

Commitment to Success – Review January 2006

Need and Initial Conception

Throughout the last decade and longer, The Ohio State University has made sustained efforts at the institutional, college, and department level to enhance the diversity climate of the university. One of the main strategies on the University's Academic Plan is to "Create a Diverse University Community" (<http://www.osu.edu/academicplan/strat.php>). In June 2000, the university adopted a Diversity Action Plan that aims to implement this goal in many ways. One initiative that has tried to support this plan is the Commitment to Success Program (CSP).

With the profound influence diversity has on learning and understanding, it is the goal of the program to accurately assess the climate for diversity and learning within the departments and units of the Ohio State University. The Commitment to Success Program exists because diversity is crucial to the university environment. At the Ohio State University, a myriad of students, faculty and staff influence and create the teaching, learning, and research that take place on this campus everyday. Many ages, nationalities, sexualities, races, ethnicities, religions, and physical differences are represented at OSU, and because of this, CSP staff research how said diversity impacts and enhances both educational and work settings. The findings produced through CSP assessments can help university programs gain a richer understanding of diversity in their settings, as well as possible steps to further improve the sociocultural climate for all involved.

The Commitment to Success Program began as a funded pilot program in the Autumn Quarter 1996 with Faculty & TA Development (FTAD) having responsibility for direct oversight and implementation and working in partnership with the Office of Minority Affairs. The purpose of CSP is to support and supplement existing efforts to increase the retention, and successful completion, of all students at Ohio State but with an emphasis on historically underrepresented student populations (i.e., students of color, women, gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered students, nontraditionally aged, students, and students with disabilities). CSP's has sought to support academic units develop

multicultural teaching practices by conducting assessments of climate for diversity and learning, report finding and recommendations to units, and collaborating with units to develop diversity action plans. CSP is directly related to other programs that supported then President Kirwan's efforts to improve and enhance undergraduate education including Continuous Quality Improvement efforts of several colleges, recommendations of the Committee on the Undergraduate Experience, and the works of the Council of Enrollment and Student Progress.

Diversity and Higher Education

A review of the relevant literature (see Appendix C for full literature review) shows the following themes:

The Importance of Diversity in Education

Students benefit both socially and educationally from their experiences on demographically diverse campuses.

There are a Range of Challenges associated with diversity, including

Identity development and "Hidden privilege" lead to varied responses to diversity

Privilege has a continuing effect on higher education as an institution

Groups differ in perceptions of the campus climate

Diversity shapes and is shaped by the organizational setting

These themes reinforce the importance of all of the efforts of The Ohio State University to create an inclusive, supportive climate for diversity. The range of challenges led the university to create CSP as a program that would enable academic units to use data rather than assumption to appropriately focus their efforts.

Pilot Program

CSP was piloted in the Colleges of Law, Mathematics, and Social Work and results indicated that there was a need for a program that addressed diversity issues beyond improving recruitment and access and meeting the remedial and financial needs of students to improving the climate that fosters positive interactions and relationship with faculty, which has been shown to have a positive relationship with increasing student retention and success (Hurtado, 2001). CSP was designed with the primary goal of

assisting academic units develop diversity actions plans for both short-term change and long-term improvement of the climate for diversity and learning. During the Winter and Spring Quarters of 1997 climate assessments were conducted in the Colleges of Law, Mathematics, and Social Work that utilized a three phase approach consisting of assessment, dialogue, and action. The results and recommendations of these assessments supported the funding CSP as an extension of FTAD and its efforts to improve multicultural teaching practice.

The purpose of CSP climate assessment is to ascertain students' and/or faculty perceptions of the climate for diversity and learning in their respective colleges, departments, and/or classrooms. The assessment further seeks to ascertain the students' perceptions and impressions as well as record their personal experiences regarding the policies, practices, and learning environment within the academic unit and its classrooms settings. Specific objectives for the climate assessment include:

1. Describe selected demographic characteristics of the participating students (i.e., gender, age, college major, race and ethnicity, citizenship status, sexual orientation, disability status, religious affiliation, and work status).
2. Identify and describe perceptions held by students on these four dimensions:
 - (A). *General climate for diversity within the college/department* (i.e., overall climate for diversity, extent of diverse faculty, extent of diverse staff, level of faculty and staff support, and advisors' understanding of diversity issues);
 - (B). *Diversity related experiences in the college/department* (i.e., interaction/self-segregation based on personal characteristics, personal experience, unfair treatment based on personal characteristics, and insensitive/negative comments)
 - (C). *Classroom climate for diversity* (i.e., instructors' emphasis on diversity, classroom/clinical learning environment, classroom/clinical comfort level, classroom/clinical participation levels, classroom/clinical climate for students with disabilities);

(D). *Extent awareness of services and programs offered in the college/department.*

3. When applicable/requested, determine faculty members' perceptions and /or value of climate for diversity and learning in their respective colleges or departments.
4. Examine the students' perception differences based on their gender, race/ethnicity, academic rank, sexual orientation, disability status, and majors.
5. Determine relationship between perceived overall climate for diversity, and selected demographic characteristics.
6. Determine relationship between perceived overall climate for diversity and diversity related experience variables.
7. Determine relationship between perceived overall climate for diversity and classroom climate variables.

CSP was design to occur through a series of stages including the following; solicitation, assessment, dialogue, action planning, implementation, and longitudinal assessment. This structure is detailed more fully in Appendix A.

Program Evolution

Several methods were developed to publicize CSP including a brochure, which has been updated once, a web page that is linked to the FTAD web page, and inclusion in the FTAD quarterly newsletter. Additionally, previous coordinators of the program chose to promote the program through both direct solicitation of units through their personal contacts and a "shot-gun" approach of mailings that sought to introduce the program to as many academic units as possible. To date the personal contact method seems to have had greater success. The current approach to soliciting participation includes leads from consultants in FTAD and the Office of Minority Affairs, recommendations from other academic units, and units requesting services.

Once an academic unit has requested CSP climate assessment, a structured process is used to adapt the basic instrument to meet the specific, local needs of the unit. The CSP

Assessment Design Process (adapted from Dillman, 2000; Fowler, 1993) occurs through consultation between CSP and the academic unit and will be undertaken to accomplish the unit's specific goals of promoting and addressing diversity issues in the unit.

Step 1 – Define unit's objective for diversity assessment.

