I. Overview

The Campus Diversity Plan Oversight Committee (hereafter the committee) is charged in Faculty Policies and Procedures with responsibilities (Section III. A.) that require the members to be informed on a very broad range of programs. It is co-chaired by a representative of the chancellor and a faculty member, and requires considerable member-hours and the help of expert staff to carry out its functions. At the end of 2002-03 co-chairs Professor Deborah Brandt and Vice Chancellor Paul Barrows turned over the committee to co-chairs Professor Michael Thornton and Associate Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Climate Bernice Durand.

The last annual committee report was in December 2002. It was a comprehensive analysis of the first five years of Plan 2008, later produced as Diversity Update, which served as the basis for the required five-year report to the University of Wisconsin (UW) System. This is a briefer report on some aspects of Plan 2008, plus on the activities of the committee. There have been four main forces driving the committee’s agenda since December 2002: shaping of the new associate vice chancellor for diversity and climate position (since January 2003); the recommendations in an external review of progress on Plan 2008 (May 2003); the Supreme Court decisions on two University of Michigan cases involving affirmative action in college admissions criteria (June 2003); and the need for a Phase II plan (through the end of 2008) for Plan 2008 (due to UW System in December 2004).

The strongest recommendations of the external reviewers were first to narrow our focus and work on fewer initiatives more intensively, and second to build a system of accountability. Our response is first to work on recruitment where it has not steadily increased the number of minorities, notably in graduate and professional students and faculty, and to improve retention by improving support systems and classroom and campus climate, especially for minorities. Second, we will continue to develop efficient assessment processes to make accountability a reality. Our long-term goal is to have the infrastructure in place by the end of 2008 to sustain success in both recruiting and retaining a diverse student body, staff, and faculty.

Our report starts with a limited overview of Plan 2008, then summarizes committee activities.

II. Plan 2008

In January, 1988, the ten-year Madison Plan for UW–Madison was endorsed by then-new Chancellor Donna Shalala. A year later the UW System umbrella plan Design for Diversity was adopted. In the academic year 1997-98 the UW System held hearings to assemble the next ten-year umbrella plan, Plan 2008, which was unanimously adopted by the Board of Regents of the UW System in May,1998. During the academic year 1998-99, the UW–Madison Plan 2008 was written, with extensive consultation by a large and inclusive committee co-chaired by Vice Chancellor Paul Barrows and Professor Bernice Durand. The Campus Diversity Plan Oversight Committee was instituted in 2000 to track the progress of Plan 2008 and any future campus diversity plans.
A. The Seven Goals of Plan 2008

Goal 1. Increase the number of Wisconsin high school graduates of color who apply, are accepted, and enroll at UW System institutions.

Goal 2. Encourage partnerships that build the educational pipeline by reaching children and their parents at an earlier age.

Goal 3. Close the gap in educational achievement, by bringing retention and graduation rates for students of color in line with those of the student body as a whole.

Goal 4. Increase the amount of financial aid available to needy students and reduce their reliance on loans.

Goal 5. Increase the number of faculty, academic staff, classified staff and administrators of color, so that they are represented in the UW System workforce in proportion to their current availability in relevant job pools. In addition, work to increase their future availability as potential employees.

Goal 6. Foster institutional environments and course development that enhance learning and a respect for racial and ethnic diversity.

Goal 7. Improve accountability of the UW System and its institutions.

B. Summary of Report from External Review, May 1, 2003

An external review process at the mid-point of Plan 2008 was built into the assessment process of the plan. The senior diversity officers at the University of Minnesota and Indiana University visited Madison March 31 – April 2, 2003, and submitted the report May 1, 2003. The complete report constitutes Appendix 1 of this report. Here we group the “short list” of five strong comments and recommendations from the report.

Based on our experience as senior diversity officers at CIC universities and our knowledge of higher education diversity efforts nationally, we have concluded that the University of Wisconsin-Madison:
• is making noteworthy progress in achieving the objectives articulated in Plan 2008;
• should become more strategic in pursuing its diversity objectives by reducing the number of initiatives and increasing the intensity;
• is doing better than many Research I universities and should explore ways of telling its story more effectively on the national level;
• should find ways to celebrate the gains that are being made;
• should develop and implement an on-going assessment plan and explore ways to address issues of accountability.

We take the second, fourth and fifth recommendations particularly seriously. We look at both recruitment and retention in four categories: undergraduate students, graduate and professional students, staff, and faculty. We are focusing on improving the least successful of these efforts by building infrastructure to have in place by the end of 2008. Since accountability depends on assessment of programs, we are working to assess adequately and efficiently our major efforts. Celebrating our gains is a pleasure: new and continuing receptions, other gatherings, and awards celebrate the accomplishments of people of color on campus.
A few further recommendations from the report follow. The first two regard diversity education, a key element in changing the campus climate to be welcoming for everyone, particularly minorities. Many of the rest point out the lack of resources for diversity-related initiatives on this campus, which stands out, even in the Big Ten state schools. We have been extremely creative with resources, thanks to a few dedicated leaders, such as Vice Chancellor Paul Barrows and alumnus Wade Fetzer, to name only two. We urge the reader the review the whole report in Appendix I.

- The university should explore ways of expanding successful programs such as SEED, the Leadership Institute, SOAR, PEOPLE, Faculty Strategic Hiring, Chancellor Scholarships, etc.
- As a means of improving the campus climate, the university should require diversity education for all staff who serve in areas that provide student academic and co-curricular support services.
- Leadership and accountability for achieving the university's diversity objectives must be distributed throughout campus administrative and faculty ranks.
- In order to make sustainable progress in all aspects of diversity, especially hiring and retaining faculty of color, university leaders should call on senior faculty to take a more active role in implementing Plan 2008.
- The necessary human and fiscal resources must be made available if the university is to parlay current successful efforts into sustainable programs that help transform the culture of the university.
- The provost should allocate additional human and fiscal resources to enable the associate vice chancellors to achieve the diversity objectives articulated by the provost.
- The chancellor's cabinet must take great care to minimize the negative impact of budget reductions on the university's diversity initiatives.
- The university must intensify its efforts to improve its image among students of color and school personnel at the secondary school level.

