AGENDA FOR PUBLIC SESSION

Call to Order

Chairman Gossett

1. Fundraising Updates
   a. Year-to-date fundraising March FY21 (information)
2. USM 2020 Quasi-Endowment Grant Awards Summary Report (information)
3. Renaming request from Towson University (action)
   a. Rename Paca House and Carroll Hall
4. Adjourn (action)
TOPIC: Year-to-date Fundraising Report

COMMITTEE: Advancement Committee

DATE OF MEETING: May 12, 2021

SUMMARY: The attached table shows fundraising progress (as compared to FY20 and against the FY21 goal) for March 2021.

ALTERNATIVE(S): This is an information item.

FISCAL IMPACT: This is an information item.

CHANCELLOR’S RECOMMENDATION: This is an information item.

COMMITTEE ACTION: Information item DATE: 5.12.21

BOARD ACTION: DATE:

SUBMITTED BY: Leonard Raley, Vice Chancellor for Advancement, raley@usmd.edu
301-445-1941
# FY21 Fundraising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>FY20 Results 31-Mar</th>
<th>FY21 Results 31-Mar</th>
<th>FY2021 Goal</th>
<th>Percentage to Goal FY21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowie State University</td>
<td>$829,167</td>
<td>$1,621,666</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td>46.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coppin State University</td>
<td>$1,273,446</td>
<td>$999,475</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td>76.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frostburg State University</td>
<td>$1,659,252</td>
<td>$2,348,374</td>
<td>$2,750,000</td>
<td>85.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury University</td>
<td>$10,962,047</td>
<td>$6,801,955</td>
<td>$11,000,000</td>
<td>61.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towson University</td>
<td>$6,952,345</td>
<td>$13,508,781</td>
<td>$14,500,000</td>
<td>93.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Baltimore</td>
<td>$5,226,225</td>
<td>$7,376,546</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>245.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland, Baltimore</td>
<td>$42,410,478</td>
<td>$64,182,449</td>
<td>$85,000,000</td>
<td>75.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland Baltimore County</td>
<td>$7,897,940</td>
<td>$6,279,348</td>
<td>$12,500,000</td>
<td>50.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland Center for Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>$700,457</td>
<td>$1,792,002</td>
<td>$1,125,000</td>
<td>159.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland College Park</td>
<td>$136,933,751</td>
<td>$165,501,125</td>
<td>$175,000,000</td>
<td>94.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland Eastern Shore</td>
<td>$1,007,439</td>
<td>$4,091,646</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>163.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland Global Campus</td>
<td>$19,664,077</td>
<td>$1,958,323</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>78.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University System of Maryland</td>
<td>$1,592,514</td>
<td>$1,886,482</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$237,109,138</strong></td>
<td><strong>$278,348,172</strong></td>
<td><strong>$314,675,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>88.46%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TOPIC: Quasi Endowment Grant Award Summary Report

COMMITEE: Advancement Committee

DATE OF MEETING: May 12, 2021

SUMMARY: The Quasi-Endowment Fund, initiated in FY15, was established with $50 million committed by USM institutions and the USM Office. Spendable income from this quasi-endowment funds two components: a competitive grant program administered through the USM Office of Advancement, and direct funding of institution fundraising programs. This report provides an overview of activities in progress made because of funding from the USM’s quasi endowment fund for FY20.

ALTERNATIVE(S): This is an information item.

FISCAL IMPACT: This is an information item.

CHANCELLOR’S RECOMMENDATION: This is an information item.

COMMITTEE ACTION: DATE: 5.12.2021

BOARD ACTION: DATE:

SUBMITTED BY: Leonard Raley, Vice Chancellor for Advancement, raley@usmd.edu
301-445-1941
## USM Quasi-Endowment Grant Program
### 2020 Grant Award Summary Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>GRANT AMOUNT</th>
<th>REPORT SUMMARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowie State University</td>
<td>Endowment Awareness and Matching Gift Campaign</td>
<td>$62,000</td>
<td>Due to COVID-19, the campaign launch event and other public gatherings planned in 2020 have been postponed. As a result, BSU will use the grant award to implement a large-scale Campaign Kickoff event in 2021, and virtual wraparound campaign activities throughout 2021. BSU seeks to continue its efforts to build the university's endowment and to raise awareness and excitement among its alumni, constituents and targeted prospects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frostburg State University</td>
<td>Giving Day Campaign</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>Due to COVID-19, FSU decided to postpone Bobcat Giving Day originally scheduled for 4.1.2020. The event is tentatively planned for 4.1.2022. While the event has been postponed, FSU continues to benefit from developing mini campaigns, building relationships with volunteers and growing advocacy for online giving utilizing the GiveCampus platform contracted through the Quasi-endowment funding. In November 2020, FSU raised $45,866 for Athletic Programs utilizing the GiveCampus social fundraising platform. Many of the donors were first time supporters of FSU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury University</td>
<td>Campaign Major Gift Officer</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>Due to COVID-19 and subsequent postponement of a major gifts officer, no activity has taken place in regard to this grant. Therefore, the funds will be rolled forward to fund the position for a total of 3 years (FY21-FY23). This position will be expected to make between 150-175 personal cultivation visits per year, raise at least $100K in the first year, and 50% of the amounts raised will be expected to be for endowments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towson University</td>
<td>Gravyty Prospect Discovery Project</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>With completion of TU's first year utilizing the Gravyty contact management system, the project has met and exceeded expectations. With staffing changes, TU placed 9 gift officers on the platform, and since moving onto Gravyty the contacts per month per GO has increased. Since the launch, TU can attribute $4.5K in total new commitments. TU has initiated a renewal procurement to extend through FY2022. TU will also be piloting use of the platform for other engagement tactics which may involve students in the philanthropy and engagement team to increase connection rates for annual fund donors, previously known as phone-a-thon callers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Baltimore</td>
<td>Development Communications Specialist</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>The Advancement Communications Manager (ACM) in Institutional Advancement (IA) began their tenure in August 2020, a delay in hiring was the result of COVID-19 and the transition to a telework environment. To date, the ACM has assumed responsibility for creating action plans to implement comprehensive communications, including assisting with editing and ensuring brand consistency; started an audit of IA's web page to update and streamline information and ensure it is user-friendly for an external audience; and partnered with campus communicators to create meaningful content that tells the story of UB, and worked with OIT to use available technology to improve IA's communications. Based on the accomplishments to date, IA is pleased with the progress that has been made in just under six months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland, College Park</td>
<td>Software Solution and Platform for Fund Stewardship, Admin and Reporting</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>A new software solution, Scholarship Universe (SU) is currently still in the implementation phase. SU will enhance the partnership between University Relations (UR) and the Office of Student &amp; Financial Aid (OSFA); revolutionize customer service to students and internal users of scholarship data; and supercharge Maryland's stewardship of existing funds to cultivate and sustain a thriving pipeline of repeat donors across campus. There were many unexpected direct benefits of funding the SU platform. Overall there is now a heightened awareness around scholarship administration and stewardship, and shared goals and objectives that will enhance collaboration and coordination, leading to major improvements to the student and donor experience at Maryland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland, Baltimore</td>
<td>Upgrade of Contractual Development Associate position in the Office of Philanthropy</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>The Development Associate position within the Development Research and Prospect Management team of was hired on a contractual basis. Since joining UMOP, they have focused on data integrity and management services, and has completed with outstanding accuracy over 8,000 Advance data updates in the past year, allowing senior research analysts and the Associate Director to focus efforts on actual prospect research. Because of this employee's value and level of achievement, the foundation has made this a full-time, exempt position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland, Eastern Shore</td>
<td>Student Ambassadors Initiative</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>Due to COVID-19, the support for a new UMES Student Ambassadors Initiative was postponed until 2021. The Initiative will engage student workers in an outreach campaign to key alumni constituents. On a positive note, UMES worked with Maryland Public Television to create and broadcast five, 15-second promo spots focusing on UMES programs in Pharmacy, Agriculture and Natural Sciences, Hospitality Management and Aviation Science. UMES also produced a broad message about UMES's important status as a Historically Black, land-grant institution, all of which have been airing in rotation since November 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Universities at Shady Grove</td>
<td>Increasing Endowment</td>
<td>$37,500</td>
<td>The funds were used for consulting help to strengthen fundraising efforts at USG. A sample of projects supported included raising funds for the Dr. Stewart Edelstein Success Scholarship Fund and Endowment Fund, an expanded USG emergency assistance fund, and establishing the Lab for Entrepreneurship and Transformative Leadership ($250K gift and $125K matching gift).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL AWARDED** $425,000
BOARD OF REGENTS

SUMMARY OF ITEM FOR ACTION, INFORMATION OR DISCUSSION

TOPIC: Renaming request

COMMITTEE: Regents Advancement Committee

DATE OF MEETING: May 12, 2021

SUMMARY: Towson University is requesting to rename Paca House and Carroll Hall, two residence halls on campus. In conducting a review of both William Paca and Charles Carroll, a campus committee found that their ownership of enslaved individuals, the lack of process in the decision to name the residence halls, and their lack of direct impact on the history of TU made a compelling case for removing their names. TU believes that despite their contribution to the United States, they do not meet the criteria set forth in the Policy on the Naming of Facilities and Academic Programs.

ALTERNATIVE(S):

FISCAL IMPACT:

CHANCELLOR’S RECOMMENDATION:

COMMITTEE ACTION: DATE: 5.12.2021

BOARD ACTION: DATE:

SUBMITTED BY: Leonard Raley, Vice Chancellor for Advancement, raley@usmd.edu 301-445-1941
April 26, 2021

Chair and Regent Barry Gossett
Regent Geoff Gonella
Regent James Holzapfel
Regent D’Ana Johnson
Regent Louis Pope
University System of Maryland
Committee on Advancement
3300 Metzerott Road
Adelphi, MD 20783

Dear Regents:

Pursuant to USM VI-4.00 Policy on the Naming of Facilities and Programs (see Exhibit IX), I am submitting a formal request, as President and on behalf of Towson University, to rename Paca House and Carroll Hall, two residence halls on Towson University’s campus.

Please find, for your review and reference, Exhibits I-VIII that provide documentation of the process, pursuant to Towson University Policy 06-04.00 Naming of Facilities and Academic Programs (see Exhibit X), that guided the consideration and the resultant decision to recommend the renaming of these two buildings.

In June 2020, Towson University’s Student Government Association (SGA) formally requested that I establish a committee to review the naming of Paca House and Carroll Hall. This request (see Exhibit I) followed resolutions passed by three consecutive SGA administrations requesting the renaming of buildings named after William Paca and Charles Carroll, prominent Marylanders from the 1700s and early 1800s.

In response to their request, in June 2020, I established a 10-person committee, comprised of students, faculty, staff and alumni, to ensure, per TU Policy 06-04.00, that “Towson University’s facilities, buildings and programs are named consistently with the University’s principles, ideals, and values” (see Exhibits II and III).

On January 28, 2021, this committee forwarded to me their review of the naming of Paca House and Carroll Hall and their unanimous recommendation that the residence halls be renamed (see Exhibit IV). The committee’s review pointed to evidence related to the appropriateness of the names based on two criteria provided in TU Policy 06-04.00. They are: 1) activities/opinions as they relate to diversity and inclusion and 2) unethical, immoral, and illegal behavior of an individual. In their review the committee stated,

“In conducting its review, the Committee found evidence of unethical behavior as well as a lack of appreciation for diversity and inclusion. This is specifically rooted in their roles as owners of enslaved people.
While the owning of enslaved people was legal in the colony and the state of Maryland during both Paca’s and Carroll’s lives, there were many, even among the slaveholding elite, who had begun to express doubts about the morality of slaveholding during that era. There is no evidence that either Paca or Carroll shared those doubts. The Committee’s review showed that both Carroll and Paca were among those who owned the largest numbers of slaves here in the state of Maryland. For William Paca, data notes he owned more than 100 enslaved people at the time of his death. For Charles Carroll, that number was in the range of 400-500 people. It is worth adding that enslaved people themselves did not accept the morality of their enslavement.