Step 2 – Specify the population that is of interest.

Step 3 – Select method(s) for data collection.

Step 4 – Determine who will be in the sample

Step 5 – Design the assessment.

Step 6 – Pretest/Revise the questions

Step 7 – Administering the assessment (i.e., survey)

Step 8 – Focus group/Interview preparation (if applicable)

Step 9 – Data analysis.

Step 10 – Result and report.

Again, depending upon the skills and preferences of the different coordinators for CSP, the primary data collection method has varied across the life of the program. Paper surveys, focus groups, and web surveys have all been used; currently web surveys are the main means of data gathering used, although focus groups are also available if these better meet the needs of the unit.

Methodology

Methodologically, the process that CSP utilizes to assess academic units is a form of Action Research. As described in the literature, Action Research is a form of systematic inquiry that collects data as part of an overall effort to educate individuals within a natural setting about conditions associated with that environment and to encourage them to create change. It is well suited for identifying areas of concern and issues within the setting as well as aiding in the development of potential solutions to improve practice. It is a research process in which the researcher works with, and for, individuals engaged in an change process as compared to more traditional forms of research that conducts research about, and on, people.

Action research uses methodologies that are well suited to assessing learning climates for the purpose of improving the overall environment to help assure that all students have the opportunity to achieve their fullest potential. Action research helps to identify problems and issues within a particular environment and aid in the development of potential solutions in order to improve the overall climate. One aspect of action research that makes it applicable to improving learning climates is its focus on generating solutions to real world issues and practical problems by utilizing practitioners in the research process. Researchers will take advantage the knowledge and experiences of the practitioners by engaging them with the data in an effort to develop activities and actions designed to create change in the environment.

There are three main elements of action research: its participatory character; its democratic nature; and its focus on contributions to social science and social change. The participatory character of action research means that those involved within a particular setting perceive the need for a change and are willing participants in the research process. These individuals will play an active role in both the research and change process. The research process utilizes multiple methods to collect data as qualitative methods are useful in highlighting key themes and issues from the participants while quantitative methods aid in making comparisons between groups within the larger population.

The democratic nature of action research acknowledges participants as equal partners with the researchers serving in a more facilitative, consulting role and engaging participants in the overall process of action and evaluation. Findings are fed back to participants for validation and to inform decisions about the next stage of the evaluation process. This collaborative process can be represented as an ongoing series of the events that includes planning, acting, observing, reflecting, and re-planning. Such a process is responsive to events, activities, and attitudes that occur in the natural setting and allows for refinements to be made to the evaluation process.

Action research makes contributions to social science and social change through helping to fill the gaps that exists between theory and practice. That is, it utilizes the experiences and intuitions of practitioners to guide the evaluation process thereby resulting in findings that are more meaningful and useful. This process allows the researcher to include participant's points of view regarding the data by soliciting their feedback on findings and incorporating their responses into the report. Additionally, this process often leads to the discovery of, and refinement to, solutions that can be implemented to create social or organizational change.

Outcomes to date

Since the program began, fourteen academic units and one central support office have engaged in a CSP climate assessment and received at least a preliminary report.

Appendix D lists these units. There are currently ongoing, follow-up assessments in process with the Department of English, and Department of Evolution, Ecology, and Organismal Biology. Many other units have engaged in consultation with CSP/FTAD staff on diversity climate issues, but have chosen not to go forward with the full assessment process.

Several themes, from both the quantitative and qualitative analysis, have emerged from the assessments that CSP has conducted. A wide range of exemplary data and responses may be found in Appendix E; however, the major findings across units are as follows

Major themes to emerge from the quantitative data analysis:

- issues of demographic representation
- perceived overall climate for diversity and learning
- differential overall experiences by gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, and disability status
- lack of awareness of programs and services

Major themes to emerge from the qualitative data analysis:

- lack of awareness of diversity issues,
- issues of representation,
- backlash to diversity efforts, and
- gender issues.

Other efforts

In addition to the assessment process, CSP has sponsored a large number of workshops, discussions, and presentations on diversity climate issues, both alone and with other campus units. These have included several significant, ongoing collaborations. One with the Office for Disabilities Services and the Nisonger Center involved several U. S. Department of Education grants, which included several disability climate assessments, and created the Fast Facts for Faculty <http://telr.osu.edu/dpg/fastfact/index.html> and the FAME modules. Another collaboration with The Women's Place has produced a regular series of very well-attended, open discussion sessions. Currently, CSP and the department of Theatre co-sponsor the *Class Act Diversity Players*. This theatrical troupe has worked with the Multicultural Center, GLBT Student Services, OMA, the African American Male Resource Center, and the Office of International Education to produce workshops on a wide variety of topics that use interactive theatre to engage participants in difficult discussions on diversity and inclusion.

Future directions

The CSP climate assessment survey project has generated a great deal of focused attention on diversity issues in those units that have made use of this service. However, this basic system was devised almost ten years ago to meet the needs of the university at that time. Since then, Ohio State has created a University Diversity Action Plan, embedded that plan within our Academic Plan, and all of our colleges and many departments have created and begun to implement their own Diversity Plans. A program that provided ongoing assessment and consultation was of great use in the process of creating these plans.

However, for this program to continue to thrive, it requires a significant investment of university resources and staff time, within both FTAD and OMA, and of faculty and staff time in the units. The most difficult part of the effort remains the outreach and recruitment process. Units are not beating down the doors to ask for this service. Therefore, it is incumbent upon the stakeholders in CSP to consider if climate assessment surveying remains the most effective means to promote an inclusive learning climate and continue to create a diverse university community or whether we should re-envision the program.

