

**Review Team Report
On the Status of Diversity Programs on the
Campus of the University of Missouri-Columbia**

April 21, 2004

I. Preface

This report presents the findings of team charged with conducting a multi-faceted examination of the University of Missouri-Columbia's (UM-C) overall approach to addressing issues related to equal opportunity and diversity. The specific areas of inquiry included the recruitment and retention of black faculty and staff, and an assessment of UM-C's organizational structure for diversity issues (See Appendices A and B).

The report is based upon two site visits to the UM-C campus, telephone conversations with UM-C employees, and documents provided by various administrative officers. The review team included Linda Greene, Professor of Law and Associate Vice Chancellor at the University of Wisconsin, Frank Motley, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Support at Indiana University Bloomington, and James Stewart, Professor of Labor Studies and Industrial Relations and African and African American Studies at the Pennsylvania State University. Michael Middleton, Deputy Chancellor, and Robert Weems, Interim Associate Vice Chancellor for Equity (The Associate Vice Chancellor), coordinated the two Review Team Site visits. The interview schedules were pre-arranged with some modifications in response to suggestions from the review team. See Appendix C for the Itineraries of the Review Team Site visits.

II. Background and Findings

In 1988, after a Justice Department mediation on race issues at UM-C, UM-C signed a Mediation Agreement mandating a number of initiatives focused primarily on African Americans. The Review Team used the 1988 Mediation Agreement as a beginning frame of reference for the review of the campus. The review team was unable to ascertain an official UM-C position regarding the current status of the 1988 agreement. However, despite differing opinions about the contemporary relevance of the Mediation Agreement, it provides a useful and important benchmark for assessing subsequent developments. The findings are organized into three categories: A. Diversity Management Challenges; B. Organizational Challenges; C. Academic Challenges.

A. University Management Challenges

▪ Challenges Identified in the 1988 Mediation Agreement

- In 1988, following mediation by the U.S. Department of Justice, the UM-C signed a Mediation Agreement mandating initiatives focusing primarily on African Americans. These initiatives included:
 - Formulation of a position description for a Vice-Provost for Minority Affairs and Faculty Development
 - Appointment of a Minority Affairs Committee
 - Establishment of a permanent position for coordination of the recruitment and retention of minority graduate students
- The U.S. Department of Justice Mediation Agreement described various indicators of UM-C's commitment to implement policies and programs intended to fulfill the spirit of the Mediation Agreement. These indicators included:
 - Addition of undergraduate scholarships and graduate fellowships
 - Special programs to assist minorities desiring to enroll in professional schools
 - Specific services to assist minority students experiencing academic difficulty provided through the Learning Center
- The Mediation Agreement notes that "Because of the racial composition of the State of Missouri, the bulk of the University's minority recruitment efforts have been and will be directed toward increasing the recruitment, retention, and graduation of Black Students" (Mediation Agreement, p. 4).
 - The Mediation Agreement states "An additional position has been filled in the Office of Admissions with specific responsibility of helping increase recruitment of minority students. The Admissions Office is considering the addition of yet a third minority recruiter" (Mediation Agreement, p. 3).
 - The Mediation Agreement also states that "other minority groups are also under-represented in higher education in general, and at the University of Missouri-Columbia in particular. The University's Affirmative Action Program must continue to be directed at all protected classes that are so designated by civil rights law" (Mediation Agreement, p. 6)
- The Mediation Agreement also describes the commitment of the UM-C to increasing the number and percentages of Black faculty members on the campus. The agreement indicates "A Faculty Affirmative Action Program in the Provost's Office assists all departments in the recruitment of minority faculty members" (Mediation Agreement, p. 6).
- The Mediation Agreement indicates that the Office of the Vice Provost for Minority Affairs and the Office of Equal Opportunity constitute "the appropriate

routes to investigate issues such as the upward mobility of Black faculty and staff” (Mediation Agreement, p. 8). It is stated in the agreement that “The University is committed to assisting all its faculty and staff advance in their careers and will be especially cognizant of the needs and goals of minority faculty and staff, and will, recommend that the Chancellor’s Minority Affairs Committee review this matter and offer proposed policy” (Mediation Agreement, p. 8).

▪ **Current Diversity Management Challenges**

- At the present time the UM-Columbia does not have a comprehensive approach to diversity management, although the review team was told that plans are underway to initiate a systematic diversity strategic planning process.
 - There is no diversity strategic plan or planning process
 - The University’s strategic plan includes only limited mention of diversity issues
- There has been a decline in the alignment between current diversity management policies and practices at the UM-C and the commitments set forth in the Mediation Agreement. Indicators of this reduced alignment include, but are not limited to:
 - Redefinition of the responsibilities of the position of Vice Provost for Minority Affairs
 - Uncertain status of the Chancellor’s Minority Affairs Committee
- The UM-C has not clearly communicated its diversity goals or priorities to administrators and constituency groups.
- The university has implemented a top-down diversity management paradigm without a campus-wide dialogue to clarify issues and various constituent perspectives.
- Many African American faculty and staff are especially disaffected and demoralized by their perception that some members of the administration, including the Vice Provost Handy Williamson (hereinafter Vice Provost), are indifferent and sometimes hostile to African American concerns.
- There appears to be an almost total breakdown in communication and goodwill between the administration including the Vice Provost, and the Black Faculty Staff Organization (BFSO). BFSO representatives told the Review Team that:
 - The university does not care about the Black concerns raised by Black faculty and staff
 - Blacks experience a hostile environment at UM-C