The committee’s review also concluded that the original naming process, that resulted in the names being forwarded to USM Administration and Board of Regents for consideration and approval (see Exhibit V),

“did not include consultation with the University Senate, Towson University’s shared governance body at the time. Additionally, there was limited documentation available for the Committee’s review regarding the previous naming process. It does not appear that the process included any broad engagement with the campus community for feedback and/or recommendations. It is also important to note that at the time of the original naming of these buildings, Towson University did not have a naming policy. Our current policy was approved in September 2017.”

As a result of their review process, the committee voted unanimously to

“recommend that the residence hall names be changed. We believe that Charles Carroll and William Paca, despite their contributions to the United States of America and the state of Maryland as legislators, do not fully meet the criteria set forth in the Policy on the Naming of Facilities and Academic Programs (Policy 06-04.00). Additionally, Towson University has a deep commitment to shared governance and community engagement. Since shared governance bodies were not consulted or provided the opportunity to provide feedback in the original naming process, we believe considering new names in consultation with shared governance and the broader campus community is warranted. The Committee believes it is also important to note that neither Charles Carroll nor William Paca have direct ties to Towson University.”

Also in January 2021, in accordance with TU Policy 06-04.00, the committee’s review and recommendation, in its entirety, was shared with the TU’s three
governance bodies – Academic Senate, Staff Senate, and the Student Government Association. All three governance bodies voted unanimously to support the committee’s recommendation that the residence hall names be changed. The recommendations were then forwarded to me for consideration and review (see Exhibits VI, VII, VIII).

The review by the committee acknowledged that William Paca was born in 1740 to a wealthy Maryland planter family and served as legislator, a delegate to the Continental Congress, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, a notable jurist, and a Governor of Maryland. The review also reported that Paca owned more than 100 enslaved people at the time of his death in 1799 and trafficked enslaved people throughout his life.

Regarding Charles Carroll, the committee’s review provided that he was born to a wealthy Maryland planter family in 1737, served as a delegate to the Continental Congress, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, a member of the Maryland Senate and the first U.S. Senator from Maryland. The review reported that Carroll, at the time of his death in 1832, also owned 400-500 enslaved people and trafficked enslaved people throughout his life.

Towson University is not the first university in recent years to consider the renaming of buildings and colleges that served to honor those with direct ties to slavery, segregation, or white supremacy. Princeton, Clemson, Yale, and the College of William and Mary are just a few of the universities that have done so. However, the murder of black citizens, such as George Floyd, and the Black Lives Matter Movement have further called into question how we can ask our students to accept living and sleeping in a residence hall that, as one student told me, “was named after a man that enslaved my ancestors and tortured them as part of his daily life.”

We cannot ignore that the work and ideas of Carroll and Paca inspired and achieved liberty for our nation. Their contributions as founding fathers of our nation and of our state were significant and notable. Although slavery was not illegal in Maryland or in the United States at that time, it should be noted that not all signers of the Declaration of Independence were owners of enslaved people and not doing so was not a rarity. Fifteen of the fifty-six signers – or nearly one-third – in fact did not.

USM VI-4.00 Policy on the Naming of Facilities and Programs emphasizes several key issues to consider for the renaming of a building including:

- **“The research and rationale of the original naming process.”**
  Whenever available, the documents and the discussions making the case for the original naming should be considered, as well as the rigor of the review process.

  - As reported by the committee, little to no documentation exists as to the process that originated the use of Paca and Carroll as names for the two residence halls.
- “Clearly documented research about the prevalence and the persistence of the namesake’s objectionable behavior.” New research and reinterpretations about prominent figures can reveal behaviors and factors not known or emphasized at the time of the naming. In this case, consideration should be given to the centrality of the offensive behavior to the namesake’s life as a whole, and whether the behavior was consistent with conventions of the time;

And

“The past and current effect of the namesake’s behavior.” The individual's behavior and how it aligns with the education mission and inclusive values of the university should be a factor. Did the namesake's action(s) cause hurt to individuals or groups that would have been avoided or corrected by contemporary peers?

- The committee’s review of Paca and Carroll acknowledges that both men were lifelong owners and traffickers of enslaved people and, although not illegal in Maryland or the U.S. at the time, as previously stated, many Americans, including nearly one-third of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, were not. Additionally, the naming of Paca House and Carroll Hall took place, respectively, in 2008 and 2015.

- In 2016, when I first joined Towson University as its president, I established Diversity Equity and Inclusion (DEI) as one of my Eight Presidential Priorities. As part of that initiative, I created the first Office of Inclusion and Institutional Equity and appointed the first Vice-President to lead that office within the University System of Maryland. Since that time, TU has achieved pre-eminence for its DEI initiatives and its achievements regarding inclusive student success including:
  
  - National recognition by Washington Monthly and US News and World Report for leadership in Social Mobility;
  
  - 2020 Insight into Diversity awardee for its annual Higher Education Excellence In Diversity (HEED) Award;
  
  - Recognition in 2021 by ACT/National Research Center for College and University Admissions as a Top 10 University in the Nation that is “among the most successful institutions (in America) when it comes to enrolling and graduating traditional-age Black undergraduates. Towson University boasts one of the
largest and most academically successful Black undergraduate populations nationally” (For the full report see Exhibit XI):

- Recognized by the NCAA and Minority Opportunities Athletic Association 2021 Award for Diversity and Inclusion.

- "The namesake’s relationship to the university." Consideration should be given as to whether the namesake had an objectively significant and noteworthy role in the history of the university."
  - As noted in the committee’s review, William Paca and Charles Carroll had no direct relationship with the university other than their roles and positions as prominent Americans and Marylanders in the late 1700s and early 1800s. It should be noted that Towson University was founded in 1866, decades after the deaths of the two men.

- “University community input." The voices and the views of the entire community should be a factor in considering the naming request. A request to remove a name is likely to elicit strong opinions; it is essential that different perspectives are given respectful consideration."
  - As noted in the committee’s report, little to no documentation exists as to the process that originated the use of Paca and Carroll as names for the two residence halls, the process did not include consultation with the University Senate, Towson University's shared governance body at the time of the naming, and finally, the process did not include any broad engagement with the campus community for feedback and/or recommendations.

- “Possibilities for mitigation and interpretation." In some cases, providing historical context and a reinterpretation of a name can be an opportunity to educate the university community about important aspects of its past. Consideration may be given as to whether the harm can be mitigated, historical knowledge preserved, by recognizing and addressing the individual’s wrongful behavior in a prominent and permanent way in conjunction with retaining the name”.
  - As noted, in their letter supporting the recommendation, the Academic Senate does add “that the university take this opportunity to consider ways in which it might...note the history of the university in relation...to slavery and its resonances across the nineteenth, the twentieth and into the 21st century.” However, as noted, the Academic Senate does support renaming of the buildings.
Thank you for your consideration of this request. I will, of course, make myself available should any questions or need for clarification occur.

Sincerely,

Kim Schatzel, Ph.D.
President, Towson University
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Exhibit I
Request Pursuant to Towson University Policy 06-04.00 Naming of Facilities and Academic Programs

Maman Deguene Ndiong
8000 York Rd
University Union, Room 226
Towson, Maryland, 21252
(240)7013850
mndiong@students.towson.edu

President Kim Schatzel
8000 York Road
Administration Building, Room 331
Towson, Maryland, 21252
(410)7042356
presidentoffice@towson.edu

June 4th, 2020

Dear President Schatzel,

In compliance with Towson University’s Policy on Naming of Facilities and Academic Programs, the Student Government Association is submitting this formal request to convene a committee to review the naming of Paca House and Carroll House.

William Paca and Charles Carroll were both prominent slave owners in the state of Maryland. This is a known fact that has made an abundant amount of students uncomfortable and upset. Several students have displayed and openly petitioned against the names of these buildings. The social justice group Tigers for Justice created a petition with exactly 6,714 signatures at the time of this letter, asking for both Paca and Carroll’s names to be changed. Prior to this, resolutions have been passed in the Student Senate concerning this issue by three consecutive administrations of the Towson University Student Government Association.

Given the collective outrage of the Towson University student body and supporters of our institution, we are formally requesting that these names are changed with the utmost urgency. With the growing dialogue around race relations in our society, particularly within our Towson community, the 100th administration of the Towson University Student Government Association believes that now is the time. This is a tangible way that the university can take a public stance against racial discrimination and acknowledge the history of violence and oppression that still affects our society today.

Sincerely,
Maman Deguene Ndiong

Maman Deguene Ndiong
President, Towson Student Government Association
100th Administration
From: University Communications <University_Communications@towson.edu>
Sent: Friday, June 5, 2020 3:37 PM
To: All Faculty and Staff <allusers@towson.edu>; All Adjunct Faculty <AllAdjunctFaculty@exchange.towson.edu>; All Students <allstudents@towson.edu>
Subject: A message regarding the naming of residence halls

This message is being sent on behalf of Towson University President Kim Schatzel:

Dear TU faculty, staff and students:

Pursuant to Towson University’s Policy on Naming of Facilities and Academic Programs, I have received a formal request from Student Government Association (SGA) President Deguene Ndiong — on behalf of Towson University SGA — to convene a committee to review the naming of Paca House and Carroll Hall, two TU residence halls located in West Village.

It is important to note that the intent of TU’s naming policy (06-04.00) is “to ensure that Towson University facilities, buildings, and programs are named consistently with the University’s principles, ideals, and values.” Additionally, the policy provides that a committee, inclusive of representation from TU’s shared governance bodies (i.e., faculty, staff and students) and the Office of Inclusion & Institutional Equity, will be formed to determine how the recommended name meets six specific criteria outlined in the policy.

The residence halls were named — Paca House in 2008 and Carroll Hall in 2015 — prior to my administration and prior to the establishment of our 2017 TU naming policy, which as stated previously, outlines specific criteria for the name’s evaluation and the participation of shared governance.

After considering these facts, I have determined to support this request by SGA and commence the review with a committee tasked to provide guidance and recommendations in alignment with the University System of Maryland policy and the 2017 TU Naming Policy. Members of that committee, including representatives of Academic Senate, Staff Senate, Student Government Association and the Office of Inclusion & Institutional Equity, will be finalized and shared with all of you next week.

As thousands in our country and across our globe call upon each other and their institutions to acknowledge and commit to stop racial injustice and inequity, Towson University is committed to relentlessly pursuing a diverse and inclusive university that supports all members of our campus community to thrive and realize their fullest potential.

I want to thank our Student Government Association and their leadership for bringing this request forward for my consideration. I also want to thank them and many other TU students who have offered great concerns over the residence hall names and encouraged me to consider approving this request as a public stance against racial discrimination and a public acknowledgement of the history of structural racism, racist violence, and oppression that has and continues to affect our nation.
I ask that everyone join me in supporting the committee as they begin their work deliberating this issue and preparing their recommendation. I can assure everyone that this process will be inclusive and transparent and that the recommendation of the committee will be made public when completed.

Thank you for your continued support for our students and each other,

Kim Schatzel, Ph.D.
President
Dear TU faculty, staff and students,

Last week, I announced the convening of a committee to review the names of Paca House and Carroll Hall, two TU residence halls located in West Village.

At that time, I promised the process would be inclusive and transparent, including an update this week outlining the membership of that committee. It is representative of TU’s shared governance bodies—faculty, staff and students—and includes the following members:

- Johnathan Beckett Jr., graduate student
- Kameron Chung, undergraduate student
- Leah Cox, vice president of inclusion and institutional equity and OIIE representative
- Andrew Diemer, associate professor of history
- Paul-Sean Gray, alumnus and TU Foundation board member
- Theresa Jenkins, TU Staff Senate president and representative
- Deguene Ndiong, Student Government Association president and representative
- Desirée Rowe, Academic Senate vice chair and representative
- Ashley Todd-Diaz, assistant librarian for Special Collections and University Archives
- Vernon J. Hurte, vice president for student affairs and committee chair

The committee will apply TU’s naming policy (06-04.00) — its goal “to ensure that Towson University facilities, buildings and programs are named consistently with the University’s principles, ideals and values” — to determine the degree to which the residence halls’ names meet six specific criteria outlined in the policy.

Please join me in thanking the committee as they begin working on their recommendation. The recommendation, in its entirety, will be shared with the TU community when completed.