Resources

- Avison, David. 2002. "Action Research: A Research Approach for Cooperative Work." Paper presented at the ACM 7th International Conference on Computer-Supported Cooperative Work.
- Avison, David, Francis Lau, Michael Myers, and Peter Axel Nielsen. 1999. "Action Research." Communications of the ACM 42(1): 94-97.
- Block, Caryn.J. and Carter, Robert T. 1998. "White racial identity: Theory, research, and implications for organizational contexts." In Workplace Diversity: Issues and Perspectives, edited by Alfrida Daly. Washington D.C.: NASW Press.
- Brown, Launcelot I. 2004. "Diversity: The Challenge for Higher Education." Race, Ethnicity and Education 7(1): 21-34.
- Brubacher, John S. 1977. On the Philosophy of Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Burke, W. Warner and George H. Litwin. 1992. "A Causal Model of Organizational Performance and Change." Journal of Management 18: 523-45.
- Carter, Robert T. 1995. The Influence of Race and Racial Identity in Psychotherapy: Towards a Racially Inclusive Model. New York: Wiley.
- Carter, Robert. T. (ed.). 2000. Addressing cultural issues in organizations: Beyond the corporate context. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishers.
- Carter, Robert. T. and Chalmer Thompson. 1997. "An Overview and Elaboration of Helms' Racial Identity Theory," Pp. 15-33 in Racial Identity Theory: Applications to Individual, Group, and Organizational Interventions, edited by Robert T. Carter and Chalmer Thompson. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.
- Conley, Valerie M, Patricia B. Hyer and G.M. McLaughlin. 1999. "A faculty assessment of the campus climate for diversity." Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, San Antonio, TX.
- Feagin, Joe and Hernán Vera. White Racism: The Basics. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Goodman, Diane. Promoting Diversity and Social Justice: Educating People from Privileged Groups. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2001.
- Gorski, Paul. 1998. "Racial and Gender Identity Development in White Male Educators and Facilitators: Towards Individual Processes of Self-Development." Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Education, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA.

- Gottfredson, Linda S. 1996. "What do we know about intelligence?" *The American Scholar*, Winter: 15-30.
- Gurin, Patricia.. 1999. "Export Report." In The Compelling Need for Diversity in Higher Education. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Gurin, Patricia, E. L. Day, Sylvia Hurtado, and G. Gurin. 2002. "Diversity and Higher Education: Theory and Impact on Educational Outcomes." Harvard Educational Review 72(3): 330-6.
- Hacker, Andrew. 1992. Two Nations: Black and White, Separate, Hostile and Unequal New York: Scribners.
- Helms, Janet E. Black and White Racial Identity: Theory, Research, and Practice. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1990.
- Hurtado, Sylvia, Jeffrey F. Milem, Alma Clayton-Pedersen, and W. R. Allen. 1999. "Improving the climate for racial/ethnic diversity in higher education." Report prepared for the Association for the Study of Higher Education. Washington, DC: The George Washington University.
- Hutchinson, S. R and Patricia Hyer. 2000. "The campus climate for diversity: Student perceptions." Report prepared for the Office of Senior Vice President and Provost. Blacksburg, VA: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- Johnson, Allan G. 2001. Privilege, Power and Difference. New York: McGraw-Hill Publishers.
- Lawrence, Sandra M. 1997. "Beyond Race Awareness: White Racial Identity and Multicultural Teaching." The Journal of Teacher Education 48(2): 108-17.
- , and Beverly Daniel Tatum. 1999. "White Racial Identity and Anti-Racist Education: A Catalyst for Change." Pp. 45-51 in Beyond Heroes and Holidays: A Practical Guide to K-12 Anti-Racist, Multicultural Education and Staff Development, edited by E. Lee, D. Menkart and M. Okazawa-Rey. Washington, DC: Network of Educators on the Americas.
- Maruyama, Geoffrey, and Jose F. Moreno. 2000. "University Faculty Views About the Value of Diversity on Campus and in the Classroom." Pp. 9-35 in Does Diversity Make a Difference? Three Research Studies on Diversity in College Classrooms. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education and American Association of University Professors.
- McIntosh, Peggy. 1989. "White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack." Peace and Freedom July/August: 10-12.

Milem, Jeffrey F., & Kinji Hakuta.. 2000. The Benefits of Racial and Ethnic Diversity in Higher Education. Pp. 39-67 in Minorities in higher education 1999-2000, edited by D. J. Wilds. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Orfield, Gary, with M. Kurlaender 2001. "Diversity challenged: Evidence of the impact of affirmative action." Harvard Civil Rights Project. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Civil Rights Project, Harvard University, Harvard Education Publishing Group.

----- and Dean Whitla. 1999. "Diversity and legal education: Student experiences in leading law schools." Harvard Civil Rights Project. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Civil Rights Project, Harvard University, Harvard Education Publishing Group.

Ohio State University, The. 2000. "Strategies and Initiatives." The Academic Plan. <http://www.osu.edu/academicplan/strat.php> Columbus: The Ohio State University.

Partnership Grant. 2003. "Fast Facts for Faculty"
<http://telr.osu.edu/dpg/fastfact/index.html> Columbus: The Ohio State University.

Powell, Rebecca. 1996. "Confronting White Hegemony." *Multicultural Education*, Winter:12-15.

UCLA Higher Education Research Institute. April 1997 Race and Ethnicity in the American Professoriate. Los Angeles: UCLA Higher Education Research Institute.

Appendix A

Six Stage Process

Solicitation - The primary purpose of the initial contact is to introduce CSP and describe the services offered. In this initial meeting, the role that CSP can play in assisting academic units in enhancing the learning climate for all students, with an added emphasis on those from historically underrepresented populations (i.e., students of color, women, gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered students, nontraditionally aged, students, and students with disabilities) will be discussed. In this process the various phases of CSP are reviewed including how CSP can assist the units develop/refine their Diversity Action Plan, discuss methodological issues regarding the gathering of useful data, and inform the unit of resources that can assist in the development of a learning climate that fosters good teaching and classroom equity. In many ways the overall process is similar to that of action research where the researcher and practitioner work together to identify problems and concerns, discuss and develop solutions and plans of action, and systematically monitors the process and outcomes of these change initiatives.

Climate Assessment - The assessment process is a collaborative process between CSP and representatives of the academic unit. The collaboration begins through the discussion of issues relevant to the particular unit and how best to assess the climate for diversity given the specific needs and concerns of the unit. In the process, the various assessment processes (i.e., focus groups sessions, survey questionnaires, interviews, classroom observation, and data analysis) are discussed and customized for the unit to assure the collection of rich and useable data. For example, academic units that have a high level of students taking GEC courses may wish to utilize a survey designed to address classroom specific issues and select an appropriate sample of classes to gain a better understanding of how these students perceive the climate for diversity and learning. At the same time, the unit may desire to have focus groups sessions with students that are enrolled as majors in the unit to explore how they perceive the climate for diversity and learning within the overall unit.