- Most academic departments are either unsupportive of, or hostile to, Black faculty
 - UM-C administration is indifferent to Black faculty
 - Black faculty are typically not considered for prestigious awards, appointments, and grants
 - UM-C administration is not committed to affirmative action
 - There are no focused efforts to improve climate such as diversity training programs
 - The Vice Provost in charge of diversity management efforts has an antagonistic relationship with the BFSO and does not support affirmative action to benefit Blacks.
- Some constituencies believe that they are benefiting from the current thrusts of the university's diversity management efforts.
 - Interviews with members of the Hispanic and Latin American Faculty and Staff Association and the Pan Asian Faculty/Staff Association revealed a high degree of satisfaction with the current directions and the leadership of the Vice Provost
 - The review team did not have the opportunity to interview any Native American members of the University of Missouri community
- The UM-C excludes Women and gender equity issues from its diversity management paradigm, per se, although various offices support women's equity issues and the Status of Women Committee meets annually with the Vice Provost and meets monthly with one of the Vice Provost's staff members.
- Women interviewed believed that there are significant women's issues at UM-C, including:
 - Barriers to faculty retention and promotion
 - Limited representation of Women in the senior academic ranks
 - Inconsistent treatment of non-regular faculty, who are disproportionately female, across academic units
 - Inadequate support services and policies such as day care options and maternity benefits
 - Low staff salaries in areas with a high proportion of female employees
- Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender equity issues appear muted, although support services are available for faculty, staff, and students
 - The Board of Curators recently added this constituency to the list of groups protected from discrimination by university policies
 - Very few students, faculty, and staff are openly Lesbian Gay, Bisexual, or Transgender
 - Very few members of this constituency are vocal about their concerns and issues

- Individuals with Disabilities have unmet needs despite the presence of offices to provide support. These unmet needs include:
 - The desire for the presence of persons with visible difficulties in high-level staff and administrative positions
 - More coordinated oversight of services for faculty, staff, and students
- The available data for the period 1989 – 2002 indicate that UM-C Columbia has not made significant progress in increasing the representation of African American, Latino/Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Native American Students among undergraduate students since the mid-1990s (see Appendix D).
- The available data for the period 1989 – 2002 indicate that UM-C Columbia has sustained high first year retention rates for all underrepresented groups. Despite a general upward trend in six-year graduation rates for all students, African Americans are the only underrepresented group that has experienced a similar sustained upward trajectory for six-year graduation rates. (These gains may be attributable to the work of Academic Retention Services.) Other groups have experienced significantly more variation (see Appendix E).
- The available data for the period 1989 – 2002 indicate that UM-C Columbia has not made significant progress in increasing the representation of African American, Latino/Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Native American Students among first professional and total graduate enrollments (see Appendix F). First Professional enrollments have been stagnant or declining for all underrepresented groups since the mid 1990s. The representation of African Americans in graduate programs declined steadily between 1998 and 2002, while the representation of other underrepresented groups has been largely stagnant although absolute numbers have increased.
- The available data for the period 1993 – 2002 indicate that UM-C Columbia has made little progress in increasing the representation of African Americans, Latino/Hispanics, and Native Americans among the full-time ranked faculty. In contrast the numbers of Asian/Pacific Islander faculty have increased significantly.

B. Organizational Challenges

- UM-C's major current organizational challenge is the existence of two administrative offices concurrently charged with responsibility to address the concerns of the African American and other diversity groups.
 - The responsibilities of the Vice Provost include direct oversight of the Women's Studies Program, African American Studies, International Affairs, and diversity
 - The responsibilities of the Interim Associate Vice Chancellor for Equity were outlined in Chancellor Richard Wallace's April 15, 2003 appointment letter to Robert Weems. The letter stated that Weems is to report to the Deputy Chancellor and:
 - Facilitate, monitor, and assist in the coordination of African American related programs
 - Serve as an advocate for the interests of African American Faculty
 - Work with a review team to review ...current structure, design a permanent structure...develop our comprehensive plan for addressing issues of diversity on campus
 - The Review team concluded that the Associate Vice Chancellor and the Vice Provost do not have a collaborative relationship and this friction impedes progress in enhancing diversity at UM-C.
- The Review team could not ascertain the respective roles of the Interim Associate Vice Chancellor, the Provost, the Chancellor, or the President in managing and promoting diversity initiatives and in ensuring accountability regarding outcomes. The relative responsibility of senior university officers for establishing priorities and setting an institutional agenda is also not clear.
- The Review team could not identify the institutional decision-making procedures nor the extant mechanisms to solicit input from constituencies necessary for effective diversity management.
- There is significant lack of representation of racial/ethnic minority groups in key academic, administrative, and programmatic units.
 - There is almost no racial/ethnic diversity among key administrative personnel and student service office staff and there is no plan to achieve greater diversity of professional and other non-faculty positions.
 - There appears to be no systematic plan to retain Black faculty or increase the number Black faculty or faculty members from other underrepresented groups. The Review Team did not have the opportunity to obtain information from Deans and Department Heads about the history and current patterns of support provided by the Vice Provost's office to facilitate faculty recruitment.