Thank you for your continued support of our students and each other,

Kim Schatzel, Ph.D.
President
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January 28, 2021

TO: Kim Schatzel, Ph.D.
President, Towson University

FROM: Paca House/Carroll Hall Naming Review Committee

RE: Committee Recommendation

In June 2020, following a formal request (attached) from Towson University’s Student Government Association, you established a committee to review the naming of Paca House and Carroll Hall, two residence halls located in the West Village community. These residence halls were named in recognition of Charles Carroll, who was the last surviving signer of the Declaration of Independence and Maryland’s first United States senator, as well as William Paca, who served three consecutive terms as Governor of Maryland. The following individuals were appointed to serve:

- Johnathan Beckett Jr., graduate student
- Kameron Chung, undergraduate student
- Leah Cox, vice president of inclusion and institutional equity and OIIE representative
- Andrew Diemer, associate professor of history
- Paul-Sean Gray, alumnus and TU Foundation board member
- Theresa Jenkins, TU Staff Senate president and representative
- Deguene Ndiong, Student Government Association president and representative
- Desirée Rowe, Academic Senate vice chair and representative
- Ashley Todd-Diaz, assistant librarian for Special Collections and University Archives
- Vernon J. Hurte, vice president for student affairs and committee chair

The Committee was charged to review the building names based upon the criteria set forth in the Policy on the Naming of Facilities and Academic Programs (Policy 06-04.00). Per the policy, “The committee shall use its best efforts and will maximize use of available resources to extensively research the appropriateness of names based on the following factors: 1. Philanthropic efforts of an individual; 2. Profession of an individual; 3. Activities/opinions as they relate to diversity and inclusion; 4. Unethical, immoral and illegal behavior of an individual; 5. Public financial holdings/activities of an individual; 6. Historical activities that occurred at a given place (included for proposed names inspired by prominent geographic entities); and 7. Locations and landmarks were heinous acts occurred shall not be considered.”
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History of Paca House and Carroll Hall Naming

Documentation outlining the original naming of these residence halls is minimal. Based on the information available, in May 2008, a work group developed names for the Phases I & II of the West Village Housing Project, using the theme, “historic/famous Marylanders.” Paca House was included in this phase of the West Village Housing Project. The Committee was unable to locate any documents which outlined the naming process for Paca House.

In a February 2015 letter to then Chancellor William Kirwan, Interim President Timothy Chandler requested approval for the naming of the buildings included in Phases III & IV, which were set to open in August 2016. This request included the naming of Charles Carroll Hall. This letter is included in attached supplemental documents. After reviewing this process, the Committee noted that the original naming processes did not include consultation with the University Senate, Towson University’s shared governance body at the time. Additionally, although there was limited documentation available for the Committee’s review regarding the previous naming process, it does not appear that the process included any broad engagement with the campus community for feedback and/or recommendations. It is also important to note that, at the time of the original naming of these buildings, Towson University did not have a naming policy. Our current policy was approved in September 2017.

Review Summary

The Committee began its work in our initial meeting on July 8, 2020 by receiving the charge from you, conducting a thorough review and discussion of the Policy on Naming of Facilities and Academic Programs, as well as developing our work plan for conducting the review. In conducting its review, the Committee established two work groups to examine appropriate and relevant sources on the lives of Charles Carroll and William Paca. These work groups were led by Ashley Todd-Diaz, assistant librarian for Special Collections and University Archives, and Dr. Andrew Diemer, associate professor of history, respectively. Following a thorough review, the work groups presented summary reports to the full Committee at our September 9, 2020 full Committee meeting. The Committee discussed each work group’s findings based on the criteria set forth within the Policy.

In conducting its review, the Committee found evidence of unethical behavior as well as lack of appreciation for diversity and inclusion. This is specifically rooted in their role as owners of enslaved people. While the owning of enslaved people was legal in the colony and state of Maryland during both Carroll’s and Paca’s lives, there were many, even among the slaveholding elite, who had begun to express doubts about the morality of slave holding during that era. There is no evidence that either Carroll or Paca shared these doubts. The Committee’s review showed that both Carroll and Paca were among those who owned the largest numbers of slaves here in the state of Maryland. For William Paca, data notes he owned more than 100 enslaved people at the time of his death. For Charles Carroll, that number was in the range of 400-500
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people. It is worth adding that enslaved people themselves did not accept the morality of their enslavement.

As a result of our review process, the Committee voted unanimously to recommend that the residence hall names be changed. We believe Charles Carroll and William Paca, despite their contributions to the United States of America and the state of Maryland as legislators, do not fully meet the criteria set forth in the Policy on the Naming of Facilities and Academic Programs (Policy 06-04.00). Additionally, Towson University has a deep commitment to shared governance and community engagement. Since shared governance bodies were not consulted or provided the opportunity to provide feedback in the original naming process, we believe considering new names in consultation with shared governance and the broader campus community is warranted. The Committee believes it is also important to note that neither Charles Carroll nor William Paca have a direct tie to Towson University.

Lastly, as several other colleges and universities, including Columbia University, Indiana University-Bloomington, and the University of South Carolina\(^1\), have moved to change facility names due to those individuals’ participation in the enslavement of people, we believe Towson University should, too, move in this direction in affirmation of our campus community’s commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Per the Policy, a memo outlining the Committee’s recommendation was shared with the presidents of Towson University’s Academic Senate, Staff Senate, and Student Government Association for each executive board to review and vote to approve or deny the Naming Review Committee’s recommendation regarding the naming of Carroll Hall and Paca House. Each of the shared governance organizations have reviewed and approved the Committee’s recommendations. Memos of support from the Academic Senate, the Staff Senate, and the Student Government Association is being submitted along with this recommendation.

As instructed within the Policy on the Naming of Facilities and Academic Programs, the Committee is sharing its recommendation with you for your review. If you require any additional information, the Committee is happy to fulfill those requests.

\(^1\) https://www.npr.org/2020/10/20/924580308/universities-rethink-building-names-in-the-wake-of-racial-justice-protests
Appendix A – Research Work Groups Review Summaries

Charles Carroll of Carrollton (1737-1832)

Section One: Biographical Sketch

Charles Carroll of Carrollton was the last surviving signer of the Declaration of Independence, Maryland’s first US senator, a supporter of early infrastructure in the US, and one of the wealthiest planters in the country. He was born in Annapolis, MD to Charles Carroll of Annapolis and Elizabeth Brooke on September 19, 1737. Carroll came from an Irish Catholic family that was purported to be descended from nobility. He attended the Jesuits’ College of Bohemia at Hermans Manor, MD and the College of St. Omer in France. Additionally, Carroll studied civil law and common law at the College of Louis le Grand in Rheims and London, respectively. Upon returning to the US following his schooling, he adopted the name of his estate, “Carrollton” to differentiate himself from his father and other relatives who share the same name.

Patriot

Carroll took an active role during the colonial tea protests. Though he did not support “mob action,” he sought to pursue action that would result in the least harm to those involved. He drafted the Declaration of the Delegates of Maryland in support of independence and voted to separate from the crown on 28 June 1776. He served in the Continental Congress from 1776 to 1778, during which time he traveled to Canada with Benjamin Franklin and Samuel Chase to develop a union between Canada and the Colonies. Carroll also served on the Board of War during his time with the Continental Congress. He had great respect for George Washington and became close friends with him over time.

Statesman

Carroll served in the Maryland legislature from 1777-1800 and was the first United States Senator from Maryland in 1789-1792. Carroll declined another term in the US senate so that he could return to the state senate. Though Carroll was the wealthiest man in the Union when he took his seat in the Senate, and was of aristocratic lineage himself, he opposed titles of nobility. Of note, Carroll served as a source of Alexis-Charles- Henri Clérel de Tocqueville’s view of American democracy for his work Democracy in America. Carroll’s


5 McClanahan, 2016.

6 https://www.c-span.org/series/?tocqueville
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“conservatism and statesmanship” were respected by his peers and, unbeknownst to him, Alexander Hamilton contemplated Carroll as a prime candidate for president if Washington had retired in 1792.7

Businessman

Carroll retired from the senate to focus on his estates. At the time of his death, Carroll owned ~70-80,000 acres of land in Maryland, Pennsylvania, and New York.8 Due to the size of his estates, he was also one of the country’s largest owners of enslaved people (~400-500 people).9 Carroll was a founder of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Company and served on the first board of directors for the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad.10 Carroll founded the First Bank of the United States in 1800, followed by the Second Bank in 1816.11

Carroll died in Baltimore on November 14, 1832.

Section Two: Criteria Review

a. Philanthropic efforts of an individual;

Invested in early US infrastructure, including Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Company, Baltimore and Ohio railroad, and early banks in the US.

b. Profession of an individual;

Last surviving signer of the Declaration of Independence; American statesman; lawyer; plantation owner; involvement with establishing infrastructure and banks in the US.

c. Activities/opinions as they relate to diversity and inclusion;

Not only was Carroll the last surviving signer of the Declaration of Independence, he was also the only Catholic to sign. As a Catholic, he could not vote, hold office, or practice law before the War for Independence. “Prior to the Revolution, all Catholics were viewed as potential traitors, and France was seen as a mortal enemy. Carroll shaped the changing viewpoint”.12 He was a strong supporter of his faith and some considered him to be the founder of the American Catholic tradition.

7 McClanahan, 2016.
10 https://charlescarrollhouse.org/the-carrolls/personal-biography-2
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d. Unethical, immoral and illegal behavior of an individual;

As mentioned above, Carroll owned many enslaved people, nearly 400-500. According to McClanahan (2016), Carroll’s “record as a slave owner and early abolitionist is a testament to his faith. He sold slaves, but avoided breaking up families, and he offered weekly religious instruction. He once presented a bill in the Maryland Senate for the gradual abolition of slavery which required all slave girls to be educated and then freed at twenty-eight so they could in turn educate their husbands and children.” Carroll’s 1776 Declaration of the Delegates emphasized “Slaves, savages, and foreign mercenaries have been meanly hired to rob a People of their property, liberty & lives, guilty of no other crime than deeming the last of no estimation without the secure enjoyment of the two former.” In 1830 he became president of the American Colonization Society (1828-1831), which sought to “solve America’s slave problem” by resettling enslaved people in Africa.

Despite this interest in abolition, Carroll’s actions regarding the enslaved people on his own estate did not always reflect these sentiments. One example is the case of Charity Castle, who Carroll gifted to his son and new wife as a wedding present. When the marriage did not last, Charity attempted to gain her freedom under Pennsylvania’s Gradual Abolition Act, though both Carroll and his son fought against this act. Carroll did not appear to free the enslaved people on his estate upon his death. For many years after his death, there were multiple petitions from various interested parties regarding the dispersal and/or sale of ~216 enslaved people on his estate.

e. Public financial holdings/activities of an individual. N/A

---

13 Charles Carrol of Carrollton: The signer. (n.d.)
15 Charles Carrol of Carrollton: The signer. (n.d.)
16 https://journals.psu.edu/pmhb/article/view/59043/58769
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William Paca (1740 – 1799)

Section One: Biographical Sketch

In this section, please provide a brief biographical summary (Limit to 650 words) of the individual.

William Paca was born on October 31, 1740, in what is now Harford County. The Paca family had been in Maryland for almost a century by the time William was born, gradually acquiring sizable holdings of land and slaves. By the time William was born, the family was quite prosperous. At the age of twelve, William was sent to Philadelphia to be educated, and he received his bachelor of arts degree from the College of Philadelphia (now the University of Pennsylvania) in 1759. He returned to Maryland, studying law in Annapolis with one of the most respected lawyers in the state, Stephen Bordley. He would go on to spend a year studying in London before returning and establishing his own practice in Annapolis. In May 1763, Paca married Mary Lloyd Chew, who was a member of the Lloyd family, one of the wealthiest in the colony of Maryland. They had three children. Mary died in 1774, and in 1777 William married Ann Harrison. The two would have one child together. Paca also fathered an illegitimate daughter, born in Philadelphia in 1775.

Paca became a leader in the protest against British policy that would culminate in the American Revolution. In 1765 he was an active participant in the protest against the hated Stamp Act, which helped lead to his election to the Maryland House of Delegates in 1767. As tensions escalated between the British government and its North American colonies, Paca became involved in local committees protesting British policies toward the colonies. In June 1774 he was appointed a Maryland representative to the Continental Congress which would meet in Philadelphia in order to coordinate the resistance among the various colonies. In the early months of 1776, Paca became an advocate within the Congress for independence from Great Britain. When the Congress finally voted in July to adopt the Declaration of Independence, Paca signed it. He continued to serve on the Continental Congress for three more years, though he returned home to help draft Maryland’s first state constitution. Shortly thereafter he was elected to serve in the State Senate. In 1777, he helped organize the local militia on the Eastern Shore of Maryland for its defense from British occupation, and in 1778 he was appointed Judge of the General Court.