The role of CSP on the assessment process is two-fold. The first is to facilitate the development of research methods that appropriately address the diversity issues within the academic unit and help to identify problems and concerns that may exist which impact the learning climate for all students. In this process methodological issues, such as how to select the participants to be surveyed or whether focus groups should be heterogeneous or homogeneous, are discussed to assure that participants can be assured the necessary level of comfort and confidentiality to share openly. Secondly, CSP will participate in the assessment process through conducting whatever data collection technique(s) the unit selects. In this process, CSP will serve as a neutral entity that assures that the research process is unbiased and provides assurances to those who participate that their contributions will remain confidential.

Dialogue - The data that has been collected is analyzed and summary reports are developed for the academic unit. These reports serve as the basis of the dialogue phase as CSP presents the data gathered and our interpretations of the findings to the academic unit. The unit will review the findings and CSP will facilitate a discussion as to how the findings may be used to develop a better understanding of the existing climate for diversity and learning as well as actions that may be taken to address the issues and concerns raised through the assessment process. This is often a period of reflection, one in which the academic unit may address cultural issues that are impacting the learning climate in ways they may not have previously recognized.

Action Planning - In this phase, the academic unit begins the process of developing a plan of action that specifically addresses issues of diversity. Whether or not the unit's Diversity Action Plan is a separate entity or part of an existing document (e.g., Academic Plan) is not critical, the important factor is that issues of diversity are recognized and specific actions are stated allowing the unit to achieve goals established in the plan. The development of the Diversity Action Plan provides the unit with specific goals to be achieved and allows the unit to gauge its progress and effectiveness. These plans may include specific goals regarding the recruitment and retention of various student populations, new strategies for recruiting faculty from diverse backgrounds, methods to

enhance the curricula, the development of mentoring programs, and seminars on multicultural teaching and culturally responsive pedagogy to name a few. In this process the unit can make use of resources available to them through CSP and FTAD as well as other departments (e.g., Office of Disability Services, The Multicultural Center) on campus that supports the development of a learning climate conducive to all students.

Implementation - Once the Diversity Action Plan has been established it is crucial that the unit take the necessary steps to achieve the goals established in the plan. In this process CSP may be able to connect the unit with other departments that have similar issues and goals to foster a sense of collaboration amongst units. Such partnerships may be helpful especially when one unit has achieved a level of success in creating a diversity climate that aids in the success of all students.

Longitudinal Assessment - The ability to measure success is a critical component in any change process and that is certainly the case in the development of a learning climate that assures the academic success of all students. As in the earlier assessment phase, the methods to conduct follow-up assessments will be determined through a collaborative process between the unit and CSP. The on-going assessment process will allow the unit to recognize which components of the diversity action plan are achieving their goals and which components may be to be re-conceptualized. In such cases, CSP can help identify resources (e.g., 'best practices' from other departments, curriculum workshops, guest speakers) that may assist the unit address the issues that are hampering its ability to achieve the goals set for in the Diversity Action Plan. This ongoing monitoring of the process allows the unit to critically reflect on its actions and should help assure the success of the unit in developing a climate for diversity and learning that benefits all students.

Appendix B

Assessment Design Process

Step 1 – Define unit’s objective for diversity assessment.

How will the results of the CSP climate assessment be used in your unit?

- To better understand the climate for diversity in the unit.
- To develop/update unit data on diversity issues.
- To develop initiatives to improve learning climate.
- To monitor the results of climate for diversity initiative already in place.
- Other specific objectives.

Step 2 – Specify the population that is of interest.

- Students (undergraduate, graduate, and/or professional) enrolled in the college/department.
- Students (undergraduate, graduate, and/or professional) enrolled specific courses in the college/department.
- Faculty and/or staff in the college/department.
- Identify demographic issues that may need special attention (e.g., racial/ethnic categories to be used).
- Other specific populations or variable of interest to the department.

Step 3 – Select method(s) for data collection.

The primary method for CSP data collection is currently through a web based, e-mail delivered survey. However units may elect to use a paper and pencil version or a combination of methods including any of the following:

- Focus groups.
- Interviews.
- Classroom observation.
- Document analysis.
- Other specific data collection methods.

Step 4 – Determine who will be in the sample.

If sampling is necessary, create a sampling frame, and determine the type of sampling to be used.

- Random (simple, stratified, cluster, or two-staged)
- Convenience
- Systematic
- Population/census
- Purposive

Step 5 – Design the assessment.

CSP has created the survey questionnaire (template) for assessing the climate for diversity and learning. Unit may select and/or modify the assessment tool.

- Review/customize the CSP template questionnaire.
- Develop questions for the focus group/interviews (if applicable).
- Determine the criteria for document analysis (if applicable).

Step 6 – Pretest/Revise the questions.

- Pilot test the survey if needed.
- Peer review the questions in the surveys, interviews, and/or focus groups.

Step 7 – Administering the assessment (i.e., survey)

- Identify methods to maximize response rate (e.g., incentive, advertising, personal request).
- Identify methods to notify sample population of the assessment.
- Solicit the dean/chair of the unit to promote the assessment.
- Assure confidentiality.
- Establish timetable for launching the assessment.
- Monitor response rate.
- Establish methods for reminder/follow-up with non-respondents.

Step 8 – Focus group/Interview preparation (if applicable)

- Identify methods to create conducive climate for focus groups/interviews.
- Determine safe location for assessment.
- Identify incentives for participation.
- Assure confidentiality.
- Create an atmosphere conducive to sharing.

Step 9 – Data analysis.

- Establish timetable for analysis.
- CSP will conduct data analysis. However unit may be involved if requested but any potential identifying marker for participants will be removed to assure confidentiality.
- Develop and write final report.

Step 10 – Result and report.

Establish timetable to:

- Review the results/reports.
- Present and discuss the finding (i.e., dialogue).
- Identify and develop plan of action to address diversity issues raised in the report.
- Implement the plan of action.
- Follow-up/longitudinal assessments.

Appendix C

Literature Review

The Importance of Diversity in Education

Reviews of educational research have shown that students benefit from their experiences within demographically diverse campus climates (Hurtado et al 1999; Milem and Hakuta 2000; Orfield 2001). Students report that they benefit from interacting with diverse peers (Orfield & Whitley 1999) and faculty assessments indicate that diversity has a positive impact on student learning outcomes as well as related outcomes that correspond to the overall mission of colleges and universities (Maruyama and Moreno 2000). According to Gurin et al (2002), students' experiences with diversity consistently and meaningfully affected important learning and democracy outcomes of their college education. These effects were consistent across national and single institutional studies, across diverse groups of students, and across various learning outcomes.