The terminology of diversity is confusing. Plan 2008 uses both “people of color” and “targeted minorities” in its principles and goals. Targeted minority is defined as African American, Hispanic/Latino, Southeast Asian, and American Indian, with “economically disadvantaged” also used as a target group.

The Office of Academic Planning and Analysis (APA) reported in August 2004 on all the various definitions used at the federal, state, and university levels for collecting data on race and ethnicity. Our policies and programs have not been consistent in usage of these terms. In part because the various agencies use different definitions and require different information, the APA recommends in its five-page report that we consistently use the definitions included in a one-page summary that constitutes Appendix 2 of this report. The categories there are for domestic students only: Black, non-Hispanic; American Indian/Alaska Native; Asian/Pacific Islander; sub-category Southeast Asian; Hispanic; White, non-Hispanic. Minority refers to a domestic student or applicant who is Black, American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian/Pacific Islander, or Hispanic. A targeted minority is a domestic student (or applicant) who is Black, Hispanic, American Indian/Alaska Native, or Southeast Asian (inferred from the race/ethnicity population targeted in Plan 2008). We will be sorting out our goals with respect to this information.

The June 2003 U.S. Supreme Court decisions on affirmative action rule out “numeric” indicators for receiving “benefits.” Thus we can no longer aim for our minority student body to be in the same proportion as all qualified minority Wisconsin high school graduates, though it would be considered acceptable to aim for our applications (not a benefit) to be in that proportion. As a matter of interest, Wisconsin’s population is about 12% people of color, and UW-Madison (see next section) is about 9% students and 10% employees of color. One concern is that certain categories of students and employees contribute less than their share to these data. Also of interest, in the year 2050 the white U.S. population will cross the 50% line, headed downward.

(continued)
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C. Summary of Progress: Statistics, Programs, Plans

This summary is presented in order of the seven goals of Plan 2008.

Goal 1. Increase the number of Wisconsin high school graduates of color who apply, are accepted, and enroll at UW System.

We include here graphs of the past decade of first year undergraduate, graduate, and professional ethnic minority student enrollment.

**New First Year Ethnic Minority Students**

*Fall Semester Enrollment*

![Graph of new first year ethnic minority students](image)

**Undergraduate Ethnic Minority Students**

*as a Percent of Total Enrollment*

![Graph of undergraduate ethnic minority students](image)

(continued)
First-year student enrollment is on a positive trajectory, and these students will gradually work their way up the ranks. Most gains in first-year and undergraduate enrollment have been in Asian Americans, and Native Americans have barely increased, if at all. It is clear that recruitment and/or retention in our professional schools has not gone far enough yet during Plan 2008, with graduate recruitment and/or retention not much better. Any gains must be put into the perspective that the national and state pipelines are producing more qualified minorities.

These data argue for looking at our specific recruitment and retention efforts, category by category. For example, mainly at the graduate and professional level, our Linkages program with minority-serving undergraduate institutions has waned lately and we are re-establishing some contacts while trying to fill in our campus-wide list of existing contacts. As another example, most professional school recruiters have numerous other responsibilities and spend a small fraction of their time actively recruiting. Those staff are meeting to address these issues. As another example, a new early academic intervention program has been constructed for students at risk, and a new academic support service will soon be piloted that will fill in the gap in services for those students not admitted into special programs.

Goal 2. Encourage partnerships that build the educational pipeline by reaching children and their parents at an earlier age.

We show data only for the well-known and successful PEOPLE program, started as a new initiative under Plan 2008. This program brings high school students from several communities, and, in Madison, middle school and high school students, to campus for exposure to various disciplines, instruction, and research. If they successfully complete the program, graduate from high school, and qualify for admission to UW-Madison, they are admitted and receive up to five years’ tuition remission. So far, 96% of PEOPLE students who completed this precollege program have gone on to some college or university, and those at UW-Madison are doing well. The high school program will be “fully loaded” in May 2006, when the first “class” graduates from UW-Madison.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1999, 2000 &amp; 2001</th>
<th>High School Cohorts who completed the precollege portion of PEOPLE (Milwaukee, Waukesha, Racine Public Schools)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants who started in 9th grade:</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants who completed the program:</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from high school:</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>enrolled at UW-Madison:</strong></td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enrolled at other UW System Schools:</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enrolled at other colleges/universities:</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entered the trades and military:</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
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Note the near doubling of UW entering students in Fall 2004. There are several other successful pre-college programs, one of note being Posse, where a cohort of about 10 select students from large cities (ours are from Chicago and Los Angeles) receive high-quality academic preparation and leadership training in high school, then all come to UW.

Goal 3. Close the gap in educational achievement, by bringing retention and graduation rates for students of color in line with those of the student body as a whole.

If we were to retain all the minorities we recruit, we would have a good-sized increase in minorities on campus. We first look at the trends in first-year retention and six-year graduation rate, in both of which we are slowly narrowing the gap between targeted minorities and all students.

### Trend in 1st-Year Retention Rate for New Freshmen

![Graph showing trend in 1st-year retention rate for new freshmen.](image)
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We are improving, but must do better. Some positive steps have been the establishment in Fall 2003 of the Multicultural Learning Community, a residential unit on the southeast campus, and the establishment in Fall 2001 of the Freshman Interest Groups (FIGs), voluntary cohorts of 20 first-year students together taking three coordinated courses. For the Fall 2003 semester, FIGs cohort GPA was 3.255, while non-FIGs cohort GPA was 3.058. Targeted minority students FIGs cohort GPA was 3.037, while targeted minority students non-FIGs cohort GPA was 2.62. In Fall 2004 targeted minorities made up 20% of the 472 enrolled FIGs students.