Paca would go on to have an illustrious political career after the Revolution. In 1782, in the waning days of the conflict, Paca was elected to the first of three consecutive terms as governor of Maryland. In 1788 he served as a delegate from Harford County to the state convention which would ratify the United States Constitution. Though he had been a leader of the Antifederalist cause in the state, the opposition to the new Constitution, Paca eventually supported its ratification. In 1789, President Washington appointed Paca to be judge of the Federal District Court of Maryland, a position in which he served until his death. In his final
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decade, he spent much of his time managing and improving his vast Queen Anne’s County estate. When he died, on October 13, 1799, Paca owned more than one hundred slaves.

Source: Gregory A. Stiverson and Phebe R. Jacobson, William Paca: A Biography (Baltimore, 1976)

Section Two: Criteria Review

In this section, the sub-committee should provide historical details regarding the individual being reviewed based on the following criteria:

a. Philanthropic efforts of an individual;
   
   Advocate for care for impoverished veterans of the Revolutionary War
   
   Contributed £450 to the founding of Washington College

b. Profession of an individual;

   Lawyer, planter/farmer, politician

c. Activities/opinions as they relate to diversity and inclusion;

   Paca owned slaves throughout his life, including more than 100 at the time of his death

d. Unethical, immoral and illegal behavior of an individual;

   While the owning of slaves was legal in the colony and state of Maryland during Paca’s life, there were many, even among the slaveholding elite of which Paca was a member, who had begun to have doubts about the morality of slave holding. There is no evidence that Paca shared these doubts. It is worth adding that enslaved people themselves did not accept the morality of their enslavement.

e. Public financial holdings/activities of an individual;

   Not applicable
February 5, 2015

Chancellor William E. Kirwan
University System of Maryland
3300 Metzerott Road, Suite 2C
Adelphi, MD 20783

Dear Chancellor Kirwan:

As we move forward with the expansion of our West Village Housing project Phase III & IV, we are writing to seek your approval of the names for the next two buildings scheduled to open August 2016.

In May 2008 we went through an extensive campus process to identify names, we proposed the theme of “historic/famous Marylanders.” To date we have the following named buildings in West Village:

- William Paca House
- Harriet Tubman House
- Clara Barton House
- Frederick Douglass House

For Phase III & IV we are seeking approval to use:

- Thurgood Marshall Hall (vs house as it is apartment living)
- Charles Carroll Hall

Charles Carroll (1737-1832) was born in Annapolis and was an early advocate for American independence and was one of four Marylanders to sign the Declaration of Independence. He was elected to the Continental Congress and later to the U.S. Senate.

Thurgood Marshall (1908-1993) was born in Baltimore and became a leading civil rights lawyer. He became the Executive Director of NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund and argued many important civil rights cases in front of the U.S. Supreme Court, the most famous being Brown vs. the Board of Education. He later became the first African-American to serve as Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court where he served for 24 years.

The two buildings will house 700 students—366 in the north building (proposed Marshall Hall) and 334 in the south building (proposed Carroll Hall) in two- and four-bedroom apartments. There are 170,540 gross ft² (106,587 ft² usable space) and 156,594 gross ft² in the south building (98,031 ft² usable space).
This request is sent in accordance with USM Policy 144.0 VI-4.00 – Policy on Naming of Buildings and Academic Programs. The policy allows for you to determine if this requires Regents’ approval. You will find that all criteria for naming for the two famous Marylanders have been met.

I look forward to receiving your approval on the two proposed names. Should you require any additional information or have any questions, please let me know.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Timothy J.L. Chandler
Interim President
January 28, 2021

Dear Dr. Hurte,

The Academic Senate executive committee unanimously approves the recommendation of the naming committee to change the names of Paca and Carroll residence halls.

We respond to point 6 (pg. 8) of the appendix to the Board of Regents policy on naming and name changes as follows:

We agree with the sentiment of Point 6 (pg. 8) to the Appendix of the Board of Regents policy on naming, which states, “In some cases, providing historical context . . . can be an opportunity to educate the university community about important aspects of its past.” We feel strongly that the names Carroll and Paca should be removed from the dormitories and new names for those buildings be determined. We also recommend that the university take this opportunity to consider ways in which it might take this opportunity to note the history of the university in relation to indigenous lands and pathways (i.e., the land that the university occupies); to slavery and its resonances across the nineteenth, the twentieth and into the 21st century; and to current policies of diversity and inclusion. We hope that student, staff, and faculty shared governance groups might work with the administration to determine a way or ways in which such an educational opportunity regarding Towson University’s past might be presented.

Thanks very much for including the academic senate and other shared governance bodies in this process. Please let me know whatever we can do to help support these efforts.

All best,
Jennifer

Jennifer Ballengee
Martha A. Mitten Professor of Liberal Arts
Director, Graduate Program in Global Humanities
Chair, Academic Senate
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Towson Student Government Association: Executive Board
University Union, Room 226
Towson, Maryland, 21252
410-704-4711
sga@towson.edu

Vice President Of Student Affairs Vernon Hurte
Administration Building, Suite 237
Towson, Maryland, 21252
410-704-2055
vhurst@towson.edu

December 24th, 2020

Hello Vice President Hurte,

We hope this letter finds you well. The Executive Board of the Towson Student Government Association met today to review the committee recommendation regarding the renaming of Paca House and Marshall Hall. Following this review, we unanimously voted to approve this recommendation.

All the best,

Maman Dgue Ndieng
President, Towson Student Government Association

Jordan DeVeaux
Vice President, Towson Student Government Association

Olivier Ambush
Chief of Staff, Towson Student Government Association

Asis Robinson
Attorney General, Towson Student Government Association
January 28, 2021

Vernon Hurte, PhD
Vice President for Student Affairs
8000 York Road
Administration Building, Suite 237
Towson, MD 21252
USA

RE: Paca House and Carroll Hall Renaming Support

Dear Dr. Hurte,

On December 16, 2020, the TU Staff Senate brought forth a motion to “support the SGA initiative to rename Paca House and Carroll Hall and to provide a formal letter of support from the TU Staff Senate to the TU Building Naming Committee”.

The discussion took into consideration the facts presented by you and SGA President Maman Ndiong at our September 16, 2020 meeting; specifically indicating that the individuals do not have any documented significant connection to Towson or Towson University and SGA’s opposition to Misters Paca and Carroll owning slaves.

The motion passed with a vote for: all in favor of approving, none opposed and none abstaining.

As a result of this motion, on behalf of the TU Staff Senate, I am honored to support SGA’s request renaming Paca House and Carroll Hall.

Respectfully,

Theresa L. Jenkins
Chair, TU Staff Senate
VI-4.00 – POLICY ON THE NAMING OF FACILITIES AND PROGRAMS

(Approved by the Board of Regents on January 11, 1990; amended January 24, 1991; amended April 4, 1997; revised February 15, 2013; revised December 12, 2014; revised and approved May 1, 2020; amended and approved November 13, 2020)

The Board of Regents of the University System of Maryland (USM) wishes to encourage opportunities for significant philanthropy to its member institutions through the naming of major facilities and programs. The Board also encourages the naming of major facilities and programs that honor scholars and other distinguished individuals who are preeminent in their field of endeavor and/or have contributed meaningfully to the USM or to any of its constituent institutions. Any such naming must undergo a high level of consideration and due diligence to ensure that the name comports with the purpose and mission of the USM and its institutions. No naming shall be permitted for any entity or individual whose public image, products, or services may conflict with such purpose and mission.

I. Applicability

This policy shall apply to the following:

A. Facilities: planned and existing buildings of all types, major new additions to existing buildings, as well as institution grounds and athletic facilities, all major outdoor areas including streets, entrances, gates, and landscape features such as quadrangles, gardens, lakes, fountains, and fields.

B. Programs: colleges, schools, departments, centers, institutes, and programs, including those that are online or virtual.

Items not covered: interior space within facilities (laboratories, classrooms, practice rooms, lecture halls, etc.); minor landscape features such as benches or sidewalk bricks; scholarships, fellowships and chairs. Institutions shall develop their own naming policy aligned with Board of Regents policy, for these items. In cases where there may be some question regarding the need for Board of Regents’ approval, the Chancellor will determine which naming opportunities require approval.

II. Philanthropic Naming of Facilities

Requests made to the Board of Regents to name a new facility or renovated existing facility must comply with the following guidelines:

A. The proposed gift should contribute significantly to the realization or completion of a facility or the enhancement of a facility's usefulness to the university.
B. All requests should demonstrate that the institution has maximized the potential of fundraising in association with facility naming. To receive best consideration, the Board recommends the following:

1. For institutions considered high research activity or special focus in the Carnegie classification and with annual research expenditures of $60 million or more as reported in the National Science Foundation’s Higher Education Research and Development survey (University of Maryland, Baltimore; University of Maryland, Baltimore County; and University of Maryland, College Park), the present value of the gift should be an amount equal to or greater than 15 percent of the cost to construct or substantially renovate the building proposed for naming.

2. For all other institutions, the present value of the gift should be an amount equal to or greater than 7.5 percent of the cost to construct or substantially renovate the building proposed for naming.

The naming of existing buildings not targeted for substantial renovation will be considered on a case-by-case basis. The underlying principle of such naming should be to honor a significant gift or history of significant giving to the institution.

C. Gifts made to fund the direct costs of construction or renovation, or to establish an endowment in support of maintenance or program costs, are encouraged and will receive more favorable consideration.

D. The building to be named should be approved for construction or renovation in the Capital Improvement Plan.

E. If a naming opportunity is being considered for a set period of time (naming rights to an athletic field, for example), the cost of installing and removing the name should be a consideration, and plans accounting for those costs should be included in the request to the Board.

F. The gift may be in cash or in the form of a legally binding pledge, provided however, that if in the form of a pledge, it should be paid in full within five years. A portion of the gift may be in the form of an irrevocable trust or bequest, provided that the donor is age 75 or older. If a bequest, there must be a legally binding pledge backing up the bequest. The Board of Regents may consider exceptions to these gift provisions as listed in this item if a strong rationale is provided.

In some cases, an institution may wish to leverage donor funds to help move a building project forward in the capital projects queue. Such gifts must meet different criteria than those required for naming a building. Please refer to Policy VI-4.20 - GUIDELINES REGARDING THE EFFECT OF DONOR FUNDING AND OTHER EXTERNAL FUNDING ON THE PRIORITIZATION OF STATE-FUNDED CAPITAL PROJECTS for details regarding moving a building forward in the capital projects queue.
III. Philanthropic Naming of Programs

Requests made to the Board of Regents to name a program must comply with the following guidelines:

A. The named gift levels for schools, colleges, departments, centers, institutes, and programs will be established on a case-by-case basis. Endowed gifts are strongly encouraged.

B. Generally, the endowment established through the gift should generate 10 to 20 percent of the unit’s operating budget on an annual basis, depending on the size of the unit.

C. Gift terms required to name a program are the same as those set forth for facilities, as described above.

IV. Honorific Naming

In those cases where facility and program naming is honorific, they should be named for scholars and other distinguished individuals who are preeminent in their field of endeavor and/or have contributed meaningfully to the USM or to any of its constituent institutions. Although significant philanthropy made over a donor’s lifetime may constitute a valid rationale for an honorific naming, honorific naming should not be used to circumvent the requirements of gift-related naming policies. The following guidelines apply to honorific naming requests:

A. No campus facility or program will be named for individuals employed by or formally affiliated with the USM or the State of Maryland, unless and until one year has passed since the individual’s USM or State employment or affiliation has ceased.

B. The Board will consider exceptions to Section IV.A. under the following circumstances:

1. If an individual has completed 10 years of service to the USM and is currently serving in a position of reduced responsibility (i.e. from institution president to faculty status).