Challenges associated with diversity

Identity development and "Hidden privilege"

Identity development theories (i.e., racial, gender, sexual orientation) address how individuals identify with their own social group (e.g. racial/ethnic, gender) as well as how such identification influences their understanding of themselves and others. This occurs through phases in which the person's attitudes and behaviors are reflective of their emotional responses to stimuli. Over time, people move from a less personally aware social identity to a more complex and dynamic social identity (Block and Carter 1998; Helms 1990). For instance, Lawrence and Tatum (1997) describe how white racial identity manifests itself. Such development entails an acceptance of "this aspect [whiteness] of one's identity as socially meaningful and personally salient, and ultimately internalizing a realistically positive view of whiteness which is not based on assumed superiority" (p. 163). The underlying premise of white racial identity development is the abandonment of a racist identity and the development of a positive, non-racist White identity (Carter 1995; Helms 1990). According to McIntosh (1989), whites must openly recognize the reality of white privilege, or the "invisible package of unearned assets" whites use everyday in their lives (p. 165).

Gorski (1998) writes that there are three characteristics associated with whiteness and other forms of social dominance (e.g., sexism, heterosexism) in the literature: 1) issues of privilege; 2) a tendency to deny the significance of racism, sexism, and other forms of oppression; and, 3) a tendency to deny or misunderstand the systemic nature of oppression. These three characteristics function together in a cyclical manner as privilege allows one to view forms of oppression as individual acts of discrimination; this in turn supports the tendency to deny the institutional and cultural dimensions of oppression, which allows members of dominant social groups to overlook the truly harmful effects of oppression on members of subordinated groups. According to Goodman (2001), “people from privileged groups tend to have little awareness of their own dominant identity, of the privilege that it affords them, of the oppression suffered by the corresponding disadvantaged group, and of how they perpetuate it. In the first place, people from privileged groups generally do not think about their dominant group identity” (p. 24). Since White, male, heterosexual, and Christian has been established as the cultural norm in the United States, members of these groups do not need to see themselves as belonging to a group and therefore having identity group membership (Powell 1996). For example, Whites in the United States are educated and socialized to be race neutral, or colorblind, in terms of racial identities and to deny the significance that race plays in our daily lives (Feagin and Vera 1995; Lawrence 1997).

One reason that member of dominant social groups are able to overlook, and often deny, the existence oppression (e.g., sexism, racism) is that they view these issues from an individualistic viewpoint. White males tend to see sexism and racism as individual acts of prejudice and discrimination and cannot, or will not, recognize them in its institutional or cultural forms, which is often how women and people of color view them (Hacker 1992; Powell 1996). Denial, or the failure to recognize institutional and cultural forms of sexism or racism, may be defense mechanisms for white males who find it uncomfortable to view themselves as receiving any form of preferential treatment because of their gender or race (Goodman 2001). This is supported by Powell (1996) who states “believing that ‘we are really all the same’ negates the institutionalization of racism; it denies that race has, and continues to be, pervasive in the structuring of relationships in our society” (p. 14). Most white males see themselves as individuals,

with their own issues and challenges, and not as members of a social group and given the individualistic and competitive nature of American society compare their individual struggles with those of others. That is, as an individual I do not feel privileged, therefore privilege does not exist (Hacker 1992; Goodman 2001; Powell 1996). According to Goodman (2001) people from privileged groups are often resistant to seeing themselves as privileged and uncomfortable with being identified as such. This resistance occurs for the following reasons: 1) being viewed as privileged has negative connotations as people assume that one willfully discriminated against others and are therefore the 'bad guy'; 2) they perceive themselves as average and normal and not the recipient of benefiting from any form of systematic inequalities (i.e., it is difficult to view oneself as privileged when one cannot recognize or understand that the privilege exist; and, 3) they do not perceive themselves to be privileged as they, like most people, are struggling to live their own lives (i.e., worrying about jobs, family, finances, and health).

Individuals from social groups that are considered "the norm" (i.e., whites, males, heterosexuals, Christians, and highly educated people) often have difficulty thinking of themselves in terms of being privileged or dominant. One reason it is difficult to acknowledge privilege or dominance is that such characteristics imply a conscious choice or willingness to openly participate in the discrimination or mistreatment of others. Most people consider themselves to be just and good, and that they treat everyone fairly and as they would like to be treated. Further, individuals within groups that represent the social norm often do not perceive themselves as even being members of a social group. It is difficult to acknowledge group privilege when you identify yourself in individual terms and even harder to acknowledge systemic inequalities associated with social group membership. Thirdly, members of groups that represent the social norm find it hard to accept the notion of being privileged when they themselves do not feel privileged or powerful. As an individual they often feel powerless and cannot fathom having privileges when they themselves are experience struggles and difficulties in life. The individualistic nature of American society contributes to the difficulty in recognizing group privilege, as individuals do not recognize or understand the nature of how dominant ideologies and systematic inequalities were created and are currently maintained (Goodman 2001). Lastly, according to Johnson (2001), the sense of being privileged is relative, as most

people have a tendency to compare themselves to others like themselves (i.e., looking sideways) or people more advantaged than themselves (i.e., looking up). Thus, if one views their peers and those above them to be “better off,” it is difficult to perceive oneself as having any form of privilege.

Effects of privilege on higher education

According to Brubacher (1977) the original intent of higher education was to educate the elite and upper classes and, historically speaking, institutions of higher education were demographically limited and predominately white and male. The exclusion of women and people of color was intentional and their inclusion on campuses would have a detrimental effect on the institution of higher education. This is supported by academic attempts (e.g. The Bell Curve) to link demographic markers such as race, ethnicity, and gender with intellectual capacity and ability and to justify the exclusion of certain groups (Gottfredson 1996). Brown (2004) argues that there is a need to recognize the historical exclusion of groups of people (i.e., women, people of color, people with disabilities) from institutions of higher education and to acknowledge that the cultural norm of prestigious institution of higher education is affluent, male, and of European descent.