Overall on campus there are 29 formal programs for students of color that we know of, and many more informal programs. The formal programs meet all criteria established by the June 2003 U.S. Supreme Court decisions on affirmative action in college admission.

A new Louis Stokes Alliance for Minority Participation (LSAMP) grant from the NSF is just being launched (November 2004), thanks to co-principal investigators Professors Molly Carnes and Douglass Henderson. The goal is to increase the number of minority bachelors degrees in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields, and most private as well as Wisconsin institutions of higher education are members of the alliance. The same two co-PI’s have submitted a parallel graduate program grant proposal to NSF, the Wisconsin Alliance for Graduate Education and the Professoriate (WI-AGEP). Both LSAMPs and AGEPs have been very successful in other states.

(continued)
Goal 4. Increase the amount of financial aid available to needy students and reduce their reliance on loans.

In the past ten years, financial aid for all students has doubled, while it has risen for undergraduates about 60%. At the same time, of course, tuition has increased as state support of UW has decreased. Need-based financial aid, rather than academic merit-based aid, favors economically disadvantaged students. We are pleased that our financial aid is based on need, opening educational opportunities to many who would not have them.
Goal 5. Increase the number of faculty, academic staff, classified staff and administrators of color, so that they are represented in the UW System workforce in proportion to their current availability in relevant job pools. In addition, work to increase their future availability as potential employees.

We appear to be doing well here with good growth sustained since 1998. Asian-American faculty are the largest category, but unfortunately the numbers are still so small that the loss of a few Black faculty results in a significant decrease on the chart. This chart illustrates one of our reporting restrictions. Federal race/ethnicity reporting mandates for employees (faculty and staff), as contrasted with students, allows for no “international” category, presumably to avoid discrimination based on visa status. Thus Black includes African citizens, Hispanic includes citizens of Spain, Mexico or Brazil, etc.

In Fall 2004, training sessions for the chairs of faculty search committees began, after nearly two years of development and piloting. The program was started by WISELI (Women in Science and Engineering Leadership Institute), a five-year Advance grant from the NSF with co-PI’s Professors Molly Carnes and Jo Handelsman. The original plan was to train search chairs in science and engineering departments, particularly in how to broaden their recruitment pools of women and minority candidates and how to recognize and compensate for the intrinsic biases we all have about gender and race. WISELI was joined by the Office of the Provost, and a committee designed the workshops. Eve Fine of WISELI assembled a resource manual, and WISELI produced a brochure on research results about biases, which is very popular at other universities as well as at UW. Most training is being led by three WISELI Leadership Team members, Carnes (Medicine), Handelsman (CALS), and Durand (most of the rest of campus). The sessions are well-received by search chairs and cover many aspects of running a successful search beyond enhancing diversity.

The success of the Women Faculty Mentoring Program needs to be duplicated for the rest of the faculty. In this program, new women faculty are offered the opportunity to be mentored by senior women faculty in related areas. The value is that the mentor is not involved in the tenure decision nor the day-to-day departmental interactions, and is a “safe” person with whom to discuss concerns. Tenured women faculty, especially those new to campus, are extended the same opportunity. We hope to develop a similar program for minority faculty, beginning with their campus visits while being recruited, through tenure.

(continued)
Race/Ethnicity of Classified Staff

Race/Ethnicity as a Percent of Academic Staff

UW-Madison Data Digest 2003-04

(continued)
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We would like to extend what we do for faculty to academic staff, and at least initially, the non-represented classified staff. Both of these groups have governance organizations that would provide mentoring, and both have very active professional development involvement.

Goal 6. Foster institutional environments and course development that enhance learning and a respect for racial and ethnic diversity.

Climate in the classroom or workplace or on campus is not easily quantified, but well-designed surveys give us much insight. WISELI carefully designed both faculty and academic staff surveys to be administered in the science and engineering departments, and the Office of the Provost supported extending the surveys to the whole campus in the Spring 2003 semester. Nearly 60% of all faculty responded. In the selected categories of academic staff, 50% were sampled and nearly 50% of those responded. The surveys will be repeated in 2006. We show two sample results for faculty. Note that congruence of response indicates that if there are problems, at least all share them at the same level.

We have some very successful diversity education programs (DEP), another crucial element in improving climate. In 2004 the student DEP, reporting to the dean of students, was reorganized and is very promising. Faculty, staff, and student DEP is centered most notable in the Equity/Diversity Resource Center (EDRC) under the direction and inspiration of Seema Kapani and her colleagues. As the external review team noted, we must broaden and enhance our DEP support.

The NSF-funded Center for Integration of Research, Teaching and Learning (CIRTL) also educates faculty and graduate students on how to incorporate diversity into all their educational endeavors.

The Women in Science & Engineering Leadership Program (WISELI) survey results
(All faculty members surveyed)

**Isolation and “Fit”**

“Fit” in Dept.: “I feel like I “fit” in my department”

Isolated in Dept.: “I feel isolated in my department”

Isolated at UW: “I feel isolated on the UW campus overall”

(continued)
These results supported another WISELI plan, to develop a series of climate workshops for department chairs, with discussions and department climate survey results held in confidence. Several of these have been held, led by Professor Handelsman and Dr. Christine Pribbenow of WISELI.

In Spring 2003 Associate Vice Chancellor for Teaching and Learning Virginia Sapiro administered a revised student survey. The Office of the Dean of Students also administered a 2003 survey designed by UW System, and the Wisconsin Alumni Association administered a 2003 survey with roughly equal numbers of minority and white respondents. Some results of the Office of the Provost survey follow.