2. If there are health issues or special family circumstances.

V. Naming Resulting from Fundraising Appeals

On occasion, fundraising appeals are organized to honor an individual via the naming of a program or facility. In such cases, the total funds raised should conform with the gift minimums and terms described in Section II or Section III, as applicable.

The guidelines set forth in Section IV, Honorific Naming, shall also apply. Institutions launching such efforts should seek approval from the Board of Regents before launching a public campaign. Institutions should clearly describe in associated fundraising materials any prerequisites that are related to or limit the naming opportunity.

Upon completion of the fundraising appeal, institutions shall report to the Board of Regents that the conditions described in the request were met before the naming is announced to the general public.
VI. Process and Procedures

The USM Vice Chancellor for Advancement should be notified of possible facility or program naming discussions as early in the process as possible. All requests shall be approved by, and submitted through, the president of the requesting institution. A naming that involves a regional center shall be submitted via the executive director of the regional center in consultation with the president of the administrative (coordinating) institution, and the USM vice chancellor for administration and finance and the senior vice chancellor for academic and student affairs (on behalf of the chancellor). Naming requests involving multiple institutions should be submitted jointly by the appropriate presidents. In the case of a naming at the USM level, the request should be submitted by the chair of the Board of Regents.

Requests should be submitted six weeks prior to the full board meeting at which the request will be considered. Exceptions to the timeline may be considered by the Chancellor and the Board of Regents. Requests will be reviewed within the USM Office of the Chancellor before being submitted for review by the Board of Regents Committee on Advancement. The Committee on Advancement will then 1) decline the request, 2) request additional information or clarification, or 3) recommend approval by the full Board.

In making requests for naming of facilities or programs, the following information is to be submitted:

A. A detailed request in letter or memo form that should provide:

1. The namesake’s name and relationship to the USM or institution, if applicable.

2. A detailed report demonstrating that the namesake’s background has been thoroughly considered; that the naming honors the values and mission of the institution; and that any controversies, if they exist, have been examined and judged to be immaterial to the naming.

3. The gift amount and terms, including but not limited to any costs associated with the gift, if applicable.

B. For honorific naming, a clear rationale for the request, including a description of the honoree’s accomplishments and contributions to the institution or USM, how the naming will reflect positively on the institution and/or the USM, and, if applicable, a justification for an exception to the provisions described in Section IV, Honorific Naming, above.

C. For a naming related to launching a fundraising appeal, a letter or memo outlining:

1. The namesake’s name and relationship to the USM or institution.

2. The amount of funds raised in gifts and pledges and expected cash realized, including but not limited to any costs associated with the campaign.

3. A rationale for the honorific naming, as described in Section IV.
4. As noted in Section V, institutions shall report to the Board of Regents regarding the completion of the campaign and fulfillment of the conditions of the request before the naming is announced to the general public.

D. As applicable, the overall cost of the facility construction or renovation or the overall budget of the program to be supported. If the gift represents partial or total funding of the construction, remodeling, or renovation, the following information must be included:

1. Relationship of the project to the institution's long-range plans;
2. Source and status of capital budget funds needed in addition to the gift;
3. A timetable for project implementation;
4. Operating budget implications, and sources of funds.

E. The proposed name of the facility or program and, if applicable, the current name of the facility or program.

F. A copy of the gift contract and/or pledge agreement, if applicable.

G. A biographical profile of the prospective donor or recipient of an honorific naming.

Requests involving negotiations with donors or honorific naming will be held in the strictest confidence. Exceptions will be considered if the requesting institution has specific reasons to believe that public input is necessary to move forward with a naming.

VII. Public Announcement

No public announcement of a philanthropic or honorific naming should be made prior to Board of Regents’ approval. Public announcements should be scheduled in coordination with the Chancellor’s Office to ensure proper representation from the USM Office and Board of Regents. In cases where a gift is funding new construction or substantial renovation, the Board encourages institutions to consider having 50% of the gift in hand before a public announcement is made. Public announcements regarding honorific naming will include the rationale for the naming, including background regarding the individual and how the naming reflects positively on the institution and the USM.

VIII. Removal of Name from a Facility or Program

As naming authority for facilities and academic programs lies with the Board of Regents, so does the authority and responsibility to remove a name.

A. Gift-related naming. In the case of a gift-related naming, the Board of Regents reserves the right to remove names from facilities and programs when the gift remains unpaid beyond the five-year limit. Should this occur, the Board of Regents may name an area of the facility or seek another appropriate naming opportunity that would be proportionate to the value of the gift received.
B. Useful life. The naming of a facility or program follows the facility or program for its useful life unless otherwise determined by the Board of Regents.

C. Controversial or Changed Circumstances. If a previously approved naming violates the standards or values of the USM and its constituent institutions, compromises the public trust or reputation of an institution, or is contrary to applicable law, the Board of Regents may remove a name. Removal of a name should be rare, and the case for removal must be compelling and well researched. Requests for removing a name shall be submitted by the institution’s president, and in the case of multiple institutions, jointly by the appropriate presidents. A naming that involves a regional center shall be submitted via the executive director of the regional center in consultation with the president of the administrative (coordinating) institution, and the USM vice chancellor for administration and finance and the senior vice chancellor for academic and student affairs (on behalf of the chancellor). Requests shall include the following elements:

1. A detailed narrative describing the institution’s process in considering the name removal. (Appendix A provides guidelines.)
2. A listing of key considerations examined in making the decision to request a removal. (See Appendix A.)
3. Consideration of any legal issues and costs associated with removing a name.
4. Evidence of meaningful community input in considering the renaming.

Renaming of an institution must follow VI-2.00-Policy on Recommendations to Change the Name or Status of an Institution, which requires approval of the Governor and the General Assembly.

As with naming requests, requests to remove a name will be reviewed by the Board of Regents Committee on Advancement, which will 1) deny the request, 2) seek additional information, or 3) recommend the request for approval by the full Board of Regents.

IX. USM institutions and regional centers shall establish policies and procedures for all naming requests, including those not requiring Board of Regents’ approval. Policies and procedures shall also be established for the removal of names or renaming.

X. USM institutions shall provide an annual report to the Board of Regents on all namings, including those resulting from realized gifts, and the form of recognition.
Appendix A

Guidelines on Renaming and Removal of Names at USM Institutions and Regional Centers

Naming of a facility or academic program is one of the highest honors an individual or organization can receive from a university, and the Board of Regents is aware of its great responsibility to ensure that such recognition honors its history, mission, and values. These guidelines are provided as a resource for institutions and regional centers to develop their own policies and procedures related to naming and renaming of facilities and programs. In general, naming recognitions have been awarded for the following:

- To honor individuals by recognizing exceptional contributions shaping the university.
- To commemorate university history and traditions.
- To honor long-term and significant financial contributions to the university.
- To honor financial contributions to support the structure or program being named.

Removal of a name should be rare, and those making such a request should understand that their case must be compelling and well researched. Removal of a name should not erase an important aspect of the university’s past, and where possible, education about and reinterpretation of the name in order for the university community to deepen its understanding about its history may be a reasonable alternative to removal.

Considerations for Renaming or Removal of a Name

1. **The research and rationale of the original naming process.** Whenever available, the documents and discussions making the case for the original naming should be considered, as well as the rigor of the review process. Were those making the naming decision aware of the negative or controversial aspects of the namesake? Did the namesake’s positive contributions outweigh those factors in the view of those authorizing the original naming?

2. **Clearly documented research about the prevalence and persistence of the namesake’s objectionable behavior.** New research and reinterpretations about prominent figures can reveal behaviors and factors not known or emphasized at the time of the naming. In this case, consideration should be given to the centrality of the offensive behavior to the namesake’s life as a whole, and whether the behavior was consistent with conventions of the time. The historical record of the subject’s behavior should be substantial and unambiguous and made publicly available.

3. **The past and current effect of the namesake’s behavior.** The individual’s behavior and how it aligns with the educational mission and inclusive values of the university should be a factor. Did the namesake’s action(s) cause hurt to individuals or groups that would have been avoided or corrected by contemporary peers? Does the use of the name undermine the ability of a significant number of individuals or groups to engage in, or feel a sense of belonging to, the university community? Is there a strong case that current values and standards have changed so appreciably as to make the name objectionable to the broader university or community?
4. **The namesake’s relationship to the university.** Consideration should be given as to whether the namesake had an objectively significant and noteworthy role in the history of the university. Legal or other commitments the university has made to any donors (and their heirs) in connection with the name in question and the legal and financial implications must also be considered.

5. **University community input.** The voices and views of the entire university community should be a factor in considering the naming request. A request to remove a name is likely to elicit strong opinions; it is essential that different perspectives are given respectful consideration. In cases where multiple institutions share a facility or academic program, input should be considered from every constituency.

6. **Possibilities for mitigation and interpretation.** In some cases, providing historical context and a reinterpretation of a name can be an opportunity to educate the university community about important aspects of its past. Consideration may be given as to whether the harm can be mitigated, and historical knowledge preserved, by recognizing and addressing the individual’s wrongful behavior in a prominent and permanent way in conjunction with retaining the name.

**Procedures**

1. Students, faculty, staff or alumni desiring the removal of a name or a renaming should submit a request to the Office of the President. The request should include:
   a. A letter providing a rationale for the request (it is recommended that the requestors review and respond to the considerations outlined above).
   b. A petition of support signed by members of the university community. The President may impose a signature threshold in order to consider the petition. Alternatively, the President may determine that requests should come via resolution of the university’s shared governance bodies.

2. The President will review the request for factual accuracy and relevance and determine if the request should undergo a formal review. The President may ask for additional information from the requestor(s) before moving forward with a review.

3. If the request undergoes formal review, the President may form a special committee. This committee may include faculty with relevant expertise, senior administrators, student leadership, and alumni or volunteer representation. This committee should be given a charge to:
   a. Embrace the role of the university as a training ground for citizens and future leaders and be true to the university mission.
   b. Ensure meaningful outreach to, and engagement with, the entire university community.
   c. Understand and respect that the entire university community is its constituency, including those with different viewpoints from those making the request.
   d. Apply intellectual rigor that will bring context, a respect for tradition balanced with regard for discovery and changing viewpoints, and a perspective that such decisions must serve the university for the long term, not just a particular moment.

The committee may include other elements in its charge as appropriate.
4. The committee will review the request using the considerations listed above as a guide; it may choose to include additional considerations. The committee will present findings to the President.

5. Upon review of the committee’s findings, the President will determine the appropriate action. If the President determines that removal of a name or renaming of a facility or academic program is appropriate, the President will submit a formal request to the Board of Regents. Renaming requests must follow the Board of Regents Policy VI-4.00 – Policy on Naming of Facilities and Academic Programs.

6. If the requested action is to change the name of an institution, the request must follow VI-2.00-Policy on Recommendations to Change the Name or Status of an Institution, which requires approval of the Governor and the General Assembly.
06-04.00 – Policy on Naming of Facilities and Academic Programs

I. Policy Statement:

To ensure that Towson University facilities, buildings and programs are named consistently with the University's principles, ideals and values and in accordance with the USM Policy VI-4.00, Policy on the Naming of Buildings and Academic Programs.

II. Definitions:

A. “Honorific” is defined as the use of a name for a Facility or program named after a distinguished person who has made a significant contribution to or impact on Towson University community or the state of Maryland.

B. “Philanthropic” is defined as the use of a name for a Facility or program named after an individual or organization whose charitable contribution(s) enhances the vision and mission of Towson University.

C. “Facilities” are defined as planned and existing University buildings of all types, major new additions to existing buildings, as well as University grounds and athletic facilities, all major outdoor campus areas including streets, entrances, gates and landscape features such as quadrangles, gardens, lakes, fountains and fields. Rooms within buildings, interior spaces, benches, and walkways are not considered Facilities for the purposes of this policy.

D. “Programs” are defined as colleges, schools, departments, centers, and institutes within the University.

III. Responsible Executive and Office:

Responsible Executive:
Vice President of Administration and Finance and Chief Fiscal Officer

Responsible Office:
Administration & Finance

IV. Entities Affected by this Policy:

All divisions, colleges, departments and operating units, University faculty, staff, students and donors.
V. Procedures:

A. The Responsible Executive shall convene a committee composed of students, faculty, staff, alumni, and other individuals deemed appropriate.

1. The committee must include representatives nominated by the Academic Senate, the TU Staff Council, the Student Government Association and a representative from the Office of Inclusion and Institutional Equity.