According to Hutchinson & Hyer (2000) there is a need to move beyond simply increasing the demographic representation of historically underrepresented groups on campuses to incorporating diversity into the curriculum and developing more inclusive classroom pedagogies. Gurin (2002) makes a case for not only achieving structural diversity (i.e., a demographically diversified campus) but for creating a climate that fosters and values both classroom and informal interaction diversity that facilitates the development of a climate that increases the knowledge and understanding of diverse groups.

Groups differences in perceptions of the campus climate

Perceptions of campus climate appear to be influenced by one’s group membership and the societal expectation associated with said membership (Brown 2004). In Brown’s study, white males, both students and faculty, did not perceive issues as women and people of color perceived them; they were generally less sensitive to issues and did not report experiencing negative behavior. Not only did white faculty and

students, regardless of gender, held a much more positive perception of the institutions climate for diversity and appeared to be largely unaware of biases faced by students and faculty of color. There appears to be an overall lack of awareness of diversity issues by whites/European-Americans, specifically amongst men, that enables them to perceive a climate that embraces all groups while people of color and women perceive of a climate that is not as tolerant and welcoming (Brown 2004; Conley, Hyer and McLaughlin 1999).

Conversely, female faculty and students not only perceived issues related to race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, and other forms of diversity more than males but were more critical of the institution and more willing to act to improve the situation. African-American faculty and students had similar findings as they reported perceiving the climate for diversity to be less hospitable than whites and were more skeptical of the institution's commitment to diversity. Faculty of color, compared to their white colleagues, report that despite the talk of improving the climate for diversity that little institutional action has, or will, occur (UCLA Higher Education Research Institute 1997). Students of color have reported that they perceive institutional efforts on issues of improving recruitment and retention are based more upon having a representative sample of students of color on campus than with their overall academic well-being (Dilg 2000; Hutchison and Hyer 2000). According to Hurtado (1999) this often results in feeling of alienation, isolation, and an overall sense of lack of belonging for students of color. Additionally students of color tend to consider diversity issues in terms of institutional commitment and action while Whites perceive diversity issues in terms of their contact with students of color (Brown 2004). This is similar to how American society as a whole views issues of race; people of color tend to see issues in institutional and cultural terms, while Whites tend to view themselves in individual terms.

How diversity operates in the organizational setting

Thompson and Carter (1997) define organizations as mechanisms for both structuring and directing the actions of groups, thereby forming a group identity. They apply theory that describes an individual's psychological development in groups, and assert that, because groups serve as the foundation of organizations, the theory may be applicable to the organization. For example, Helms (1990) hypothesized that members of a group will form coalitions that are based on their racial identity and that these coalitions

will then represent the combined influence of individual members as persons of similar identity statuses will bond. Block and Carter (1998) support such a contention and state that “if most members of a group or organization are characterized by a predominance of a particular level of racial identity, then the organization or group will take on that racial identity perspective” (p. 273).

It has also been found that organizational climates and cultures are strongly influenced by their leaders and decision makers and that leaders form and shape the moral and ethical compass that guides decision-making (Burke and Litwin 1992). Such findings relate to the organizational identity as the beliefs and values of leaders will greatly influence the overall climate. Carter and Thompson (1997) argue that organizational leaders who want to meaningfully include groups that do not represent the dominant culture in all sectors of the organizational structure must do so by promoting a healthy, organizational climate that values members from all groups. This can be accomplished when organizational leaders: 1) display through their decision making and managerial practices sensibilities associated with advanced social identity stages (i.e., redefinition, internalization); 2) anticipate issues associated with group membership to occur and prepare in advance to deal with them; 3) help foster social identity development by recognizing the role group membership plays in their area of the organizations; and 4) recognize that issues associated with social group identity and membership will occur and need to be dealt with at the interpersonal level as well as within the various coalition that interact within the organizational setting (Carter and Thompson 1997).

Block and Carter (1998) report on a study they conducted that demonstrated that a person’s racial identity influenced their decision-making when rating applicants on favorability scales. They found that the racial identity status of the evaluator was a moderating variable and that selection decisions were influenced by their identification with the white culture. This is similar to an internal investigation of letters of reference for graduate students within a historically, male-dominated academic department at Ohio State. Findings indicated that letters of reference for men and women differed. The differences were subtle, as all the letters could be rated as favorable. Importantly, letters for male graduate students tended to focus on accomplishment and gave specific

examples of academic successes, while letters for female graduate students tended to focus on personality issues and likeability. This may seem like a minor issue; however, the academic community for this particular field recognizes and rewards measurable and recognized accomplishments more than it does character of applicants.

Carter (2000) advocates for the need to investigate the affects of social group identity development on the organizational culture when he states: “In the literature on organizational psychology and management, little is said about how cultural issues will influence organizations in the future” (p. 4). The literature reviewed for this report supports Carter’s assertion and has presented an argument for the need to better understand how social group identities of members of academic department contribute to the overall organizational culture. Further, we need to directly assess the influences of social group identities on the overall climate for diversity and learning within the unit.

Appendix D
Past CSP Assessments

The following academic units have participated in the CSP Assessment Process.

Academic Unit	Type of Assessment
Moritz College of Law	Focus groups and Paper and pencil survey
Mathematics	Focus groups and Paper and pencil survey
College of Social Work	Focus groups and Paper and pencil survey
Nursing	Focus groups
Geography	Focus group
College of Veterinary Medicine	Focus group and Interviews
College of Education	Focus groups and Paper and pencil survey
East Asian Language & Literature	Online survey
Women's Studies	Online Survey
College of Humanities (Junior Faculty)	Focus Groups (GLBT, Faculty of Color, Female)
Office of Minority Affairs	Paper and pencil survey
College of Pharmacy	Focus groups and online surveys
College of Dentistry	Online surveys
Evolution, Ecology, and Organismal Biology	Online survey
English	Online surveys

Appendix E

Quantitative and Qualitative Data Common Themes

Several themes, from both the quantitative and qualitative analysis, have emerged from the assessments that CSP has conducted. The following are among the focal themes.

Quantitative Analysis:

The descriptive statistics used to describe the variables of the assessment includes frequencies, percentages, measures of central tendency, and variability. Cross-tabulations were made on the students' responses by gender, race/ethnicity, academic rank, disability status, and major. T-tests were used to test the differences among the variable mean scores on gender, race/ethnicity, academic rank, major, disability status, and sexual orientation.