How serious a problem do you think race relations is at the UW-Madison? (Percent rating Extremely or Somewhat Serious)

- Minority Students: 68%
- Majority Students: 47.8%

How would you rate the UW-Madison in dealing with issues of race relations? (Percent rating Excellent or Very Good)

- Minority Students: 18.1%
- Majority Students: 29.0%

Have you personally experienced what you feel is discrimination or harassment at the UW-Madison since the fall semester began? (Percent rating Yes)

- Minority Students: 16.1%
- Majority Students: 5.6%

(continued)
Goal 7. Improve accountability of the UW System and its institutions.

The new associate vice chancellor for diversity and climate (AVCDC) position is charged with oversight and coordination of the diversity efforts on campus. This means there is one point person who is expected to know as much as possible about all that goes on at this large institution, and to some degree in the greater community, to advance diversity, and to take initiative to close gaps. The AVCDC coordinates, more than directs, programs. This position was established, in part, to improve and consolidate campus accountability for diversity programs. The culture of our campus means that we operate with very few “carrots” (resources) and essentially no “sticks’ (consequences of not doing something) and therefore must rely on persuasion and good will.

Accountability depends on reporting and assessment. We have been short on assessment of programs, and it is marginal to have amateurs, such as members of the Campus Diversity Plan Oversight Committee, charged with the only formal assessment of programs.

III. Committee Report

A. Functions of the committee from *Faculty Policies and Procedures*, 6.27.B. Campus Diversity Plan Oversight Committee:

FUNCTIONS. This shared governance body is advisory to the administration, the faculty, the academic staff, and the recognized student governance organization regarding diversity policy and its planning, implementation, assessment, and revision. In performing its functions, the committee may consult with groups and individuals that it believes will provide the perspective and insight necessary to address campus diversity and climate issues. It may request information, data, and reports that it deems appropriate to make informed decisions and recommendations. It may establish subcommittees as needed, which may include individuals who are not members of the committee.

1. Addresses university diversity issues and provides for faculty, staff, and student participation in long-range planning and execution of plans.

2. Advises the chancellor on issues related to the current campus diversity plan. Meets with the chancellor at least once per semester to discuss the progress of the plan.

3. Monitors some recommendations in the current diversity plan and hears reports from groups working on those recommendations.

4. Reviews school/college/administrative division plans for implementing the campus diversity plan.

5. Plans and holds at least one campus-wide forum each academic year to solicit comments and share information on campus diversity issues. The chancellor, provost, and vice chancellor for student affairs shall each participate in the forum.

6. Assists the administration in the dissemination of information about campus diversity initiatives, and in the preparation of an annual report to the UW System and the Faculty Senate and the Academic Staff Assembly.

7. Oversees and updates procedures for the evaluation and approval of new diversity program proposals, and the university's overall diversity assessment strategy.

(continued)
8. Stays informed on and initiates, as appropriate, activities at all levels aimed at improving campus climate.

9. Stays informed on academic aspects of the current diversity plan, including academic affairs of minority or disadvantaged undergraduate, graduate, and professional students including policies and programs affecting educational opportunities, recruitment, academic progress, support services, retention, and graduation rates; credit and non-credit seminar or training courses addressing diversity; ethnic studies requirement; and ethnic studies programs.

10. Advises the academic deans on the impact of diversity priorities.

11. Stays informed on and initiates, as appropriate, activities aimed at funding campus diversity programs.

12. Coordinates its activities with other committees and administrative units.

B. 2002-03 and 2003-04 major developments

- January 2003: A new position was created in the Provost’s Office and Professor of Physics Bernice Durand became the first associate vice chancellor for diversity and climate. For three years, Bernice Durand and Paul Barrows co-chaired the development, writing, and implementation of Plan 2008, together with Ruby Paredes. Durand’s first two years have been spent learning about the broad array of diversity programs on campus and sorting out where our efforts need to be re-organized to do better. She has also led various climate initiatives.

- Spring 2003: Virginia Sapiro, associate vice chancellor for teaching and learning, reported to the committee in 2003-04 on the results of a re-designed three-year undergraduate student satisfaction survey undertaken in Spring 2003. The Office of the Dean of Students also conducted a survey in that semester, designed by UW System staff. Both surveys contained questions about campus climate. The Wisconsin Alumni Association (WAA) also conducted a survey of alumni, balanced between whites and those of color. These efforts address Goals 3, 6, and 7 of Plan 2008.

- Spring 2003: Climate surveys of all faculty and a sampling of academic staff were conducted, and are planned to be repeated every three years. The basic survey was sponsored and designed by the Women in Science and Engineering Leadership Institute (WISELI), funded by an NSF Advance grant, with co-principal investigators Professors Molly Carnes and Jo Handelsman. The provost’s office extended the survey from exclusively science and engineering faculty and staff to the whole campus. This addressed Goal 6, the “climate” goal.

- Winter 2003-04: One American Indian student left UW-Madison after two physical assaults. Several American Indian students were invited to share their insight and experience with the committee. Arising from that conversation was a suggestion that we create a safe space for them on campus. Associate Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Climate Durand made contact with Facilities, Planning and Management staff and the Indian students, staff, and faculty on campus met to discuss and compile their needs. This is resuming in 2004-05. The students asked the committee to incorporate student experiences into the Fall Forum. These efforts relate to Goals 3, 6, and 7 of Plan 2008.

