



BOARD OF REGENTS

SUMMARY OF ITEM FOR ACTION, INFORMATION OR DISCUSSION

TOPIC: Programs of Cultural Diversity Progress Report

COMMITTEE: Education Policy

DATE OF COMMITTEE MEETING: March 16, 2011

SUMMARY: Senate Bill 438 and House Bill 905 require that each institution of higher education in Maryland develop and implement a plan for a program of cultural diversity among its students, faculty, and staff. If an institution already has a cultural diversity program, it is to develop and implement a plan for improving the program. Plans must include an implementation strategy and timeline for meeting goals, a process for responding to reporting campus-based hate-crimes and bias-motivated incidents, and a summary of any resources, including State grants, needed by the institution to effectively recruit and retain culturally diverse student body, faculty, and staff. Institutions are also required to enhance cultural diversity programming and sensitivity to cultural diversity through instruction and training of the student body, faculty, and staff.

The law requires that, on or before May 1 of each year, each institution shall submit its plan to the governing body of the institution for the governing body's review. Further, on or before August 1 of each year, the governing body of an institution shall submit to MHEC a progress report regarding the institution's implementation of its plan.

"Cultural diversity" is defined in SB 438 and HB905 as the inclusion of those racial and ethnic groups and individuals that are or have been underrepresented in higher education. The USM institutions have taken a more inclusive approach to reflect guidance from the Attorney General's office dated May 15, 2008, that states, "a plan that will include race-conscious elements should not be implemented in a manner that will limit the elements of 'cultural diversity' solely to racial and ethnic considerations." Individual campus reports may be accessed at <http://www.usmd.edu/regents/agendas/ed031611.html>.

ALTERNATIVE(S): The plans are legislatively mandated and must be reviewed by the Board of Regents each year; there is no alternative identified.

FISCAL IMPACT: Fiscal impact is a function of resource needs identified by the institution.

CHANCELLOR'S RECOMMENDATION: That the Committee on Education Policy recommend that the Board of Regents approve the institutional programs of cultural diversity progress reports submitted in Spring 2011.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Approval.	DATE: March 16, 2011
-------------------------------------	----------------------

BOARD ACTION:	DATE:
---------------	-------

SUBMITTED BY: Irwin L. Goldstein	(301) 445-1992	irv@usmd.edu
----------------------------------	----------------	--------------

**REPORT
to the
BOARD OF REGENTS
on
PROGRESS OF INSTITUTIONAL PROGRAMS OF CULTURAL DIVERSITY**

MARCH 16, 2011

Background

Effective 1 July 2008, Senate Bill 438 and House Bill 905 require institutions of higher education to develop and implement a plan for a program of cultural diversity. If the institution already has a program of cultural diversity, the law requires a plan for improving it. Institutional plans must include:

- an implementation strategy,
- a timeline for meeting goals,
- a description of the way the institution addresses cultural diversity among students, faculty, and staff,
- a description of how the institution plans to enhance cultural diversity, if improvement is needed,
- a process for responding to reporting campus-based hate crimes and bias-motivated incidents that may occur on campus,
- a summary of needed resources, including State grants, to effectively recruit and retain a culturally diverse student body, faculty, and staff, and
- instruction and training of the student body, faculty, and staff at the institution to enhance cultural diversity programming and sensitivity.

On or before May 1 of each year each institution is required to submit its plan to the governing body for review. On or before August 1 the governing body is required to submit a progress report regarding the institution's implementation of its plan to the Maryland Higher Education Commission.

Cultural diversity is defined in SB 438 and HB905 as the inclusion of those racial and ethnic groups and individuals that are or have been underrepresented in higher education. However, based on advice from the Attorney General's Office as of May 15, 2008 that states: "a plan that will include race-conscious elements should not be implemented in a manner that will limit the elements of 'cultural diversity' solely to racial and ethnic considerations.", the University System of Maryland (USM) has taken a more inclusive approach to cultural diversity.