Major themes from the quantitative analysis include the following:

- issues of demographic representation
- perceived overall climate for diversity and learning
- differential overall experiences by gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, and disability status
- lack of awareness of programs and services

Demographic Representation

1. The majority of the respondents consists of White students; and was typically a heterosexual, U.S. Citizens, female, Christian, between 21 to 25 years of age, worked between 10 to 20 hours per week, and lived in suburb before coming to O.S.U. Less than 3% considered themselves as persons with substantial disability that impacts a major life activity.
2. The racial/ethnic composition of the respondents typically consists of over 80% White/Caucasian, and less than; 5% Asian American/Pacific Islander, 4% African American/Black, 2% Hispanic/Latino American, and 0.5% Native American Alaskan Native.

Perceived climate for diversity and learning

1. Data attest to a highly favorable perception of climate for diversity and learning by students with regards to:
 - (a). ***The Departments tend to have***; (a) commitment to establish positive learning climate in classrooms, (b) ability to welcome students with diverse background and make them feel at home, (c) ability to provide opportunities for students to succeed academically, and (d) the department's overall climate for diversity was perceived as good or excellent.
 - (b). ***Instructors tend to have***; (a) commitment to meet the needs of students from diverse background, (b) respect for students diverse cultural identities, (c) maintain the same high levels of expectations for all students in the classroom, and at the same time, encouraged full participation of all students
2. Most students indicated that their departments did not provide them with adequate information concerning procedure to address instances when they felt they have been treated unfairly
3. Students with learning disabilities felt that faculty members did not respond with consideration and cooperation when they request accommodation with respect to their special learning needs in the classroom.
4. Many students felt uncomfortable expressing their opinions about issues of diversity in the classroom.

Differential Overall Experiences

1. Minority students were more likely than White students to believe that expectations of their performance were based on their racial/ethnic background.
2. Minority students were more likely to agree that they need to minimize aspects of their identity to fit in the department than white students.
3. Minority students were more likely to feel that they were expected to represent the collective views of their respective racial/ethnic groups in the classroom than white student. Expecting or asking a student to represent the views of an entire racial/ethnic group negates inherent differences in needs and experiences among group members. Such expectation may put the student "on the spot" and sometimes forestall his/her free and full meaningful participation in classroom discussions and learning activities.
4. Minority students were more likely to agree that they experienced unfair treatment in the department than white students.
5. Male students were more likely than female students to have experienced a sense of alienation in the classroom because of their cultural identity.
6. Female students were more likely than their male counterparts to have experienced insensitive behavior and unfair treatment because of their gender, and were more likely to perceive that their expected academic performances were

based on their gender.

7. Non-heterosexual students were more likely than heterosexual students to have been treated unfairly or harassed in the department because of their sexual orientation.

Qualitative Data:

Students were asked if they had anything else they would like to share about their perception of the climate for diversity in the Departments.

Major themes to emerge from the qualitative data analysis include the following:

- lack of awareness of diversity issues,
- issues of representation,
- backlash to diversity efforts, and
- gender issues

The following are examples of participant responses from each of these categories (Note – spelling errors have been corrected for readability purposes and references to specific department/colleges have been removed).

Lack of awareness of diversity issues

There seemed to be a recognition of promoting diversity in many of my classes. I do not fit into any minority category, so I feel reluctant to speak for the overall minority experience. I went to OSU as a "non-traditional student" working 40 hrs/wk and going to school. This would be the only reason I felt the department did not make me feel as though I belonged. Not from professors, but from advising staff when trying to schedule classes. I realize that the OSU program is not designed for non-traditional students, but there are still many here and they should not be made to feel like they are not welcome.

I think things are fine within the department. It shouldn't be a matter of trying to incorporate diversity just for the sake of having a perfect balance of cultures. Diversity can be a good thing, but it should happen naturally where inclusion is based on intelligence. I strongly agree that different cultures can bring different angles to a class

discussion, but it is extremely important that we avoid having set standards just for the sake of meeting some regulated criteria.

The word 'diversity' was used 10 times in this questionnaire. That is 10 times too many. Once again, diversity is not important - it is the academics and the learning styles that are important as well as the number of students that go on to graduate. Stop asking the diversity questions!

I actually never thought about the diversity in courses. Frankly, who cares if it is diverse. From my experiences, it doesn't matter boy/girl or ethnical origin, if I need to ask a question from another student, it will be from someone that is beside and alone. I won't choose someone in a group as common courteous.

I feel that there is an unwritten and sometimes unspoken understanding that diversity is good. I'm not sure that there needs to be an explicit statement about diversity in the classroom, though it seems that this survey may be leading towards some such statement. When syllabi are full of statements about academic misconduct, disabilities, nondiscrimination policies, and the diversity climate, where will the academic information be listed?

Here again, students are the ones with the problem of perception and judgmental attitudes. I feel that some classmates have discriminated against other classmates and I have heard classmates discuss patients in a very judgmental way. ALL STUDENTS IN PROGRAM SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO GO TO AT LEAST ONE EXTERNSHIP THAT DEALS WITH POVERTY, ETHNICITY, AND OR DIVERSITY, TO HELP BETTER ENLIGHTEN THEM ON THESE ISSUES AND CLEAR UP THEIR MISCONCEPTIONS OF THESE PAITENT AND STUDENT SITUATIONS FOR FUTURE PRACTICE!!

Within the classroom as mentioned above, my class has many groups and one in particular is very derogatory towards others in the class who are different. For example, they have nick names for people based on their differences and they think they are the

greatest things that have entered parks hall. I just ignore them and do not take part in their laughter. They can make it intimidating to ask questions b/c they just want to leave and make fun of those that ask questions, but I don't care b/c I am paying good money for my education. Students like that just need more time for growing up I guess.

Further, the dean works on "slave" ants - she should be told by someone that that language is extremely offensive to many people and that she should try to use other, biologically appropriate language to describe the behavior of a non-human organism (including removing from display all media clips from around her door).

While a lack of diversity would be detrimental to any learning environment, the presence or absence of diversity never enters my conscious thoughts during class, rotations, etc. Not that there is anything wrong with it, but I feel this survey was forced on the college in order to satisfy some state requirement.