- 2003-2004: Mary Louis Gomez, professor of curriculum and instruction, directed exit interviews to learn why students of color choose to leave the university. The effort was continued by student Sakhroy Lay under the direction of Ruby Paredes, assistant vice chancellor of student affairs. Three principle reasons for students of color leaving campus are family difficulties, finances, and frustration over low grades. Not many students participated in the interviews, however, and a clear need to reach a larger pool was discussed. It is very difficult to locate students who don’t return, since many of them did not realize when they last left campus that they would not return. This addresses Goals 3, 6, and 7.
• 2003-04: The committee discussed the need to keep resources on diversity in an accessible place, such as a website. In the Fall 2004 we are exploring what resources are needed to do this, mainly staff. This also will address Goal 6, making information broadly accessible.

• Fall 2004: WISELI and the provost’s office collaborated in designing a workshop for the chairs of faculty search committees, to educate them about developing and attracting a diverse pool of candidates. The workshops were fully launched, with full support from the deans, in Fall 2004, led by Molly Carnes in the Medical School, Jo Handelsman in CALS, and Bernice Durand in the rest of the campus. This will advance Goal 6.

• Fall 2004: Members of the committee and others on campus attended and presented at a UW System best-practices conference. Goal 6.

• 2003-ongoing: Bernice Durand has begun development activity by opening an account with the UW Foundation to help support some diversity efforts beyond what the provost’s office can support. There is one full-time person in student affairs who successfully raises funds for some diversity programs, plus one staff person at the UW Foundation. Additional funding for diversity efforts is still necessary, and this issue was charged as part of the tasks for all subcommittees. The need for increased funding, which mainly supports staff to do the work of recruiting and supporting people, touches all the Plan 2008 Goals.

C. Further Themes of Discussions

• (Fall 2003) Admissions: Rob Seltzer, director of admissions, briefed the committee on the implications for campus admissions policy of the June 2003 U.S. Supreme Court decisions on affirmative action. He said that the university is on safe ground, but that we need to be sure to clarify the link between the university’s overall educational mission and the importance of diversity. Discussion later in the year clarified our task of communicating how we can maintain our diversity efforts to include race as a factor without excluding anyone in the process.

• (Winter 2003-04) Directions of Plan 2008: Cora Marrett, UW System senior vice-president for academic affairs, met with the committee. She suggested that not all of 2008 goals need to be emphasized, that the idea of critical mass – important in the U.S. Supreme Court comments – needs to be reconsidered, and how all the efforts fit into overall mission/vision of this institution (that is, what is the compelling interest of diversity to what we do?). She said that campuses are not expected to provide detailed plans, but rather to think broadly about where to focus their efforts most effectively.

• (Fall 2003) Recruitment: Walter Lane, assistant dean with the PEOPLE and Posse Programs, and Cleveland James, associate director of admissions, described pre-college programs (PEOPLE and Posse) and “standard” recruitment of students of color.

• (Fall 2003) Early intervention: Ruby Paredes, assistant vice chancellor for student affairs, reported on Connecting for Academic Success (CAS), a pilot project to identify academic trouble very early in the first semester and direct the student to support staff.

• (Spring 2004) Professor Marlys Macken (Department of Linguistics) announced a new Hmong Studies initiative on the UW-Madison campus. She also noted the support of such efforts by the governor.

• (Spring 2004) Student Sakhouy Lay reported on a committee established by L&S Dean Phillip Certain, to investigate a potential comparative ethnic studies program/department.

D. Further events

• February 2003 Multicultural Fair
• April, 2003, September 2004 campus-wide diversity forums, part of the accountability plan in Plan 2008
• April-May, 2003, external review by two Big Ten senior diversity officers
• Spring 2003 Madison parents of color meeting with chancellor

(continued)
• Spring 2003 and 2004 Madison association of parents of students of color and others concerned about achievement gap has university participants
• Spring, summer 2003, winter 2004, women of color conversations at a reception and brown-bag lunches, then reception honoring past and present awardees of the annual UW System Woman of Color award.
• 2003-ongoing Diversity Education Programs (DEP) such as SEED, SEEDED, Student SEED, Leadership Institute, Excellence Institute grow less rapidly than the demand
• 2003-ongoing Service Learning courses contribute to diversity awareness of UW students
• Fall 2003 Multicultural Learning Community starts (part of a residence hall)
• Fall 2003 UW System meeting on U.S. Supreme Court Michigan decisions
• Fall 2003 national meeting (in Chicago) on U.S. Supreme Court Michigan decisions
• Fall 2003, 2004 Students of Color Connections retreat
• November 2003, 2004 understanding privilege retreat with white students
• February 2004 MOSIAC joint retreat with white students and students of color who participated in their separate fall retreats
• April 2004 regents meeting on diversity with Durand speaking on the need for cultural competence of graduates and on UW-Madison programs that work
• Spring 2004 faculty of color reception hosted by the governor, after which Stan Davis, deputy chief of staff to the governor, visited the committee to discuss the governor’s support for diversity.
• Summer 2004 Student Diversity Education Programs (DEP) reorganized
• Fall 2004 UW System best practices conference
• Spring 2005 expected pilot of new academic support service to supplement TRIO, AAP, and others
• Spring 2005 expected pilot of a community-driven “Pre-PEOPLE” program

E. Subcommittees

The year began with a discussion of the goals of the diversity plan and how subcommittees would be restructured to meet the goals. We decided the focus should remain around the seven goals of 2008 (see section I.A.). However, we decided to focus our efforts on a few initiatives, based on outside reviewer suggestions. After much discussion, we identified sub-themes for 2004-2005: classroom climate; academic support and early warning/mentoring; and harassment, race/class privilege training and awareness programs (identify grievance procedures, for example), plus professional development. This was later amended to have all these efforts focus on the theme of retention, more specifically classroom climate, academic support, and training.

At various times during the year, the subcommittees reported on their work. For example,
• The Recruitment Subcommittee developed survey questions about recruiting into STEM fields;
• the Environment Subcommittee investigated how to identify best practices;
• the Faculty/Staff Recruitment Subcommittee examined progress in minority hiring and shared comparative data on CIC faculty/staff demographics;
• the Recruitment and Retention Subcommittee created a report card on plan 2008, and emphasized the university’s investment and marginal cost to expand each successful program;
• the Education Subcommittee met with Chemistry Learning Center staff, and planned to meet with Math Chancellor’s Scholars and AHANA.