2. The committee shall solicit, vet, and recommend prospective names for Facilities and Programs in accordance with USM Policy VI-4.00, Policy on the Naming of Buildings and Academic Programs.

3. Recommendations shall be forwarded to the Academic Senate for review and be accompanied by a summary of the process used, the participants involved, and a description of how the recommended name(s) meets the criteria outlined below:

   a. Facilities and programs should be named for scholars and other distinguished individuals who are/were prominent in their field or endeavor and/or have contributed meaningfully to Towson University or to the State of Maryland.

   b. One year must pass before the name of an individual who is formerly affiliated with the University, or held public office and/or has been employed by the USM or the State of Maryland may be considered for honorific naming.

   c. The legacy of the namesake should be aligned with the mission and values of the university.

   d. The individual’s work inspires effective, ethical leaders, and engaged citizens.

   e. The individual’s work crafts solutions that would enrich the culture, society, economy, and/or environment of Maryland, the region, and beyond.

   f. Facilities and programs can also be named for prominent geographic landmarks in the State of Maryland.

4. The Academic Senate shall vote to approve or reject the committee’s recommendation and then forward the results of the Senate vote, the committee’s recommendation, and all supporting materials to the President for final consideration.

5. The President shall approve or deny the recommendation. Upon acceptance of the recommendation, the President shall forward the recommendation to the University System of Maryland Office of the Chancellor for final approval.

B. The committee shall use its best efforts and will maximize use of available resources to extensively research the appropriateness of names based on the following factors:
1. Philanthropic efforts of an individual;
2. Profession of an individual;
3. Activities/opinions as they relate to diversity and inclusion;
4. Unethical, immoral and illegal behavior of an individual;
5. Public financial holdings/activities of an individual;
6. Historical activities that occurred at a given place (included for proposed names inspired by prominent geographic entities); and
7. Locations and landmarks were heinous acts occurred shall not be considered.

C. To initiate the process for consideration of the withdrawal and renaming of a Facility or program, a formal request approved by the majority of its constituents must be forwarded to the President by the Academic Senate, the Student Government Association and/or the Towson University Staff Council. From there, the process outlined in this policy shall be followed.

Related Policies:

USM Policy VI-4.00, Policy on the Naming of Buildings and Academic Programs

Approval Date: 09/21/2017

Effective Date: 09/21/2017

Approved By: President’s Council 09/21/2017

Signed By: President’s Council
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Introduction

Something that has inspired me here at Towson is the culture and diversity. When we walk around campus there are a lot of things we’re unfamiliar with but I feel like I’m safe, and I can ask questions, and that inspires me to keep going.

Black student at Towson University, MD (Source: Towson University Values page.)

When discussing higher education and Black students, two things are well-established:

- Underrepresentation among traditional-aged undergraduates
- Below-average six-year graduation rates

Underscoring point #1, a 2020 report from the Education Trust chronicled sustained underrepresentation of Black and Latino undergraduates at the majority of the country’s 101 most selective colleges and universities. The 2019 Black Students at Public Colleges and Universities: a 50-State Report Card, published by the Race & Equity Center at the University of Southern California, also considered Black enrollment by gender, completion rate, and Black faculty-to-student ratios. Across 506 institutions, the authors awarded an average Equity Index Score of C.

This Eduventures report, drawing on data, websites and interviews, considers the rare institutions, selective and otherwise, that not only transcend this unfortunate state-of-affairs, but also demonstrate a combination of: a sizeable and growing traditional-aged Black undergraduate cohort, a superior overall graduation rate, and a Black graduation rate that surpasses the institutional average. The report attempts to go beyond the numbers to consider something of institutional history, initiative, leadership, and culture.

If higher education leaders are to overcome decades of under-serving Black students—a trend the COVID-19 pandemic may worsen if fall 2020 enrollment shortfalls among less traditional populations are sustained—these exceptional but far from uncomplicated institutions deserve more attention. Who are they, and what is their secret?
Wrong Direction

First, some background data to set the scene.

The Black share of the undergraduate student population (those students who identify as “Black or African American”) stood at 11.9% in 1999, peaked at 14.7% in 2011, and then fell to 12.9% in 2019 (the most recent year available). Black enrollment surged during and immediately after the Great Recession, and then—more than average—fell off over the course of the long recovery. Between 2010 and 2019, total undergraduates dropped 9%, but Black undergraduates declined 20%.

Figure 1 shows Black undergraduate representation regardless of age by institutional type in 2005, 2011, and 2019.

Figure 1 highlights that Black students are much more common, proportionally speaking, at some types of institutions. At for-profit schools, Black students made up a quarter or more of undergraduates, compared to about 14% at community colleges, 11% at public four-year schools, and fewer than 7% at leading research universities (R1). This reflects higher Black representation among older undergraduates, enrolling in higher education for the first time later in life or completing an unfinished program.

Only for-profit schools report an enrollment ratio higher than that of Black students aged 18-19 in the general population. Private four-year, B1, R2, public four-year, and R1 institutions fall below both this ratio and that of the Black population overall.
Excluding for-profits, other institutional types show gains during and immediately following the Great Recession, but then a decline by 2019. This aligns with more marked Black enrollment decline over the past decade.

In summary, Africans Americans are disproportionately enrolled at lower-tier, nontraditional, and second-chance institutions. Some of these institutions are first-rate and perform a valuable role, but others suffer poor graduation rates and are low quality. Underrepresentation persists at most other school types and has worsened in recent years.

R1 schools show a steady increase over time, but from the lowest base. At this pace—a net 0.5% increase in the Black undergraduate ratio over 12 years—it will take R1s about 140 years to match the Black share of people aged 18-19 in 2019. Indeed, some R1 gains in Black enrollment may be attributable to the expansion of the R1 category in recent years.

For all school types, there is a litany of reasons for the status quo. How can higher education do more to overcome rather than simply reflect stubborn societal disparities?

**Right Direction?**

Some schools have bucked the trend: enrolling a sizeable and growing Black cohort and reporting higher graduation rates than the rate for the institution overall. In 2019, the six-year graduation rate for all first-time, full-time undergraduates was 60%; for Black students it was 40%.

Figure 2 compares graduation rates by institution for the Black and overall population. The focus is four-year schools and the six-year graduation rate for first-time, full-time bachelor’s-seeking students.

![Figure 2. Exceptions to the Rule](image)

Source: Eduventures analysis of IPEDS data. Four-year schools (n=940) with an overall cohort size of 100+ and an African-American cohort size of 30+. Excludes HBCUs.
A mere 37 institutions (3.9%) have the distinction of graduating Black students at a rate of three percentage points or higher than average. Another 154 schools (16%) report a Black graduation rate within +/- three percentage points of the average. Simply outperforming or matching the institutional average, however, says nothing about the African-American graduation rate itself. Beating or equaling a lowly average is hardly worth celebrating.

Before considering schools that report both a high overall graduation rate and a high Black graduation rate, mention must be made of HBCUs.

What about HBCUs?

Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) are not the focus of this report. HBCUs are remarkable institutions that have thrived against the odds and decades of under-funding, but educate only a small minority of traditional-aged Black undergraduates.

In 2019, HBCUs (84 schools at the four-year level) enrolled 18% of first-time, full-time Black undergraduates, down from 20% in 2010. The absolute number of such students enrolled at HBCUs fluctuated over the period, with the 2019 total about 12% smaller than in 2010, consistent with the overall decline in Black (and general) undergraduate enrollment during these years. HBCUs are overrepresented (28%) among the 50 schools that enroll the largest number of such undergraduates.

In 2019, according to IPEDS data, Black students at an HBCU were, on average, less likely (38%) to graduate in six years compared to those at a non-HBCU (40%). From 2011 to 2019, the HBCU graduation rate held steady between 34% and 36%, while the non-HBCU rate fluctuated from 35% to 42%. In four of the past eight years, the non-HBCU average was six-to-seven percentage points higher than the HBCU average.

The opponent to being able to feel like you belong is the feeling of alienation. So, to belong somewhere is feeling a complete wholeness in the self. What we have been sort of grappling with on campus and in the world, is this: Are we looking for acceptance, or are we looking for tolerance?

- Jonathan Jackson, class of 2019 at Amherst College.

(Source: Amherst College Belong Campaign page.)
Of course, the Black graduation rate at some HBCUs is much better than the HBCU average: such as 76% at Bennett College, 75% at Spelman, 64% at Howard, and 60% at Hampton.

HBCUs are enjoying something of a resurgence in the midst of this year’s Black Lives Matter movement, with anecdotes citing enrollment gains and a boom in corporate and other donations. The 2019 FUTURE Act and the COVID-19 CARES Act boosted federal funding for HBCUs. The coming years may look brighter for HBCUs, but if the goal is to understand the experience where the vast majority of Black students enroll, and to find the rare schools that combine significant Black enrollment and superior graduation rates, we must look beyond HBCUs.

Top 50?

Out of the 191 non-HBCUs that report either in-line or superior Black graduation rates compared to the institutional average (highlighted in Figure 2), 67 also report a Black graduation rate of at least 70% (10 percentage points higher than the all-student national average of 60%).

Table 1 characterizes the top 50 best performing schools by size (Black cohort) and type (Carnegie Classification):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size/Type</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Master’s</th>
<th>Baccalaureate</th>
<th>Specialized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large (500+)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (100-499)</td>
<td>13 (26%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small (30-99)</td>
<td>15 (30%)</td>
<td>7 (14%)</td>
<td>12 (24%)</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>28 (56%)</td>
<td>7 (14%)</td>
<td>12 (24%)</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL non-HBCU Black Cohort</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Eduventures analysis of IPEDS data. For this analysis, four-year Carnegie Classification “14” schools (Baccalaureate/Associate) were classified as “Baccalaureate”.

An obvious takeaway from Table 1 is the prominence of highly-selective institutions: two-thirds of the top 50 schools for Black graduation rates are either R1s or top-tier liberal arts colleges. Most of the Ivies are in this group, along with the likes of University of Chicago, Emory University, and Tulane University. Outperforming public R1s include University of Georgia, University of South Florida, and Stony Brook University. Top liberal arts colleges include Amherst, Davidson, and Vassar.

A national brand, no shortage of high-quality applicants, and sizeable financial resources give these schools considerable advantages. Perhaps it is more important to ask why similarly prestigious schools perform less well.

R1s in particular are much more prominent in this exclusive company (40% of the 50 schools) than their share of the total Black first-time, full-time cohort (19%); but R1s account for 24% of the 2019 graduating Black cohort. In general, R1s enroll relatively few Black students but have a high graduation rate for this population.
Cohort size is another takeaway from Table 1: there is an inverse association between Black cohort size and graduation performance. Only 21% of first-time, full-time Black bachelor’s-seeking students in the 2019 six-year graduation cohort were enrolled at schools with a Black cohort of under 100, but 72% of top 50 schools fall in this category.

Nationally, there are 53 non-HBCU colleges and universities that reported a Black adjusted graduation cohort of 500+ in 2019, enrolling 26% of non-HBCU, first-time, full-time Black students, but none featured in Table 1. These 53 schools exhibit a Black graduation rate below 70% and/or one significantly below the institutional average.

The next question is: which of the top 50 in Table 1 also exhibit sustained Black graduation rate outperformance, and which have combined outperformance and Black enrollment growth? One striking finding is that, collectively, the top 50 schools in Table 1, the schools with the best Black graduation rates, reported 18% growth in first-time Black undergraduate enrollment between 2010 and 2019, a period when overall Black first-time undergraduate numbers slid 25% and total first-time undergraduate enrollment declined 12%. A critical mass of successful Black students has attracted yet more Black enrollment. It is important to note that a minority of top 50 schools showed a steady decline in Black enrollment over this period, or a fluctuation.

Over time, many top 50 schools exhibit a relatively stable overall graduation rate and a more volatile Black one. This is consistent with generally much smaller Black cohorts but may also reflect inconsistent institutional attention to this population. Also, most top 50 schools reported a similar or superior Black graduation rate in only one or two of the past seven years, suggesting that outperformance in 2019 (Figure 2) is not necessarily a sound guide to longer-term trends.