- Standard reporting procedures to track the numbers of faculty and staff are in place; however, the Review Team could not determine how or whether scrutiny of employment patterns affects policy and programmatic decisions.
- The absence of systematic efforts to increase staff diversity hampers the development of effective initiatives to increase student diversity.
 - There is no plan to hire experienced minority staff in the office of admissions.
 - There is no comprehensive plan for the recruitment of African American and other minority students.
 - There are no pre-college programs for the development of African- American and other minority students.
- The current relationship between the Student Success Center (SSC) and Academic Retention Services does not serve the interests of minority students
- The Student Success Center (SSC) is the center of student support activities
 - The SSC does not have a diverse staff
 - The SSC has no experienced minority staff members
 - The SSC has no plan to increase the diversity of its staff
- Academic Retention Services (ARS) primarily serves African American and other minority students
 - ARS, now located in the SSC building, no longer controls the meeting space necessary for its confidential work with students.
 - SSC does not have a collegial working relationship with the ARS.
 - The disparity in space allocation has negatively affected the collegiality of SSC and ARS
 - The staff of the two units is negatively impacted by the disparity in space allocations
- The Black Student Center is an important resource supporting the needs of African American students

C. Academic Issues

The discussion of academic issues is limited to consideration of selected programs providing specialized instruction. The Review Team did not have the opportunity to examine other issues, such as the manner in which diversity matters are treated in the general education curriculum.

- **Black Studies**
 - Students desiring to major in Black Studies must pursue a double major
 - This disincentive leads Black Faculty to perceive that the administration devalues the academic specialties of Black faculty who teach Black studies courses and limits the attractiveness to students
 - There is no systematic effort to upgrade Black Studies from program to departmental status
- **Women's Studies**
 - Faculty in the Women's Studies Program do not believe that the administration values their academic activities
 - Women's Studies faculty indicate that the administration has not provided the resources necessary to stabilize the Program
 - Women's Studies Faculty report that the administration does not support the creation of a Women's Studies department
- **Other Specialized Programs**
 - The Review Team was unable to determine if there are systematic plans in place to establish a structured Latino/Hispanic Studies Program
 - The Review Team was unable to ascertain the degree of interest in considering the creation of an Asian American Studies program or curriculum

III. Recommendations

The recommendations presented below focus on prerequisites for developing a viable institutional diversity management strategy and diversity strategic plan and specific areas and units that must be prioritized if existing barriers to achieving equity and fostering diversity are to be overcome.

A. Diversity Management

- The Review Team recommends that UM-C undertake a comprehensive effort to address equity and diversity issues. The Team has been informed that UM-C plans to initiate a systematic Diversity Strategic Planning process similar to those undertaken at several major institutions. The Review Team strongly supports this approach to

more effective diversity management, and offers the following suggestions regarding preliminary steps:

B. Prerequisites for Developing a Viable Diversity Strategic Plan

- Senior Leaders must first identify those programmatic interventions designed to address the inequities identified in the Mediation Agreement and distinguish those interventions from UM-C's broadly-targeted diversity initiatives. In the opinion of the Review Team, UM-C has attempted to instantiate a diversity-management approach that targets the growing diversity of its community without simultaneously strengthening efforts to overcome past inequities, especially those affecting African Americans. The situation is further complicated by the fact that "international" diversity issues have been introduced as well with no articulation of how these considerations interface with "domestic" diversity issues, or discussion of the relative importance of these "international" diversity issues to UM-C's long term goals.
- UM-C has attempted to introduce a diversity management paradigm largely through a top-down decision-making process. In contrast, as discussed below, a viable diversity strategic planning process hinges on widespread involvement in defining the institutional objectives, with appropriate guidance from leaders. Given the limited success in resolving persisting domestic equity issues, including international diversity issues within the portfolio of the Chief Diversity Officer does not seem well-advised at this point in time. The types of conflicts and distrust that the Review Team has observed are predictable because of the absence of a clear vision of institutional direction and unproductive and unfocused dialogue with key constituencies.
- Senior university leaders, i.e. the Chancellor, President, and Provost, must be the principal "diversity champions" that empower the Chief Diversity Officer to implement the university's diversity strategic plan effectively. If senior leaders are perceived as unsupportive of or only weakly committed to diversity objectives, then those resisting change will perceive that they have allies and will work more aggressively to stifle implementation efforts. The leadership of UM-C will have to undertake a variety of special activities to create trust among some constituencies, as indicated in the findings reported above.
- Oversight and direction of the diversity strategic planning process should be vested in a single office. As noted previously, this is not currently the case at UM-C, i.e. two different administrative offices with oversight responsibility exist. The Chief Diversity Officer must be able to work constructively with many constituencies, and especially those constituencies that have been the subject of past efforts to address inequities. This situation does not currently exist at UM-C.
- The institution's leadership team must have a clear idea about the long-term goals of instituting a diversity strategic plan. One way of conceptualizing this goal is the

creation of a multicultural institution. Multicultural institutions have different philosophical orientations and operating principles than monocultural institutions. Most institutions are neither monocultural nor multicultural. Many institutions that are actively engaged in systematic diversity management efforts are attempting to transform core processes to improve alignment with multicultural institutional goals. Table 1 presents a partial taxonomy of core processes that must be reviewed and refined through the diversity strategic planning process. Core processes that are identified as exhibiting monocultural characteristics should be prioritized for transformation. One of the purposes of a diversity strategic plan is, in fact, to reduce variation in alignment across core processes such that a balanced pattern of institutional transformation can proceed. The Review Team did not have the opportunity to obtain information about all of the key core processes, but our findings suggest that many of the core processes are organized to achieve nondiscrimination (column 2), even though top leadership perceives that it has made the leap from nondiscrimination to multiculturalism.