1. Recruitment: This subcommittee is instructed to work closely with the shared governance Committee on Undergraduate Recruitment, Admissions and Financial Aid (CURAFA).

2. Pipeline: This subcommittee is instructed to meet with, and perhaps invite as additional members, members of CURAFA, PEOPLE, Posse, the schools and community.
3. Retention: This subcommittee will incorporate academics (a former stand-alone subcommittee) and diversity education plus other retention programs. It could also be supplemented, e.g. by academic advisers.

4. Fundraising: Funding considerations will be incorporated into all committees, and may become the subject of a stand-alone committee.

5. Faculty/Staff Recruitment & Retention: This committee will also incorporate Academics and Diversity Education plus the other retention programs.

6. Campus/Classroom Environment (climate) and Curriculum will replace the former stand-alone Climate Committee. This subcommittee will incorporate academics, ethnic studies programs and required courses, curriculum and Diversity Education plus the other climate programs. At least some of its members will be connected to the Campus Climate Network Group (CCNG).

7. Accountability: This committee will have at least two special charges: examine the reciprocal diversity roles and expectations of the university and community, and analyze the recommendations of the other committees under their charge to evaluate projects, which includes measures of success and accountability. In addition this committee, together with the committee co-chairs, will assure that the annual report and campus forum are organized.

The subcommittees’ task for the spring semester 2004 was to identify “overarching goals” and “operational goals.” The four overarching goals were:

- find the roots of our lack of progress, in addition to the barriers to progress;
- determine if our diversity program strengths as outlined in the December 2002 annual report and April 2003 external review address all components of our diversity program needs;
- determine if our programs grow our strengths, are specifically designed to address our weaknesses, and whether truly address our needs;
- evaluate at least the most prominent programs to aid in answering the above questions.

The operational goals involved evaluating how the programs in the part of Plan 2008 which each subcommittee addresses fit into the above overarching goals.

In order to assess better our strengths and weaknesses we also developed a template for evaluating the contributions to achieving the Plan 2008 goals for every campus diversity project or program. The evaluation was organized around four issues.

- First, who is served by the program? Among the questions asked of each program were: Why is the program needed and how do we know that? What goals for the university, or school, college, or unit does the program serve and how does the program fit into the campus diversity plan? The goal here is to assess the relative importance of the needs the program serves, and understand the link between the program and the needs it serves.
- Second, what are the costs to implement the program? What are its costs in full-time employees? What other expenses are there (e.g., space)? Where does its funding come from? The goal here is to assess the relative cost of the program given its contribution to the overall goals and our specific needs.
- Third, how is the program evaluated? Who is accountable to whom? What are the measures of success? Why are these the best measures of success? What are the barriers to success and what would help overcome those barriers?
- Finally, based on the subcommittee’s assessment of the success, barriers and needs of the program, how successful is the program? Does it receive the correct support to do the job expected of it, and are our expectations of what to expect from the program reasonable? What is the subcommittee’s recommendation: enhance it, consolidate its efforts with another program, scale it back?

(continued)
F. Plans

In Spring 2004 the committee selected retention as its main theme for 2004-05, based on the fact that we would have a much more diverse campus if we improved our retention rates. Within retention, the committee chose classroom climate, academic support and training. While the subcommittees are still organized by Plan 2008 goals, they will relate the programs under those goals to their roles in retaining students, staff, and faculty of color.

The subcommittees will help identify those programs that will help us meet our long-term goal to have the infrastructure in place by the end of 2008 to sustain success in both recruiting and retaining a diverse student body, staff and faculty.

IV. Committee Membership 2003-04

Co-chairs and faculty
Durand, Bernice, co-chair, Office of the Provost
Thornton, Michael, co-chair, Ethnic Studies, Afro-American Studies
Leong, Sally, Plant Pathology
Macken, Marlys, Linguistics
Brandt, Deborah, English
Bloch, Mimi, Curriculum and Instruction
Fultz, Michael, Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis

Students (only three were appointed by ASM)
Benjamin, Pabitra
Miranda, Leon Carlos
Montoya-Humphrey, Colette

Academic Staff
Mike Dean, Space Science and Engineering, Semester I
Browning, Bruno, L&S Learning Support Services, Semester II
Crim, Elton, Student Advocacy and Judicial Affairs
Iaccarino, Greg, L&S Student Academic Affairs
Nossal, Susan, Physics
Pham, Ann, Multicultural Student Center
Steffenhagen, Bill, Dairy Science

Classified Staff
Czynszak-Lyne, Mary, L&S Honors Program
Marty, Nancy Shaker, State Lab of Hygiene

Alumni
Braunginn, Steve, Urban League of Greater Madison
Maltes, Farshad, WHEDA

Community
Stitt, Linda
Odom, John (for part of year)

Ex Officio
Barrows, Paul, Student Affairs
Davis, Richard, Music
Deer, Ada, American Indian Studies Program, Social Work
Hong, Luoluo, Office of the Dean of Students
Horikawa, Rodney Yasushi, University Health Services
Kapani, Seema, EDRC (Equity & Diversity Resource Center)
Moss, Michael, Intercollegiate Athletics
Paredes, Ruby, Student Affairs
Piñero, Luis, EDRC
Symonette, Hazel, Human Resource Development and EDRC

(continued)
Appendix 1: Report from External Review, May 1, 2003

University of Wisconsin-Madison
Plan 2008 Review, conducted by

Sallye McKee, Associate Provost
Multicultural & Academic Affairs
University of Minnesota

Charlie Nelms, Vice President
Student Development & Diversity
Indiana University

Site Visit: March 31 - April 2, 2003
Report presented: May 1, 2003

With development of the Madison Plan in 1988, the University of Wisconsin-Madison became one of the first public research universities in the United States to boldly and publicly declare its aspirations for becoming a more diverse institution. Followed by the Madison Commitment in 1994, and now Plan 2008 - A Blueprint to Enhance Campus Diversity, the University has consistently articulated the view that diversity and excellence are core values of a great university. Although UW-Madison has fallen short of achieving its diversity aspirations, we applaud the University for its vision, passion, and engagement of the University community in the process.