Without exception, institutional programs of cultural diversity are explicitly linked to institutional mission, vision, core values, strategic plan, and in many cases accreditation standards. Thus, there is variation as to how each institution approaches, implements, and enhances its program of cultural diversity. Although there are common themes, elements, and approaches across USM institutions, the implementation strategies, timelines, and resources for meeting the institutional goals of their programs vary as well.

Consistent with the requirements of this legislation, each USM institution submitted its plans for a program of cultural diversity to the Board of Regents for its initial review in March 2009 and in February 2010 its first progress report. This 2011 progress report provides a brief summary of the more detailed institutional progress reports that are attached. Data on student, faculty, and staff are provided in each institutional report. Although provided in separate crime reports to the Board of Regents, summary institutional data are also included in **Table 1** on hate crimes and bias-motivated incidents. For brevity, selected institutional examples are provided throughout this report solely to illustrate the range of possible responses to implementing and sustaining programs of cultural diversity. While comparisons of institutional programs of cultural diversity are inevitable, it is more important to note the commonality and consistency of efforts to implement such programs across USM institutions. Institutions have begun

to identify and use national “best practices” in continuing refinement of their efforts to effectively address cultural diversity.

Develop and implement a plan for a program of cultural diversity.

Board approved institutional plans for programs of cultural diversity reflect the leadership, history, complexity, scope, organization, resource commitment, and level of engagement across the USM that is consistent with the distinctive location, character, mission, and vision of each institution. The ongoing institutional development and maintenance of programs of cultural diversity promote a campus climate conducive to inclusiveness and sensitivity to the value of diverse cultures, experiences, and perspectives. For example, shortly after his arrival in July 2010, Dr. Jay A. Perman, the new President at University of Maryland Baltimore (UMB) created a Diversity and Inclusion Council. In his letter of invitation to the inaugural members of the Council he posed the following question and statement that permeates in varying ways the central importance of cultural diversity across all USM institutions. “Are we doing all we can to make our faculty, staff, and student body as welcoming as possible in serving an increasingly diverse population? In raising this question I am talking about more than than numbers and percentages; I am talking about inclusiveness and sensitivity....”¹ Considered a national “best practice”, diversity councils or similar administrative structures that formally address cultural diversity are found at every USM institution. It should be noted also that these councils are becoming important vehicles for inter divisional collaboration as is the case with Frostburg’s (FSU) divisions of Academic Affairs, the President’s Advisory Council on Diversity, and Student and Educational Services.

Develop and implement a plan for improving an existing program.

Expansion of the concept of cultural diversity beyond race and ethnicity has enabled institutions to be more reflective and discerning in their approaches to improving their programs of cultural diversity. Significant in this regard is the integration of programs of cultural diversity with initiatives to close the achievement gap. Through on-going campus-wide, school, college, and department level strategic planning, assessment, and evaluation of efforts to achieve greater access to academic program and improve institution wide cultural diversity, institutions have sought ways to advance their programs of cultural diversity and close the achievement gap concurrently.

Improving institutional efforts is by no means a short-term nor easy task. For example, the University of Maryland College Park’s (UMCP) 30-member campus-wide steering committee comprised of faculty, staff, and students spent more than a year crafting the first institutional diversity plan in its history. The plan provides a vision and roadmap for campus efforts in diversity for the next ten years. Among its measures is the hiring of a Chief Diversity Officer, creation of an Office of University Diversity, and the establishment of a representative Diversity Advisory Council to give voice to the needs and visions of diverse groups at all levels of the campus community.

In still another institutional example of improving its program of cultural diversity, Towson University (TU) is now in Phase II of its Reflective Process implementation plan that involves the identification of diversity goals by academic colleges and departments. Among the many initiatives that the University of Baltimore (UB) is undertaking to improve its program of cultural diversity work is the organized review of its curriculum and co-curriculum. Specifically, in February 2010, the Provost recruited a diverse (in terms of age, tenure, gender, race, and sexual orientation) faculty team to participate in an American Association of Colleges & Universities conference on cultural diversity. In so doing, the University of Baltimore positioned these faculty to be more effective in addressing the diversity issues in the curriculum and the needs of first year students. The University of Maryland Eastern Shore (UMES) approaches improvement of its programs of cultural diversity with specific goals and benchmarks in each aspect of its effort, like other USM institutions. UMES also uses a familiar comparative outcome metric

¹ University of Baltimore, 2010 Programs of Cultural Diversity Progress Report, p.3.