- Climate Assessments

One way to obtain useful information about progress in achieving institutional transformation is through climate assessments. Such assessments provide quantitative and qualitative information that can serve as a baseline for assessing whether diversity management initiatives are achieving the desired outcomes. UM-C has recently participated in a standardized climate assessment. The Review Team did not have access to that information at the time of the site visits. The findings discussed previously suggest the need for a series of focus groups to be conducted to ensure that the specific concerns of various groups achieve appropriate attention. The results of the initial climate assessments for individual units should be part of the documentation provided to guide unit efforts to develop a diversity strategic plan.

C. Initiating the Diversity Strategic Planning Process

- At the outset of the diversity strategic planning process, a working statement outlining the institution's values and objectives should be developed and disseminated to the entire university community. In distributing this statement it should be made clear that there is an expectation that each unit will adapt the relevant components of the institution's statement to reflect its specific scope of responsibilities and that the plan will be action-oriented, i.e. that concrete initiatives to advance the diversity objectives must be developed and implemented. The statement should also clearly indicate that the planning process will engage all members of the community (students, faculty, staff, and administration). Elements of such a statement should include, but are not limited to:
 - a declaration of continuing commitment to remediate continuing inequities faced by specific group concurrent with efforts to expand the focus of diversity management efforts to encompass additional constituencies (while efforts to address inequities experienced by racial/ethnic groups and women constitute an important foundation

- for diversity efforts, they should not delimit efforts to integrate traditionally underrepresented groups into the life and fabric of the entire university).
- a statement describing how diversity enhancement efforts will contribute to the institutional mission and goals, including providing graduates with the cross-cultural communication and interaction skills necessary to function in increasingly diverse professional, educational, and social environments
 - an assurance that adequate resources will be committed to enable diversity enhancement objectives to be realized
 - a commitment to provide equal access to all educational opportunities, to be measured, in part, by comparing trends in disparities in enrollment, persistence, and graduation rates across various groups
 - a pledge to promote respect for different perspectives and ideas, to solicit counsel from all constituencies regarding strategies to enhance diversity, and provide leadership opportunities for members of underrepresented groups
 - a recognition of the special role that curricular transformation and support for specialized programs in achieving long-term diversity objectives
 - a guarantee that periodic assessments of the climate for diversity and other evaluation activities will be undertaken to monitor progress toward achieving diversity objectives
- As each unit initiates diversity strategic planning activities, the following suggestions may be useful:
 - Establish a diversity committee within the unit, comprised of representatives of various constituencies, with a well-defined role, which has responsibility for various activities including:
 - Coordination of efforts to collect information about the climate for diversity through surveys, focus groups, and other mechanisms
 - Design and delivery of training and educational programs for unit members with the goal of creating a shared understanding of diversity
 - Communicate current status to members of the unit
 - Generation of policy and programmatic recommendations for administrators
 - Development of a working statement regarding the role of effective diversity management in enhancing the unit’s effectiveness that is both specific and inclusive of the various constituencies targeted in the university’s vision statement

D. Additional Recommendations

While rationalizing the oversight structure and implementing a diversity-strategic plan to guide long-term transformation efforts, the Review Team’s findings also point to the need to initiate short term changes in several key areas. We offer specific recommendations below in the areas of (1) Faculty Recruitment/Retention; (2) Student Recruitment, Retention and Support Services, and (3) Academic Programs.

■ Faculty Recruitment/Retention

- The effective recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty requires conscious and proactive effort. Fortunately, a growing body of research literature provides a rich source of guidance to institutions that desire to recruit and retain a diverse faculty. The following best practice principles have emerged from the research literature and practice.
 - Communicate the Institution’s Faculty Diversity Commitment to the Campus and beyond
 - Challenge and Dispel Myths, such as the location of the campus, that excuse the failure of an institution to attract a diverse faculty
 - Create comprehensive faculty search and screen guidelines
 - Broaden the Definitions of Scholarship to include work of interest and concern to faculty of color as well as scholarly work on institutional diversity
 - Provide a Central Pool of Funds to hire and retain minority faculty and for spousal/partner hiring where such hiring will increase faculty diversity
 - Require Departments to recruit and hire from diverse candidate pools
 - Make deans and department chair accountable for insuring the recruitment and development of diverse faculty candidate pools
 - Appoint diverse search committees
 - Provide training on the development of diverse faculty pools to search committee chairs and search committee members
 - Encourage and support existing faculty to make minority faculty recruitment an integral part of their work year-round
 - Expand the scope of recruitment sites including minority serving institutions, meetings of minority scholar caucuses, minority scholar conferences and meetings, and institutions with non-token populations of minority students and faculty.
 - Create linkages with minority serving colleges and universities as well as other institutions that have significant minority student and faculty population
 - Encourage departments to invite minority scholars to campus as speakers and as visiting professors for varying terms.
 - Create Minority Pre dissertation and post doctoral programs that couple assistant professor appointments with pre and post doctoral programs that permit departments to identify promising minority scholars for mentoring before they assume full time faculty appointments
 - Provide mentoring training for all post tenure faculty
 - Development a faculty of color mentoring program to provide both academic and social support for minority faculty
 - Formalize mentoring and evaluation programs for all faculty and insure effective mentoring and evaluation of pre-tenure minority faculty
 - Establish a “super” mentor with the responsibility to check the mentoring quality and progress for all minority faculty
 - Assess and improve the climate for minority faculty in departments, colleges, on campus, and in the community