Consistent with the recommendations contained in Plan 2008, a two-person review team from CIC institutions accepted an invitation from the co-chairs of the Diversity Oversight Committee to conduct a mid-year review of the University's progress toward achieving the objectives outlined in the Plan. In carrying out their charge, the reviewers read Plan 2008 along with numerous other documents and held structured and unstructured conversations with over 200 members of the University community. In addition to meeting with the chancellor, provost, and deans, we attended a day-long Diversity Forum which attracted approximately 400 registered participants plus about 200 drop-in attendees.

We were impressed with the enthusiasm, engagement, and passion exhibited by everyone who attended the Forum. We know of no other university in America where the chancellor and other campus leaders have taken an active role in such an event and concluded the day by assembling on a stage to answer questions from the University community!

Based on our experience as senior diversity officers at CIC universities and our knowledge of higher education diversity efforts nationally, we have concluded that the University of Wisconsin-Madison:

• is making noteworthy progress in achieving the objectives articulated in Plan 2008;
• should become more strategic in pursuing its diversity objectives by reducing the number of initiatives and increasing the intensity;
• is doing better than many Research I universities and should explore ways of telling its story more effectively on the national level;
• should find ways to celebrate the gains that are being made;
• should develop and implement an ongoing assessment plan and explore ways to address issues of accountability.

This report is organized around several broad categories: consensus, commendations, observations, and recommendations.

CONSENSUS

A clear consensus emerged around seven central issues

• Diversity is a strongly held institutional value. It was described by some campus leaders as the fifth competence with benefits accruing to both minority and majority students.
• A high level of commitment and passion was exhibited by staff who have participated in the various programs designed to increase leadership capacity and the advocacy for diversity.
• Leadership and accountability for achieving the University's diversity objectives must be distributed throughout campus administrative and faculty ranks.
• The University must intensify its efforts to improve its image among students of color and school personnel at the secondary school level.
• Senior faculty must assume a greater leadership role in efforts to diversify the UW-Madison faculty and academic staff.
• The necessary human and fiscal resources must be made available if the University is to parlay current successful efforts into sustainable programs that help transform the culture of the University.
• Given the uncertainty of the U.S. Supreme Court decision in the University of Michigan admission lawsuits, campus leaders must be prepared to take the necessary steps to minimize the legal vulnerability of its diversity programs and services.

RECOMMENDATIONS

While the reviewers found numerous examples of programs that any University would be proud to offer the following are ones that we would note:
• A strong commitment to diversity and student success by the chancellor and members of the senior leadership team is reflected in the recent allocation of $1,000,000.00 to support the Faculty Strategic Hiring Program and the decision not to cut the budget for student-related programs to the same extent of other campus units.
• The collaborative leadership approach embraced by the co-chairs of the steering committee for Plan 2008 is exemplary. We note the leadership role and commitment of Professor Deborah Brandt.
• The goals articulated in Plan 2008 are comprehensive and appropriate for a Research I Land-Grant University.
• The PEOPLE Program shows considerable promise for strengthening ties between the K-12 system and UW-Madison.
• UW-Madison is one of a handful of major universities with an ethnic studies requirement, which is one way of ensuring that graduates leave the University with a greater appreciation for the culture of others.
• The Law School has demonstrated exemplary leadership and success in attracting and graduating a diverse pool of students.
• Those students, faculty, staff, and administrators with whom we met exhibited a high level of engagement in the University's diversity endeavors.

OBSERVATIONS

Our review led us to make the following observations:
• There are unexploited opportunities to enhance the level of synergy between campus units that offer a variety of diversity related programs and services.
• The involvement of senior faculty in helping the University achieve its diversity objectives is not clearly articulated.
• Plan 2008 includes a large number of ambitious initiatives without adequate attention to the human and fiscal resources needed to accomplish them.
• Except for the student services division, there appears to be little ethnic diversity within the academic and administrative ranks of the University.
• UW-Madison's image within the minority community throughout Wisconsin needs careful review and attention.
• UW-Madison needs to explore ways of telling its diversity story more effectively on a national level.
• While Plan 2008 makes clear the need for all members of the University community to assist with meeting the University's diversity objectives, the accountability for doing so is not as well articulated.
Over the past two decades, the University has made limited progress in diversifying the faculty ranks. Yet, there does not appear to be much consistent discomfort with the slowness of the pace.

Programs such as SOAR, SEED, and the Leadership Institute, for example, offer significant potential for institutional transformation. Plan 2008 reflects a high level of decentralization without clearly articulated measures of effectiveness and accountability. Those who serve in the roles of associate vice chancellor (for faculty and staff programs, diversity and climate, and teaching and learning) are in key positions to assist with the successful implementation of diversity initiatives within academic affairs. However, the extent to which they are able to do so entails clarifying their role and empowering them by allocating the necessary human and fiscal resources.