**Top 10?**

Ten schools in the top 50 stand out from the rest, outperforming on all or some of the following metrics specific to Black students:

- Sustained growth in enrollment
- Steady gains in the graduation rate
- A graduation rate above the institutional average over the period
- A first-time undergraduate ratio above the national average

Table 2 names these schools and details their performance:
### Table 2. National Leaders
Top 10 Schools: Black Enrollment & Graduation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amherst College (MA)</td>
<td>Stable then down somewhat</td>
<td>Flat, some fluctuation (90s)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mason University (VA)</td>
<td>Up 73%</td>
<td>61-74% (some fluctuation)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola Marymount University (CA)</td>
<td>Up 42%</td>
<td>76-82% (some fluctuation)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Brook University (NY)</td>
<td>Up 15%</td>
<td>70-76% (some fluctuation)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY Albany (NY)</td>
<td>Up 112% (some fluctuation)</td>
<td>66-68% (some 70s mid-period)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY Cortland (NY)</td>
<td>118%</td>
<td>63-69% (some fluctuation)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towson University (MD)</td>
<td>Up 199%</td>
<td>55-73%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia (GA)</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>79-86%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Florida (FL)</td>
<td>Mix of decline and fluctuation</td>
<td>53-78%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington University in St. Louis (MO)</td>
<td>Up 70%</td>
<td>Flat (mid-90s)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Eduventures analysis of IPEDS data.

No school passed all four tests. But all 10 schools show strong (quantitative) evidence of serving Black undergraduates much more assiduously than average.

It is ironic that seven out of the 10 schools report a below-average Black first-time undergraduate ratio, although most are growing Black enrollment at a pace that might change that in the coming years. The ultimate test for these schools will be to both continue to grow Black enrollment and sustain or improve graduation rate outperformance for this population.

SUNY Albany and Towson serve a much higher ratio of Black students than average and have simultaneously grown said population, pushed up the Black graduation rate, and (at least
sometimes) pushed that rate above the institutional average. It should also be said, however, that the City of Albany’s population is about 27% Black, suggesting that the university still has some way to go to match local demographics. Albany County—the university straddles the city and county—is about 14% Black. The city of Towson is 15% Black, while nearby Baltimore is 63% Black.

School location is notable: most are on the east coast. This may be in part a function of regional demographics, but (aside from University of Georgia and University of Southern Florida) schools in southern states with large Black populations are conspicuous by their absence, as are schools in a number of major urban areas, such as Chicago. Figure 3 is split 7/3 between publics and privates.

A more diverse and inclusive campus will be achieved through senior-level leadership with strategic vision for the design, promotion, and delivery of best-practice diversity, inclusion and cultural competency efforts across campus.

Creating a more diverse and inclusive campus is one of eight presidential priorities that are linked to and aligned with Towson University’s strategic plan. These eight priorities will help us build a stronger foundation for Towson University’s promising future.

Source: Towson University’s Diverse & Inclusive Campus page on the President’s website.

These top 10 schools are not role models for others in any simplistic sense. Each has a particular mission and target audience. Some are highly selective institutions, while others are closer to open admission. All of these schools would acknowledge they have plenty of work still to do. But they are role models in that each has managed something very few other schools, of any type, have achieved: to graduate traditional-aged Black undergraduates at a rate far above the national average and close this population’s graduation gap that is the norm at most peers.

From Numbers to Culture

The next section looks at three of the top 10 schools from the bottom up, considering not only data but also illuminating something of the policies and practices behind these apparent success stories. Eduventures reviewed each school’s website to get a sense of how the institution operates. The three schools represent very different institutional types.
SUNY Albany

This report is not the first to recognize SUNY Albany’s superior record on Black enrollment. Indeed, the Education Trust report mentioned at the start cites the university as something of a rarity among R1s. In 2000, the Education Trust gave the university a failing grade on Black and Latino access, which turned into an “A” by 2017. The University of Southern California (USC) Race & Equity Center report, however, gave the university a “B-minus”, based in part of the contrast between the university’s Black student ratio and that of New York State.

SUNY Albany’s website offers some clues about its approach to diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI), and Black students in particular. Examples include:

- **Homepage**: “A More Diverse and Inclusive Campus” is one of six lead statements/images on the homepage, signaling the institution’s commitment. “Diversity and Inclusion” is one of the six pillars of the SUNY Albany 2018-23 Strategic Plan.

- **Imagery**: Student, faculty, and staff promotional imagery throughout the website conveys a diverse community.

- **Office of Diversity and Inclusion**: Oversees diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) work institution-wide, which is positioned not in narrow compliance or equality terms but as fulfilling the university’s mission to “ensure that diversity—in our people and ideas—drives everything we do.” At SUNY Albany, DEI enables the university to fulfill its mission. The ODI oversees implementation of the university’s Diversity and Inclusion Plan, which encompasses quantitative hiring targets for underrepresented faculty and staff as well as a number of training and climate initiatives. Many academic units have their own DEI officers and efforts.

- **Taskforce**: The Diversity and Inclusive Excellence Taskforce, representing faculty, staff and students, is in the midst of a comprehensive review of organizational structures, programs and services in support of DEI. Included is a review of the core curriculum at all levels. Individual colleges are conducting their own reviews. Today, based on the school website, DEI dimensions to admission and academics are less obvious.

- **Campus Climate Surveys**: Annual faculty, staff and student surveys spanning a variety of DEI topics, and used to benchmark tensions and progress. The university publishes ongoing institutional responses to collated student DEI concerns and requests. In an effort to decentralize DEI, every academic and administrative department has its own “Climate Committee.”

- **Student Support**: The university hosts a range of tutoring, mentoring and similar services, targeting all undergraduates. A recent Chronicle of Higher Education article credited such offerings as central to supporting a diverse student body at SUNY Albany.
• **Faculty Diversity**: SUNY as a whole funds a variety of diversity programs, including the Faculty Diversity Program, providing central funds to part-support hiring of “outstanding scholars” from historically underrepresented groups. At SUNY Albany, a DEI-driven review of faculty hiring processes is underway, and search committee members engage in DEI training.

• **Presidential Leadership**: SUNY Albany’s president, Havidán Rodríguez, continues to play an active part in DEI efforts, leading prominent discussions and underlining their importance to the institution.

What about admissions arrangements, Black faculty and leadership, and institutional spend on student support? Do these help explain SUNY Albany’s outperformance?

SUNY Albany is currently test-optional during the pandemic, but previously required a standardized test score. The school also makes clear that it practices holistic admissions, and seeks a “diverse educational environment.” The university’s overall admission requirements are standard at peer schools, and there is no evidence of a “special” admissions pathway targeting underrepresented groups (such as the A2A initiative at Amherst College—see below).

Black faculty can be role models for students. Is SUNY Albany’s outperformance when it comes to Black enrollment and graduation attributable in part to above-average Black faculty ratios? Indeed, in 2019, the most recent year available, SUNY Albany reported that 4.2% of tenured faculty were Black, compared to an R1 average of 3.3%; and 6.5% vs. 4.5% tenure track. The university lagged the peer average for non-tenured faculty, however. No doubt individual Black faculty make a difference, but the low ratios—acknowledging above-benchmark performance for two faculty types—suggest that Black faculty are not a distinguishing feature of the SUNY Albany story.

As of the time of publication, one of SUNY Albany’s Executive Council is Black, and the president and provost are non-white. None of SUNY Albany’s deans are Black.

SUNY Albany’s success in recruiting and graduating traditional-aged Black students is not associated with atypical per-student spend on support services, at least at a macro level. Per-student “student support” spend at SUNY Albany consistently trailed the peer average over the past decade—according to Eduventures analysis of IPEDS data—although the gap has narrowed.

In summary, it is clear that SUNY Albany decided to embrace an equity agenda. Without such commitment, it is hard to explain the university’s move from a failing grade to an “A” on the Education Trust’s measure of equitable admissions. Yes, SUNY Albany is located in a city with a large Black population, but so are many peer schools with less stellar track records.

But it is also apparent that the institution’s admission arrangements, Black faculty presence, and per-student support spend do not suggest anything exceptional.

The presidency of Robert J. Jones, SUNY Albany’s first Black president from 2007 to 2012, however, undoubtedly had a major impact, symbolically and strategically. Under Jones’ leadership, an overall enrollment decline from the late 2000s, prompting renewed effort to improve recruitment and retention, convinced the university to pay more attention to talent in its backyard. New York’s new Excelsior Scholarship and the longstanding Equal Opportunity Program, together offering free tuition, additional financial aid, and post-enrollment support for
low- and middle-income residents matriculated at in-state public colleges, has helped SUNY Albany widen access.

The school’s website highlights plenty of DEI-related activity, and some ambitious work-in-progress (e.g., faculty hiring targets) but it is not obvious that such activity drove SUNY Albany’s outperformance. It appears more as an outgrowth of a surge in the Black student population, and rooted in a desire to address DEI issues institution-wide, but no doubt built on prior work that aided the student surge in the first place, and that began under Dr. Jones’ presidency.

It should be noted that many Black students at SUNY Albany hail from New York City as well as from the Albany area. Like in many places, numerous local high school graduates are eager to study elsewhere, and the SUNY systems offers plenty of choice.

The measure of SUNY Albany in the coming years will be whether the university can continue to build on its strong performance with Black traditional-aged undergraduates, driving further graduation rate gains even as student numbers rise. Yet the university’s overall six-year graduation rate has actually fallen in recent years, even as the Black rate has generally improved and surpassed it. Ambitious curriculum reform and faculty diversity initiatives currently underway, alongside new state funding, may prove key to lifting the entire institution to the next level.

Towson University

Towson University (Towson), a public doctoral-professional institution just outside Baltimore, is a large, comprehensive university that has embraced its location and has strived to embrace diversity and close achievement gaps. Once a whites-only college, Towson began to integrate seriously in the late 1960s, and hired its first dean of minority affairs, Julius Chapman, in 1969. Chapman, who served at Towson for 13 years, is cited as a driving force in reimagining the university as a welcoming place for Black students.

The Towson website sheds light on why today the university features among the most successful institutions when it comes to enrolling and graduating traditional-aged Black undergraduates. Examples include:

- **Strategic Plan:** Towson’s [current plan](https://www.towson.edu/strategic-plan/) calls for the university to be a “model for campus diversity”: including to enhance recruitment and retention of underrepresented or underserved populations, and to close any achievement gaps. A [Diversity Strategic Plan](https://www.towson.edu/strategic-plan/) is under development.
- **Office of Inclusion and Institutional Equity (OIIE):** Under the auspices of the Towson president, OIIE coordinates numerous DEI efforts, rooted in a philosophy of shared values and responsibility, and tied to institutional mission. OIIE strives to set the climate for the university, and curates a Diversity & Inclusion Toolkit (third party resources for faculty, staff, and students).

- **SAGE (Students Achieving Goals Through Education):** This longstanding student support unit, almost two decades old, works with new students (on an opt-in basis) and develops student mentors. Significant use by Black students. SAGE students have an above-average graduation rate. In 2014, a SAGE Residential Learning Community was started. SAGE staff share space with the Center for Student Diversity- see below.

- **Diversity & Inclusion Faculty Fellow:** The university offers annual funding for selected faculty to work on DEI-related projects, ranging from curriculum reform to undergraduate research. Fourteen faculty were named as 2019-20 fellows.

- **Center for Student Diversity:** Housed under OIIE, the Center supports multicultural organizations at Towson, coordinates financial assistance for underrepresented students and runs DEI education events. Videos relay how individual students experience DEI at Towson.

- **Black Student Development Program:** Under the Center for Student Diversity, and with a history stretching back 30 years, the AASD works to “aid in the recruitment, retention and development of students of African and Black descent and heritage and to assist the university in creating a more welcoming and inclusive environment across campus.” AASD activities include events to build up current aspiring Black leaders and an annual Celebration of Black Excellence across the Towson community.

- **President’s Inclusive Leadership Institute:** Established in 1996, annual cohorts of 20-25 senior staff and faculty are nominated to take part in a series of group activities, case studies, and projects over an academic year. Each class ends with a joint project that benefits the university. The institute began with a general leadership focus, but has in recent years focused on DEI. All cabinet members take part to share their experiences and perspectives.