- Insure that support for minority faculty (e.g. space, startup, research funding) is equitable, and competitive
 - Provide opportunities for social interaction among minority faculty as well as social interaction opportunities that include minority and majority faculty
 - Conduct, Monitor, and disseminate research on practices that increase, or decrease, faculty diversity.
 - Make faculty diversity recruitment and retention an integral part of the agenda for the meetings of deans, department chairs, and departmental faculty
 - Develop strategies to recognize the important contributions of minority faculty through awards and public recognition
- An increasing body of research on faculty diversity has emerged over the past ten years. Several sources of important information include:
 - C. Turner, *Diversifying The Faculty: A Guidebook For Search Committees* (2002, Association of American Colleges and Universities)
 - F. Hale, Jr., Editor, *What Makes Racial Diversity Work in Higher Education* (2004, Stylus Publishing)
 - J. Moody, *Faculty Diversity: Problems and Solutions* (2004, RoutledgeFalmer)
 - A. Rios and R. Bashaw, *Symposium Proceedings: Keeping Our Faculties: Addressing the Recruitment and Retention of Faculty of Color* (April 21-23, 2002, Symposium Proceedings)
 - C. Turner, *Executive Summary, Symposium: Keeping Our Faculties: Addressing the Recruitment and Retention of Faculty of Color in Higher Education* (October 10-20, 1998, http://www.diversityweb.org/diversity_innovations/faculty_staff_development/recruitment_tenure_promotion/keeping_our_faculties.cfm)
 - As part of its diversity strategic planning process UM-C should develop an inventory to determine whether it has in place best practices identified in the literature on faculty diversity. UM-C should establish a special subcommittee charged with determining which additional practices hold the best prospects for enhancing minority faculty recruitment and retention efforts and empowered to develop and implement these practices.
- **Student Recruitment, Retention, and Support Services**
 - Student Recruitment
Minority recruitment is enhanced when those involved in the process have familiarity with the social and cultural backgrounds of these students. The current admission office needs to hire and retain experienced administrators who are familiar with minority students, their demographics, and successful minority recruitment programs.

While this is not to say those persons must all be members of racial/ethnic minority groups, it would be anomalous that a staff involved in recruiting non-white students would have no, or only a token, representation of people of color among its staff.

A plan to recruit experienced minority recruiters (those who specialize in the recruitment of this target population) is imperative if the university is to meet the expectations of equity and diversity among its entering student population.

Similarly, a recruitment plan that targets minority and, possibly under-served populations is necessary for similar outcomes.

As noted previously, there are a few miscellaneous pre-college programs on the campus, but the appropriate offices need to develop an integrated plan to include these populations in follow-up activities and programs on campus.

- Student Retention

The Student Success Center should begin to communicate to the community at large that diversity is part of its mission and to embrace that component of its mission aggressively.

The Student Success Center should also initiate steps to diversity its staff in general and, in particular, to augment its senior staff with experienced members of underrepresented groups who can assist the Center in meeting the needs of all students effectively.

- Academic Retention Services (ARS)

The working relationship between the Student Success Center and the Academic Retention Services must be improved in order to provide complementary and enhanced student services.

Improving the working relationship may require a reconfiguration of existing reporting lines. Enhanced effectiveness for both units could be achieved through more coordinated planning and programming.

Because of the historical perception of the ARS (as a minority-only program), the lack of quality and comparable physical space to that provided other units in the Student Success Building has symbolic as well as practical problems, both of which are not currently being addressed.

ARS space needs to be enlarged and improved in order to provide a sense of program equality and student confidentiality that the staff and minority community at the university feel is necessary for student advisement and success.

The collegiality issues of the two programs should improve with elimination of space inequities in the programs.

- **Student Climate**

While the focus of our work was faculty and staff concerns, students views were instructive. According to a paper we received in our packet of material , a University of Missouri-Columbia Research team, led by Roger Worthington, Assistant Professor of Educational and Counseling Psychology, found that campus leaders' efforts to foster diversity were not visible to most URG survey respondents and about a third of the respondents observed conduct on campus that created an offensive, hostile or intimidating working or learning environment for people other than themselves mainly due to race (53 percent) gender (43 percent) sexual orientation (40 percent) ethnicity (39 percent) and religious beliefs (38 percent).

The impact of a racially charged campus environment on the academic success of minority students is difficult, if at all possible, to measure. But the experience cannot help but be transforming.

- **Academic Programs**

The UM-C should conduct a Formal Program Review of both the Black Studies and Women's Studies Programs. The reviews should be conducted by external faculty consultants from nationally respected Black Studies and Women's Studies departments and programs. The purposes of these reviews include:

- Developing of an assessment of the appropriateness of existing administrative reporting relationships
- Obtaining information about the adequacy of current support levels for individual programs
- Generating information about the strengths and weaknesses of existing policies regarding faculty appointments
- Examining the appropriateness of existing curricula and the configuration of majors and minors
- Identifying opportunities to strengthen alliances with other academic units
- Providing guidance in developing program enhancement plans based on comparisons with peer institutions

IV. Conclusion

The Review Team does not presume that it has been able to capture fully the complexity and vitality of UM-C. The Team recognizes that refinement of diversity management processes in all institutions is an ongoing process. We also note the University of Missouri Columbia may be already implementing measures consistent with some of our recommendations. Nevertheless, we believe that this document may be the basis for a useful dialogue on those initiatives that will assist UM-C in realizing the objectives set forth in the Mediation Agreement of 1988. As importantly, we hope that this document will ground UM-C's potential to become a leading multicultural institution that pursues a twenty-first century vision of excellence through diversity.