The availability of financial resources for undergraduate scholarships and graduate fellowships is essential for increasing minority representation throughout the campus. The comprehensiveness of Plan 2008 notwithstanding, attention should be given to developing benchmarks against which to measure the University's progress and overall success.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Although our stay at the University was brief, we believe the University of Wisconsin-Madison can achieve many of the goals articulated in Plan 2008 by implementing the following recommendations:

- The University of Wisconsin-Madison should consider implementing fewer initiatives with greater intensity.
- To maximize the impact of the Faculty Strategic Hiring Program, the academic deans should consider "cluster hiring" in disciplines where there is a stronger pool of potential faculty of color.
- As a means of improving the campus climate, the University should require diversity education for all staff who serve in areas that provide student academic and co-curricular support services.
- The Chancellor's cabinet must take great care to minimize the negative impact of budget reductions on the University's diversity initiatives.
- The University administration should ascertain why students of color leave the University and take corrective action. Consideration should be given to consistently completing exit interviews with all students of color who withdraw or graduate from the University.
- Immediate steps should be taken to increase the enrollment of students of color in the School of Business and other professional schools. Consideration should be given to utilizing criteria that appropriately balance qualitative and quantitative measures of success. The significance of diversity from a corporate perspective was well articulated by the panelists from Proctor & Gamble, Kimberly Clark, and Cargill Corporation who participated in the Diversity Forum.
- Given the fact that the University of Wisconsin is a nationally recognized university located in a state with a relatively small pool of students of color, the University must seek ways to improve the competitiveness of its financial aid and support programs for undergraduate, graduate, and professional minority students.
- The University should explore ways of expanding successful programs such as SEED, the Leadership Institute, SOAR, PEOPLE, Faculty Strategic Hiring, Chancellor Scholarships, etc.
- In an effort to increase the persistence and graduation rates of students of color, the provost should convene a task force comprised of a cross-section of members of the University community to develop an action plan for consideration and implementation.
- In pursuit of the University's diversity objectives, the University administration should provide incentives to increase collaboration and synergy between various administrative and academic units.
- In order to make sustainable progress in all aspects of diversity, especially hiring and retaining faculty of color, University leaders should call on senior faculty to take a more active role in implementing Plan 2008.
- The Oversight Committee should design and implement an ongoing assessment program to determine which initiatives work, the extent of the impact, and how to expand those that work.
• In admitting students to majors, the University should examine the admissions criteria to ensure that students of color are not excluded because of a disproportionate reliance on quantitative measures such as test scores and cumulative grade point averages.
• The provost should allocate additional human and fiscal resources to enable the associate vice chancellors to achieve the diversity objectives articulated by the provost.
• The University should develop and implement a comprehensive marketing, outreach, and recruitment plan focused on students of color who attend selected high schools and community colleges throughout Wisconsin.
• To ensure that members of the ethnic studies faculty are not unduly burdened by having to teach required ethnic studies courses, additional faculty lines should be allocated and increased efforts should be made to recruit faculty from other disciplines to teach these required courses.
Appendix 2: Definitions of Race/Ethnicity Terms

DEFINITIONS OF RACE/ETHNIC TERMS
Definitions Used for Collection and Reporting Purposes at UW-Madison

Academic Planning and Analysis, Office of the Provost

To address definitional issues and confusion about the use of various terms for race and ethnicity, we provide the following definitional foundation. These definitions are based in federal and state legislation. This information is collected from students at the point of application for admission according to these mandated categories. These categories define the universe of categories available for reporting purposes and in use by Undergraduate Admissions and other admitting offices, the Office of the Registrar, Academic Planning and Analysis (APA), and other reporting units.

International Student: A person who is not a citizen or national of the United States and who is in the US on a visa or temporary basis and who does not have the right to remain indefinitely; “international student” is a common and often preferable synonym for the term “non resident alien” (US Department of Education). Racial and ethnic information for this group of students is not collected and there is no requirement to report it. A subset of these students – those with a J-1 or F-1 visa – are reported in SEVIS.

Domestic Student: A United States citizen, resident alien and other eligible non-citizen including a non-citizen who has been admitted as a legal immigrant for the purpose of obtaining permanent resident alien status and who holds either an alien registration card, a Temporary Resident Card, or an Arrival-Departure Record with a notation that conveys legal immigrant status such as Section 207 Refugee, Section 208 Asylee, Conditional Entrant Parolee or Cuban-Haitian (non non-resident aliens, according to the US Department of Education). These students are eligible for Federal financial aid.

The following terms refer to domestic students only. (Source is US DoE, unless otherwise noted.)

1. Black, non Hispanic: A domestic student having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa (except those of Hispanic origin).
2. American Indian/Alaskan Native: A domestic student having origins in any of the original peoples of North America and who maintains cultural identification through tribal affiliation or community recognition.
3. Asian/Pacific Islander: A domestic student having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, the Indian Subcontinent, or Pacific Islands. This includes people from China, Japan, Korea, the Philippine Islands, American Samoa, India, and Vietnam.
   • Southeast Asian: A domestic Asian/Pacific Islander student who is also a person who was admitted to the United States after December 31, 1975 and who either is a former citizen of Laos, Vietnam, Cambodia or whose ancestor was or is a citizen of Laos, Vietnam or Cambodia. (also Wisconsin State Statutes)
4. Hispanic: A domestic student of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race.
5. White, non-Hispanic: A domestic student having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, North Africa, or Middle East (except those of Hispanic origin).

Minority: A domestic student (or applicant) who is Black, American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian/Pacific Islander, or Hispanic.

Targeted minority: A domestic student (or applicant) who is Black, Hispanic, American Indian/Alaskan Native, or Southeast Asian (inferred from the race/ethnicity population targeted in Plan 2008).
APA recommends that these definitions be applied uniformly to policies and programs for which they are relevant, or that programs and policies that deviate from these definitions use explicit and distinct terminology and provide a policy-based justification.

For more detailed explanations of the source of these definitions and issues associated with non-standard usage, see the companion paper, Issues With The Use of Race/Ethnic Terms and the Identification of Minority and Targeted Minority Students at UW-Madison (August 2004).