Issues of Representation

The department is not very diverse but I don't feel I have been discriminated against. As a minority though, it is pretty noticeable that I am the only person of color in a classroom at times. But that's really a personal issue.

Frankly, having done Post Secondary, I'd have to say my experience is that Ohio State is not particularly 'diverse', at least compared to Akron U. Not only that, Ohio State makes a big deal about how amazingly diverse it is as a school. Basically it's a case of compensating for reality by shouting really loudly to solidify the idea into peoples' heads. I don't think I heard a thing about diversity at Akron, but perhaps they didn't need to go and say LOOK EVERYBODY! WE'RE, LIKE, SOOOOOOO DIVERSE! "Out to lunch" seems to describe the situation properly. On the other hand, part of the reason Ohio State is less 'diverse' is probably that it has selective admission. That keeps out a large and interesting portion of the population.

This department is not especially diverse - it is populated by open-minded and welcoming people.

It is hard to evaluate the climate towards diversity when I see very little to for the department to react to. I encounter mainly middle class Americans as students and faculty with few minorities and women sprinkled within this category. Thus, there is little pressure to create a climate sensitive to diversity within the department. The focus should be on creating the diverse student and faculty body and then ask these questions. This is putting the cart before the horse.

I don't see much diversity within our class. It seems like more than 70% of our class consist of non-minority groups, mostly Caucasian/White. Overall, I was disappointed about the program and the environment within my class. To be honest, if I ever had a chance to do everything over, I would not choice to attend this university. This is not the kind of environment I envision it to be prior to attending the program. I think it would be a good idea in the future to give prospective students, perhaps during his or her interview session, a chance to see what it is really like to be in this program. A chance to see the classroom or actually attend classes so that he or she won't regret at a later time. I am not sure how you can better the program. Maybe it is just the nature of program that no one really has much time to interact with one another, I don't know.

The college, while trying to attain more diversity, has also enrolled many, many students of the same racial and religious minorities, thereby defeating the purpose of having a diverse student population. Although there are quite a few minorities, they are of the same groups, which is disconcerting when faced with the issue of increasing diversity in the learning process. We are not increasing diversity, we are simply "evening" it out. I don't believe true diversity is seen here.

Backlash to Diversity Efforts

I think that diversity is complete bullshit, and anyone that actually uses the fact that they are a 'minority' to make other people do things for them and go out of their way so that the 'minority' doesn't feel bad, has a lot of problems.

I think that it is kind of odd how almost all of the people that work for or represent the office of minority affairs are black. I consider most of these individuals to have very little minority standing considering that their ancestors have been in this country for several generations.

I do not believe that diversity should be preached as much. Yes, it is nice to have people with different backgrounds and skin colors. But that should not be the focus of most of these questions. I am sick and tired of hearing people brag about diversity. I don't care about the male to female ratio or the percentages of races in the program. This survey should be asking us how we feel the professors and TA's treat us, our classes, and how we feel about the program thus far from our experiences.

Stop working so hard to further diversity. We are ALL individuals no matter our backgrounds. It shouldn't matter if you are Asian, White, Middle Eastern, male, or female. Every single person is the same. Personally, as a white male, I feel that I am underrepresented. I want special scholarships that only apply to other white males. I want financial help based on my background. The program is being racist and biased against all white males. I believe more is expected of me because English happens to be my first language. One kid in one of my classes turned in a lab report that was FAR inferior to mine AND was riddled with spelling and grammatical errors and he received the same grade as me. I maintain that this is because he is foreign and English is not his native tongue. This is biased and any person with a lick of sense would notice this. Unfortunately, in our society, we would allow this to go on, in the interest of "allowing everyone to have an equal chance". Well, sometimes, if you can't hack it, you shouldn't do it. If I go to Japan and want to go to school there, I would HATE it if I was allowed to

perform lower than the native students and receive similar grades only because of my difficulty with the language.

I am actually a bit offended by this survey. The more I hear about OSU, the more it seems they actually do not care about the average student. Their "diverse" reputation seems more important than their actual educational standards, and as a white male I feel all I am doing here is taking up space they would rather devote to someone who might make OSU look more accepting. All the while, we are all being neglected educationally in favor of the school's image.

I feel that this survey is an excellent example of the excessive attention paid to fostering diversity, while other characteristics, such as work ethic, personality and likelihood of success after graduation are taken far less seriously than they should be. There are several minority students in the college who definitely deserve to be there and will be excellent [practitioners]. Similarly, the college has done some of the minority students a great disservice by giving them a false sense of security that they will have a strong financial future considering their inability to communicate with patients and their peers. They are obviously intelligent individuals, but I am certain that a survey [of practitioners] across the state will show that there is a negative correlation between grade point average during college and successful business practice out of college. Please do not take this as a racist/xenophobic statement. This is applicable to all students regardless of background. I am neither suggesting that educational abilities be removed from the equation or that interviews of applicants be the sole factor in the decisions to accept or reject students. I am merely stating what seems to escape the schools ability to remedy. Surveys like this are arrogant attempts to stroke the institution's ego over its diverse population, while other factors in our education (such as preparedness for board certification) seem to take a less prominent position in the hierarchy of importance.

Gender Issues

Just to reiterate....there is discrimination against men within the program. There aren't scholarships or awards solely for men as there are women. We don't see presentations

about men in the computer science world, or clubs for just men (other than the engineering frat). Please in the spirit of diversity try and find a balance of celebrating both men and women in the program.

I would like to see more female professors get involved in mentoring and advising undergraduate females. I would also like to see increased awareness of what constitutes sexual harassment, as I and many females I know in the department have had unpleasant experiences with a handful of male professors (the majority of male professors are fine, but a few seem to think that their position excuses their behavior).

Some male professors have said some slightly offensive statements about women. Nothing huge though, just little things.

It seems like women get treated differently than men but not unilaterally- that is, they fare better in lab courses with male instructors, but worse in didactic courses with male instructors. Our administration seems very concerned with finding out issues, and instead of solving them, covering them up or "negotiating" with the parties involved to settle the specific argument, without addressing the bigger issue OSU and the College seem very rooted in tradition- I think the number of faculty who consider students as "colleagues" could be counted on one hand.

A few people ruin the climate for many - it would be great to have some in house seminars on diversity incorporated into our seminar series. As a woman, I feel as if several male faculty need this training desperately and should be informed that their behavior reflects badly on the department.