APPENDIX A

Table 1

INDICATORS OF DEVELOPMENTAL STAGE OF CORE PROCESSES - VIS A VIS DIVERSITY MANAGEMENT

Transformation Stage Indicator	Monocultural —————>	Nondiscrimination —————>	Multicultural
1. Relationship between diversity objectives and other objectives	No recognition of non-traditional missions; denial of need to augment mission	Perceived trade-off between “excellence” and diversity; diversity initiatives are optional	Diversity and excellence are complements; all units initiate diversity efforts
2. Institutional Planning processes	Lack of recognition of need to reflect presence of sub-populations in plans	Creation of temporary structures (e.g. committees) to address diversity concerns	Inclusion of diversity considerations is a standard expectation in all planning efforts
3. Engagement with Key Constituencies	Serving special constituencies perceived as “reverse” discrimination	Limited remediation thrust; creation of artificial umbrella groups	All constituencies served equitably and engaged in institutional transformation
4. Staffing/Development	Existing staff assumed to have the capabilities to serve all sub-populations	Underrepresented group staff serve special populations only; one-shot human relations workshops	Underrepresented groups represented throughout the organization; comprehensive staff development program
5. Conflict resolution	Crisis focused	Reactive; process oriented	Proactive; outcome oriented
6. Evaluation Procedures	None	Ad hoc	Systematic
7. Budgetary support	Ad hoc, no special funds available	Exclusive use of special funds; limited commitment of resources obtained through normal budget channels	Planned funding strategy involving combination of reallocation; special funds and external resources
8. Programming	Monocultural	Special events/public lectures, orientations, (e.g., Black History month, MLK Holiday)	Innovations reflecting synergies between curricular and co-curricular activities
9. Management	None	Diffuse; lack of centralized authority	Central coordination; well defined decision-making communication channels
10. Curriculum	Monocultural	Diversity content is optional or additive	Diversity content is fully integrated

See James Stewart, “Planning for Cultural Diversity: A Case Study” in Harold E. Cheatham and Associates, *Cultural Pluralism on Campus*. Alexandria, VA: American College Personnel Association [1991], pp. 161-181. See also Hale, “Hales Inventory for Assessing an Institution’s Commitment to Multicultural Programming, in What Makes Racial Diversity Work in Higher Education 307-317 (2004).

APPENDIX B
Letter of Invitation to Review Team

Dear Dr. :

You have been identified as a potential member of a review team to conduct a multi-faceted examination of the University of Missouri-Columbia's overall approach to addressing issues related to equal opportunity and diversity. Specific areas of inquiry would include: the recruitment and retention of black faculty and staff, and an assessment of MU's organizational structure for diversity issues.

I envision that your work would entail a three or four day on-campus visit in early September so as to ensure access to a number of key people on campus and to ensure that the Supreme Court's rulings in the Michigan cases have been fully analyzed. Of course, prior to your campus visit, we would provide you with documentation of our history and our current situation. Based on your campus visit and a review of the documents, I would expect a written report of the review team's position on a number of questions to be posed.

You would receive an honorarium of X to serve on this review team. Moreover, all your travel expenses would be covered. Dr. Robert E. Weems, Jr., MU's Interim Associate Vice Chancellor for Equity, will work with me in coordinating this effort.

If this is an assignment that fits your interest and schedule please contact me as soon as possible.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Michael A. Middleton
Deputy Chancellor
University of Missouri-Columbia

APPENDIX C

Charge to the Review Team

1. Assessment of the University of Missouri's overall approach to addressing issues related to equal opportunity and diversity.
2. Assessment of the structure, responsibilities and staffing of the Office of the Vice Provost for Minority Affairs, International Programs, and Faculty Development, including:
 - a) MU's efforts to recruit and retain black faculty from the period of 1986 – 2003.
 - b) The extent and consequences of implementation of the 1988 mediated agreement between the Legion of Black Collegians/Columbia NAACP and the University of Missouri-Columbia.
1. Assessment of MU's administrative structure as it relates to such diversity related programs as:
 - a) Academic Retention Services
 - b) The Black Culture Center, and
 - c) The Office of Multicultural Affairs
1. Assessment of MU's efforts to recruit and retain black staff from the period of 1986-2003.