- **University’s Diverse Progress Report:** In 2015, Towson agreed to work toward twelve DEI goals, ranging from advocating for a required American Race Relations course to increasing tenure and tenure track faculty by 10%. A website monitors progress.

- **University Diversity & Inclusion Awards:** The awards, inaugurated in 2019, “recognize individuals and departments that foster greater awareness, understanding and advancement of diversity and inclusiveness at Towson University.” There is one faculty, one staff, one department, and one administrator award each year.

- **Academic Departments:** Each department’s presentation is distinct but across the board departments made a point of underlining their commitment to DEI at Towson, and using diverse imagery and examples. All Towson’s college are required to have a diversity action plan. Founded in 2019, the Faculty Academic Center for Excellence at Towson is beginning to explore curriculum and pedagogy questions, and all new faculty must engage with the Center.
What about admissions arrangements, Black faculty and leadership, and institutional spend on student support?

Like SUNY Albany, Towson is currently test-optional, but only in the midst of the pandemic. Towson’s admission requirements are conventional, and appear to offer no special pathway for underserved populations.

Towson’s record on Black faculty is generally much better than the national and peer average: 10.2% of Towson’s tenure-track faculty were Black in 2019 (compared to 6.3% at peers), and 8.7% of non-tenure track faculty were Black (vs. 6.1%). Towson is in-line on Black tenured faculty: 3.9% were Black in 2019 (and down from 4.9% in 2013) compared to 3.9% at peer schools. Overall, for Towson, a stronger case can be made for an association between superior Black student and faculty representation. An Associate Provost for Diversity and Inclusion works with faculty. Prospective faculty must speak to DEI plans.

Of the 13 members of Towson’s president’s cabinet, two are Black: the vice president for inclusion and institutional equity and the vice president for student affairs. As with faculty, this does suggest some association between leadership and student representation. None of Towson’s deans, however, are Black. Towson has never had a Black president. Towson was the first school in the University of Maryland System to hire a vice president for equity and inclusion, a now common position.

Per-student, Towson spends only three-quarters of what peers devote to student support, a ratio that has held since at least 2010. Of course, higher spend does not necessarily mean better service, but any service superiority at Towson must transcend spend alone.

In summary, Towson’s organizational commitment to advancing DEI is clear on its website, and student, staff, and faculty diversity is visually obvious. The wide-ranging Diversity Issues Progress Report shows DEI work many aspects of the university, and a mix of discrete and ongoing efforts. Towson has combined strong gains in both the Black and overall graduation rates in recent years. The university’s Black first-time, full-time undergraduate population has tripled over the past decade, suggesting a positive relationship between numbers and student success. Maintaining this outperformance, with a rapidly increased Black cohort, is the next test for Towson.

The still wide gap between the Black enrollment ratio at Towson and the Black presence in Maryland overall persuaded the USC Race & Equity Center to give the university an “F” on student “representation equity,” even though Black representation at Towson is superior to that at the vast majority of other schools. Indeed, the majority of Black students at Towson do not come from Baltimore. Many hail from north of Washington DC. Robust alumni networks and the efforts of the Black Faculty & Staff Association have strengthened Towson’s visibility in African American neighborhoods.

Institutional location is consistent with above-average Black enrollment, but graduation rate outperformance is less easily explained. There is some evidence of atypical Black faculty and leadership presence, but admission arrangements and per-student support spend suggest nothing out of the ordinary. Sustained institutional commitment is clear, but the specific services, strategy, and tactics that closed the achievement gap are less apparent.

What is clear is that Towson’s transformation from a white-only college in the 1960s to a multi-ethnic comprehensive university today, boasting one of the largest and most academically successful Black undergraduate populations nationally, is a remarkable achievement.
Amherst College

Amherst College (Amherst) is a private liberal arts college in Amherst, Massachusetts, about two hours west of Boston. The town’s Black population was 6.1% in 2019.

Amherst has a long history of recruiting small numbers of talented Black students from far afield, notably from the Paul Laurence Dunbar High School, the first Black public high school in the nation, in Washington D.C., in the Jim Crow era. At the same time, up until the 1950s, campus housing was unofficially segregated, many campus activities were off-limits, and Black student recruitment strictly curtailed. It was not until the college became co-educational in the 1970s that the Black cohort really expanded and diversified.

Edunventures reviewed the Amherst website for insight into the College’s contemporary approach to DEI, with particular reference to Black students:

- Ethos: Amherst claims to be “one of the most diverse liberal arts colleges in the country,” citing a 45% “students of color” ratio, and connects this to the institution’s founding ideals.

- Visuals: The homepage includes an “Amherst in Pictures” slideshow, showcasing all sides of campus life, including plenty of diverse imagery.

- Office of Diversity, Equity & Inclusion (ODEI): The Office (founded in 2016) works for a “just, equitable, vibrant, and intellectually challenging educational environment, and a culture of critical and compassionate campus engagement.” The ODEI site includes a statement from the campus police about the department’s commitment to DEI. ODEI includes the Office of Inclusive Leadership, focused both on recruiting a more diverse staff and fostering an inclusive workplace.

- ODEI Strategic Plan: Goal two of the Office’s strategic plan is to “create a sense of belonging for all Amherst students.” Initiatives to that end include focus groups, cross-referencing various DEI reports across Amherst, work to better connect “cultural centers” and “student life,” discussions on the role of DEI in the core curriculum, and consulting with all student-serving centers on creation of DEI plans. A three-year ODEI plan evaluation report is available, but is framed in general terms. It is not clear what progress has been made on the various goals and strategies from 2016. There is also a Presidential Task Force on Diversity & Inclusion, formed in 2017, with a multifaceted staff, faculty, and student membership. The object is to take practical steps to further ODEI’s work across the institution, but its reports are password protected.

- Wade Fellowship: Named in honor of a former student, Harold Wade Jr., author of The Black Men of Amherst, a history of pioneering Black students at the college from the late 19th century, the annual fellowship connects alumni winners with current Black students. Fellows visit campus over a year to give talks and mentor.

- Open Curriculum: Since 1971, Amherst has adopted the “open curriculum,” emphasizing intellectual breadth and student development. There is no core curriculum, and no distribution requirements. The College website makes no mention of any mandatory DEI course, a path some schools have taken. Instead, students are encouraged to explore across the college’s 850+ courses, in every subject imaginable, not to mention those of the Five Colleges Consortium of which Amherst is a part.
• **Need-Blind Admission:** There is no question that resources aid Amherst’s DEI commitment. Amherst enjoys one of the largest endowments among liberal arts colleges. The College meets 100% of demonstrated financial need for all admitted students. The average financial aid package in 2019/20 was $58,000.

• **A2A:** The Access 2 Amherst initiative works to introduce the College to prospective students, prioritizing underrepresented groups, and any prospects with limited financial resources. Participation—a no-cost weekend on campus—is selective based on an application. About three-quarters of past A2A participants applied for Amherst admission, and half this cohort were admitted (a much higher ratio than average). A team of Diversity Outreach Interns help students settle in.

What about Black faculty, leadership, and institutional spend on student support?

Amherst College slightly trails its peers on Black faculty ratios: 4.7% among tenured faculty (vs. 5% at peers), and 7.9% among tenure-track faculty (vs. 8.3%) in 2019. Amherst is on par with peers when it comes to non-tenure track faculty at 7.1% in 2019 (vs. 7%). Compared to national averages, the College is in-line or ahead. This suggests respectable but not exceptional Black faculty presence, although there have been gains over time: the Amherst website states that in 2015, Black faculty made up 3.1% of the total, rising to 5.4% in 2018.

Senior administration includes one Black leader (chief equity and inclusion officer) and a non-white chief student affairs officer. There are no Black leaders on the provost’s senior team. Amherst has never had a Black president.

The College vastly outspends its peers on student support, with a per-student dollar amount of nearly $19,000 in 2019, more than double even its lofty peer average. Indeed, Amherst grew per-student support spend over 65% between 2010 and 2019, much faster than usual. The extent to which growth in spend was driven by DEI-specific activities is unclear.

In summary, Amherst is a well-resourced, independent-minded institution wedded to diversity as a core attribute. Various initiatives have helped the college to better live up to its ideals when it comes to student and faculty diversity, but there remains plenty of scope for development. Indeed, Amherst’s Black first-time, full-time population was flat over the past decade, a period when the likes of SUNY Albany and Towson increased Black enrollment strongly. According to Amherst College’s 2019 Common Dataset, the college enrolled more first-time, full-time international students than Black students that year.

Location, list price, and selectivity are challenges, real and perceived, for Amherst. Local developments may give a new dimension to the college’s DEI efforts. The Town of Amherst is considering a reparations fund for its Black community in recognition of systematic housing and other discrimination in decades past. Amherst College has expressed support.

**The Bottom Line**

Very few U.S four-year colleges and universities (excluding HBCUs) truly exemplify a commitment to Black students: enrolling them at or above population incidence, growing this cohort strongly over time, posting a Black first-time, full-time graduation rate above 70%, and a graduation rate that matches or exceeds the institutional average. Among the handful that get
close to this ideal, most hit some of these metrics but not others: a stellar graduation rate but flat or down Black enrollment, for example.

Institutional location has something to do with our “Top 10,” but there are far more counter-examples. SUNY Albany and Towson University would perhaps not have such a strong track record on Black enrollment and student success if they were not located in large urban areas with significant Black populations. But there are numerous other institution in somewhat similar settings with no such track record. Amherst College shows that location need not be an impediment to greater student diversity, and both SUNY Albany and Towson still lag their settings in terms of representation.

History and personalities also matter. Towson University’s transition from whites-only college in the 1960s to a multi-ethnic university much more aligned with its north-of-Baltimore home, was inspired by early Black leaders such as Julius Chapman. SUNY Albany’s first Black president, Robert J. Jones, provided a focal point as the university looked for new direction.

Resources also matter, but are not decisive. Amherst College operates need-blind admission and spends lavishly on student support but has seen Black first-time, full-time enrollment flat-line in recent years. SUNY Albany and Towson are less well-off and spend less than peers on student support but have grown Black enrollment substantially, and simultaneously raised graduation rates and closed equity gaps.

When it comes to faculty and leadership, only Towson’s Black faculty ratios stand out, and only for non-tenured faculty. Black senior leaders are either absent or exceptional at the three case study institutions featured here. SUNY Albany’s Dr. Jones aside, the most obvious Black senior leaders have a DEI brief, suggesting that other top roles remain a frontier even at schools with a strong track record on Black enrollment and graduation. Towson’s Black vice president for student affairs is notable.

On school websites at least, DEI units and plans are perhaps the most visible manifestation of institutional commitment, along with photos and videos of student diversity. DEI units and plans, often formed only relatively recently, are still finding their way when it comes to advancing Black equity, as well as more generally. Numerical targets for faculty, evident at some schools, are not employed when it comes to students, wary of political and legal sensitivity about affirmative action. Similarly, curriculum reform tied to a DEI agenda is absent or tentative. Some voices imply that the “problem” is admission and support, while the academic “content” is neutral; others, like Amherst, view any course prescription as antithetical to learning.

It is often difficult to discern exactly what a school is striving for when it comes to different dimensions of DEI, including the Black experience. This is partly because the subject is hard-to-pin-down “culture” and “climate,” and partly because higher education is defined by intricate interplay between institution and individuals, not top-down targets. Deeper explanatory layers, such as the intersections of race, gender, and field of study, have not been tackled in this report.

In the end, data cannot tell the whole story. Institutions operate in complex social realities beyond their control, and the lived experience of individual students is both diverse and ultimately beyond studies like this. What is apparent is that a handful of schools have much to teach others about how to make meaningful progress, from different starting points and with much work still to do, on the Black student experience.
It is clear that schools that recruit and graduate Black students in larger numbers get rewarded: the schools with the best Black graduation rates reported 18% growth in first-time Black undergraduate enrollment between 2010 and 2019, a period when overall Black first-time undergraduate numbers slid 25% and total first-time undergraduate enrollment declined 12%. Success breeds success.

Higher education leaders cannot be "neutral" on DEI, not least sustained Black underrepresentation. Commitments to truth and excellence sit uneasily with access and success gaps that both reflect and perpetuate centuries of systemic racism in the United States. There are no simple answers, but those rare institutions that have made more progress than most deserve acknowledgment and emulation, and more needs to be done to unpack and propel their success.
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