implemented across the state among LSU System institutions of higher education. Also included is a proposed budget for implementation of the above aforementioned initiatives.

It is believed that with the LSU System’s commitment to diversity, the institution’s students and personnel will benefit with a greater sense of community and value added to its many program offerings.
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