APPENDIX D

Itinerary of Review Team Campus Visits, October 13, December 1-2, 2003

ITINERARY FOR REVIEW TEAM VISIT, OCTOBER 13, 2003

7:45 – 8:00 a.m.	Tour of the Black Culture Center (Amanda Clarence)
8:00 – 9:00 a.m.	Breakfast meeting with the review team, members of the Legion of Black Collegians (LBC) executive committee, members of the Association of Black Graduate and Professional Students (ABGPS) executive committee (Black Culture Center, Mini-Multipurpose Room)
9:10 – 10:55 a.m.	Meeting with Linda Garth and the staff of Academic Retention Services. Also present will be: Clarence Wine (Diversity Programs, School of Business); Alisa Warren (Diversity Programs, College of Engineering); Amanda Clarence (Director of Black Culture Center); and Dr. KC Morrison; first Vice Provost of Minority Affairs and Faculty Development at MU (Academic Retention Services/Student Success Center.)
11:00 – 11:55 a.m.	Meeting with Dr. Richard Wallace, Chancellor of the University of Missouri-Columbia (105 Jesse Hall)
12:00 – 1:10 p.m.	LUNCHEON MEETING: Dr. Ann Korschgen, Vice Provost of Enrollment Management, Joe Camille, Director of Student Financial Aid, Georgeanne Porter, Director of Admissions, Dr. Jim McCartney, Director of the International Center (Kirkwood Room, Reynolds Alumni Center)
1:15 – 2:15 p.m.	Meeting with Dr. Handy Williamson, Vice Provost of Minority Affairs, International Programs, & Faculty Development (211 Jesse Hall)
2:15 – 3:15 p.m.	Meeting with Pablo Mendoza, Director of Multicultural Affairs Office, Student Life (123 Jesse Hall)
3:00 – 4:00 p.m.	Meeting with Dr. Brady Deaton, Provost of the University of Missouri-Columbia (114 Jesse Hall)
4:14 – 5:30 p.m.	Meeting with the Black Faculty & Staff Organization (BFSO), Black Studies Library (328 Gentry Hall)
6:00 – 7:00 p.m.	Dinner Meeting, Review Team, Dr. Michael A. Middleton, Deputy Chancellor of the University of Missouri-Columbia and Dr. Robert E. Weems, Jr., Interim Associate Vice-Chancellor for Equity (Location, TBA)

APPENDIX D

Itinerary of Review Team Campus Visits, October 13, December 1-2, 2003

ITINERARY FOR REVIEW TEAM VISIT, DECEMBER 1, 2003

8:00 – 8:55 a.m.	Dr. K.C. Morrison, Professor of Political Science and former Vice Provost of Minority Affairs and Faculty Development, 123 Jesse Hall
9:00 – 9:55 a.m.	Chris Koukola, Assistant to the Chancellor, University Affairs, 123 Jess Hall
10:00 – 10:55 a.m.	TBA
11:00 – 11:55 a.m.	Todd Coleman, Associate Vice Chancellor for Development and Alumni Affairs, Executive Director MU Alumni Association & LeAnn Stroupe, Eric Wilson, and Kevin Wilson former Presidents of the MU Black Alumni Association, 123 Jesse Hall
12:00 – 1:15 p.m.	LUNCH: Karen Touzeau, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Human Resource Services, Reynolds Alumni Center, Kirkwood Room
1:30 – 2:55 p.m.	Black Studies Program Advisory Committee; Dr. Julius Thompson, Director of Black Studies and Committee Chair, 328 Gentry Hall
3:00 – 3:55 p.m.	Disability Services Office, Director Sarah Weaver and Staff, A038 Brady Commons
4:00 – 4:55 p.m.	Adam Brigham, Coordinator, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender Resource Center, 230 Brady Commons

APPENDIX D

Itinerary of Review Team Campus Visits, October 13, December 1-2, 2003

ITINERARY FOR REVIEW TEAM VISIT, DECEMBER 2, 2003

8:00 – 8:55 a.m.	Dr. Marvin Lewis, Professor of Spanish, Director of the MU Afro-Romance Institute, 318 A & S
9:00 – 9:55 a.m.	Pan Asian Faculty & Staff Organization, Memorial Union 203 South (Arvarh Strickland Room)
10:00 – 10:55 a.m.	Academic Retention Services Staff, Memorial Union 203 South (Arvarh Strickland Room)
11:00 – 11:55 a.m.	Hispanic and Latino Faculty & Staff Organization, Memorial Union 203 South (Arvarh Strickland Room)
12:00 – 1:15 p.m.	LUNCH: Arvarh E. Strickland, Kirkwood Room, Reynolds Alumni Center
1:30 – 2:55 p.m.	Women and Gender Studies Advisory Committee, Dr. JoAnne Banks-Wallace, Interim Director and Committee Chair, 303 Switzler Hall
3:00 – 3:55 p.m.	Dr. Cathy Scroggs, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, 110 Jesse Hall
4:00 – 4:55 p.m.	Open, 123 Jesse Hall

APPENDIX E

**UM-C Total Undergraduate and First Time Freshman Enrollments
Absolute Numbers and Percentage Representation
Selected Racial/Ethnic Groups 1989-2002**

Undergraduate Enrollments								
Date*	African American		Native American		Asian American		Latino/Hispanic	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
1989	704	3.9	42	.2	239	1.3	153	.8
1990	768	4.1	60	.3	283	1.5	153	.8
1991	763	4.1	67	.4	298	1.6	172	.9
1992	689	4.0	56	.3	313	1.8	193	1.1
1993	642	3.9	52	.3	350	2.1	193	1.2
1994	801	4.9	57	.3	375	2.3	206	1.3
1995	926	5.5	70	.4	410	2.4	221	1.3
1996	1018	5.9	62	.4	433	2.5	236	1.4
1997	1126	6.5	84	.5	460	2.7	240	1.4
1998	1200	6.8	79	.4	447	2.5	255	1.4
1999	1124	6.3	83	.5	407	2.3	259	1.5
2000	1086	6.0	86	.5	437	2.4	267	1.5
2001	1020	5.5	97	.5	473	2.6	265	1.4
2002	1112	5.6	111	.8	489	2.5	293	1.5