(baseline year 2008-2009) to measure its success from year to year and to adjust its approach accordingly. UMES' goal to maintain a non-African American administrative staff of 18 between 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 was achieved. Institutions across the USM are engaging in similar activities to strengthen and advance the scope of impact of their programs of cultural diversity.

The way the institution addresses cultural diversity among its students, faculty, and staff populations.

To address cultural diversity among its students, faculty, and staff each institution has implemented initiatives internally encompassing curricular and programmatic areas and externally with community and business partners. Initiatives include, but are not limited to, formal academic programs, special cultural programs, marketing, recruitment, bridge programs, retention, support activities, faculty/staff development and training, as well as community collaborations and partnerships.

While institutions make statements like: "We are resolutely committed to fostering dialogue and collaboration among peoples of different backgrounds, orientations, and perspectives and ensuring the respectful treatment of all."²; it is their behavior that clearly demonstrates to all a firm commitment to cultural diversity. UMCP continues to give leadership by being among the nation's most diverse campuses with more than 33% of its undergraduates being persons of color and some 3000 undergraduate and graduate international students. In Fall 2010, this commitment was manifested in still another way. UMCP hired its first Asian American president and welcomed its most diverse group of new tenured/tenure track faculty: five who identified themselves as African American; two as Hispanic; and seven as Asian American.

Organizationally, Bowie State University (BSU) recently created the Office of International Programs designed to make international students feel at home on campus. Since 2008, its Department of Psychology and Disabled Student Services have co-sponsored Disability Awareness Day to make more than 400 participants aware of the resources and support services available to address physical and psychological disabilities. At Salisbury University (SU) the Franklin P. Perdue School of Business' Business, Economic, and Community Outreach Network (BEACON) hosts the Bienvenidos a Delmarva Network to improve outreach to children of migrants in the region and to support tutoring programs aimed at English-language learners. Capitalizing on the currency of social networking, University of Maryland University College (UMUC) utilizes its social media platform to engage all students in the virtual diversity discussion. UMUC has also continued to sponsor and host the Top 100 Minority Business Entrepreneurs (MBE) program that highlights Washington DC Metro Region minority and woman owned businesses who are recognized as leaders in the business world.

In 2010, Salisbury University (SU) held a Professional Networking Luncheon to strengthen or establish partnerships to help increase Maryland's minority student college admittance and degree attainment. Over 50 community college and secondary education professionals from the Baltimore/Washington region and Southern Maryland attended.

Process for responding to reporting campus-based hate crimes and bias-motivated incidents

All institutions have a formal process for reporting campus-based hate crimes and bias-motivated incidents under the federal requirements of the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act. However, institution-wide response to such incidents involves offices outside of the criminal justice function to systematically address and calm potentially dis-harmonizing reactions in the overall campus environment.

² University of Maryland College Park, 2010 Programs of Cultural Diversity Progress Report, p.2.

Table 1 summarizes the campus-based hate crimes and bias-motivated incidents reported by institution.

Table 1 2010 SUMMARY of Campus-based hate crimes and bias-motivated incidents											
	BSU	CSU	FSU	SU	TU	UB	UMB	UMBC	UMCP	UMES	UMUC
Students	0	DNR	2	2	23	0	0	1	4	0	0
Faculty	0	DNR	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Staff	0	DNR	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	DNR	2	3	23	0	0	3*	4	0	0
DNR = Did Not Report * = Reported without category.											

Summary of any resources, including State grants, needed to effectively recruit and retain a culturally diverse student body, faculty, and staff.