*Fall enrollment data

First Time Freshmen Enrollments								
Date*	African American		Native American		Asian American		Latino/Hispanic	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
1989	164	4.1	10	.2	47	1.2	30	.7
1990	198	5.1	20	.5	73	1.9	35	.9
1991	164	4.8	13	.4	65	1.9	45	1.3
1992	125	4.2	8	.3	70	2.4	45	1.5
1993	97	3.3	9	.3	84	2.9	28	1.0
1994	334	9.2	13	.4	88	2.4	47	1.3
1995	282	7.3	17	.4	107	2.8	44	1.1
1996	285	7.6	18	.5	87	2.3	52	1.4
1997	284	8.0	13	.4	100	2.8	57	1.6
1998	278	7.2	16	.4	87	2.3	44	1.1
1999	250	6.4	21	.5	77	2.0	52	1.3
2000	229	5.4	22	.5	127	3.0	63	1.5
2001	227	5.4	18	.4	114	2.7	52	1.2
2002	290	6.5	27	.6	127	2.9	70	1.6

*Fall enrollment data

APPENDIX F

**UM-C First Year Retention Rates and Six-Year Graduation Rates
Selected Racial/Ethnic Groups 1987-2001**

First Year Retention Rates					
Year	African American	Native American	Asian American	Latino/Hispanic	Total
1992	79.5%	83.3%	75.0%	76.1%	81.2%
1993	77.7%	100.0%	75.5%	85.7%	81.5%
1994	84.0%	70.5%	85.0%	80.8%	81.4%
1995	82.0%	64.7%	82.5%	65.9%	82.2%
1996	85.4%	77.7%	83.9%	79.6%	82.3%
1997	83.3%	64.2%	80.3%	83.3%	84.3%
1998	76.4%	84.8%	75.0%	75.0%	82.7%
1999	82.9%	95.6%	83.3%	76.4%	82.2%
2000	80.5%	77.2%	89.4%	80.5%	84.6%
2001	83.3%	72.2%	81.5%	81.8%	83.6%

Six Year Graduation Rates					
Year	African American	Native American	Asian American	Latino/Hispanic	Total
1987	36.6%	60.0%	53.4%	46.1%	56.9%
1988	38.5%	50.0%	64.5%	39.3%	58.4%
1989	43.6%	60.0%	56.6%	50.0%	58.1%
1990	39.2%	46.6%	58.3%	56.7%	56.0%
1991	40.7%	36.3%	59.7%	38.2%	57.7%
1992	43.3%	33.3%	51.3%	59.5%	59.8%
1993	48.4%	81.8%	55.2%	57.1%	60.1%
1994	48.0%	41.1%	59.7%	59.5%	60.0%
1995	54.3%	47.0%	66.0%	42.5%	64.6%
1996	55.4%	61.1%	64.3%	68.5%	65.1%

APPENDIX G

**UM-C First Professional and Graduate Enrollments
Absolute Numbers and Percentage Representation
Selected Racial/Ethnic Groups 1989-2002**

First Professional Enrollments								
Date*	African American		Native American		Asian American		Latino/Hispanic	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
1989	49	4.2	4	.3	41	3.5	16	1.4
1990	56	4.8	9	.8	45	3.8	21	1.8
1991	50	4.5	7	.6	48	4.3	19	1.7
1992	44	4.0	7	.6	48	4.3	21	1.9
1993	47	4.2	8	.7	40	3.5	22	1.9
1994	49	4.4	4	.4	40	3.6	21	1.9
1995	43	4.0	8	.7	39	3.6	20	1.8
1996	36	3.2	11	1.0	42	3.7	15	1.3
1997	36	3.1	8	.7	52	4.5	19	1.6
1998	42	3.6	7	.6	53	4.5	13	1.1
1999	57	5.0	8	.7	53	4.6	11	1.0
2000	54	4.7	6	.5	54	4.7	10	.9
2001	45	3.9	6	.5	47	4.0	12	1.0
2002	41	3.6	8	.7	46	4.0	9	.8

*Fall enrollment data

Graduate Enrollments								
Date*	African American		Native American		Asian American		Latino/Hispanic	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
1989	126	2.6	11	.2	50	1.0	38	.8
1990	141	2.8	14	.3	58	1.2	34	.7
1991	161	3.2	18	.4	64	1.3	52	1.0
1992	137	2.8	19	.4	60	1.2	45	.9
1993	174	3.7	19	.4	68	1.5	47	1.0
1994	187	4.1	19	.4	76	1.7	53	1.2
1995	211	4.8	16	.4	65	1.5	48	1.1
1996	212	5.1	19	.5	68	1.6	41	1.0
1997	190	4.8	22	.6	61	1.5	39	1.0
1998	194	5.0	22	.6	72	1.8	56	1.4
1999	189	4.8	22	.6	72	1.8	56	1.4
2000	197	4.8	19	.5	69	1.7	79	1.9
2001	170	4.2	15	.4	63	1.5	77	1.9
2002	198	3.8	24	.5	83	1.6	88	1.7

*Fall enrollment data

APPENDIX H
Total Full Time Ranked Faculty
Selected Racial/Ethnic Groups and Total
1993-2002

Year	African American	Native American	Asian American	Latino/Hispanic	Total
1993	38	3	114	26	1398
1994	43	4	113	23	1402
1995	43	5	117	23	1402
1996	45	3	117	23	1395
1997	46	3	123	27	1431
1998	47	2	133	30	1449
1999	43	2	154	34	1507
2000	41	2	153	32	1447
2001	44	1	157	31	1507
2002	41	1	161	29	1545