Although institutions have been resourceful in reallocating, finding, and securing additional resources to support their programs of cultural diversity particularly to create a culturally diverse student body, faculty, and staff, severe budgetary challenges continue to limit the scope of their efforts. The adequacy and sustainability of resources have prohibited the continuation of institutional initiatives in these areas for several USM institutions. The following examples illustrate the range of these challenges and the limits imposed on institutions. The attached institutional reports provide fuller details of their particular resource needs.

Coppin State University (CSU) School Nursing Dominican Republic Initiative exposes nursing students and faculty to patients abroad through clinical experiences and educational programs. However, in 2010 CSU did not send students or faculty due to a shortage of financial resources. An additional \$30,000 would be required to increase students participation from five to ten. At the University of Maryland Baltimore County (UMBC) the Center for Women in Information Technology has to limit the participation of transfer and underrepresented students in scholarly activities designed for them due to lack of funding. Similarly, UMBC'S Annual Research Symposium which brings together first-year Meyerhoff graduate fellows with current Meyerhoff graduate fellows is only partially funded by a grant. In 2009, FSU estimated that its program of cultural diversity required an additional \$214,000. Although it has made progress over the last two years, it has been unable to provide these additional funds. At UMB, there is a positive contrast. Ten \$10,000 scholarships were awarded by the Robert Wood Foundation in the Clinical Nurse Leader program to newly admitted students who are from groups underrepresented in nursing or from disadvantaged backgrounds.

With respect to recruitment and retention, UMBC offers a pilot Postdoctoral Fellows Program for Faculty Diversity designed to support for two years promising scholars committed to diversity in the academy and to prepare them for possible future tenure track appointments at UMBC. Through the use of diverse media outlets, such as Maryland Workforce Exchange and the National Association of College Auxiliary Services, BSU has hired 31 ethnically diverse employees: 23 Caucasians, 3 Hispanics, and 5 Asians. The Office of Student Research in the UMB School of Medicine maintains an online database of summer research/year-off fellowships and seeks out minorities and actively recruits them. UMCP is in the third year of a \$2.4 million grant program that designated UMCP as an Asian American and Native American/Pacific Islander serving institution. In the inaugural class, it is the only academically selective institution and the only one located on the east coast to receive this designation. TU's Community Enrichment and Enhancement Partnership Award (CEEP) designed to increase access and success of cultural diverse and traditionally under-served undergraduate students has produced the greatest number (137 or 81%) of CEEP award recipients from its African American students.

Enhance cultural diversity programming and sensitivity to cultural diversity through instruction and training of the student body, faculty, and staff at the institution of higher education.

Enhancing cultural diversity programs and sensitivity through instruction and training is ongoing and carried out in myriad ways across USM institutions. SU is developing workshops covering Sexual Harassment Prevention, Prevision of Discrimination and Other Forms of Harassment, and Teaching in a Diverse Classroom for implementation in 2011. UB is working to identify campus leaders with expertise in cultural diversity as a step toward becoming a “Living Library” in which those with cultural diversity knowledge can be paired with those who have cultural diversity questions. UMUC offers through the Office of Diversity Initiatives a Diversity Awareness Program comprised of the following training modules: Interpersonal Communication, Managing a Diverse Workforce, Working in a Diverse Environment, and Sexual Harassment, a module mandatory for all faculty and staff. Its Human Resource Office continues to provide ongoing employee training through a proprietary online training program called UMUC LEADS (Learning, Education, Advancement, and Development). At BSU a dozen faculty have participated in a range of cultural diversity related professional development and training activities.

Conclusions

In this 2011 progress report on institutional programs of cultural diversity, particularly noteworthy is the continuing engagement that USM institutions have made between plans for programs of cultural diversity and closing the achievement gap. This connection and engagement recognizes the interdependency. The goals of neither can be achieved without the other.

Further, it is important to note that USM institutions value the necessity for deliberate regular consideration and review of their goals, plans, strategies, and benchmarks to appropriately make improvements in their cultural diversity efforts. While institutions readily acknowledge the inadequacy of funding to support initiatives, the resolve to sustain and where possible to do more remains strong. All see the value-added dimensions of programs of cultural diversity as vital to their missions and interests.