****

**Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting Minutes**

April 18, 2017 1:30-2:30pm CP 206 C

***Present:*** *Sarah Hampson, Marian Harris, Greg Benner, Jim Thatcher, Jennifer Heckman, D.C. Grant, Susan Johnson.*

1. **Consent Agenda**

The March 14, 2017 Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting Minutes were approved.

Chair’s Report and Discussion Items:

1. **Proposed Policy on Non-Competitive Faculty Appointments** *Appendix A*

FAC members reported on whether or not they had received feedback from their units:

* SWCJ – no feedback
* US – none so far
* IT – none so far, maybe more at Friday’s (4.21.17) IT meeting
* Milgard – there may be unintended consequences of implementing this policy, namely, the use of more adjunct/part-time positions
* NHCL – they have special instructional needs that are filled by people from the community; this policy does not align well with those needs
* SOE – none reported
* SIAS – waiting to ask SIAS faculty due to large restructuring conversation; SIAS is the largest academic unit – who should this policy be brought to? The Faculty Council? Marian will consult with Lauren Montgomery, FA vice chair, SIAS faculty, and on the SIAS Faculty Council.

FAC members agreed that the next iteration of this policy won’t be ready for review until the next academic year. It is a work in progress. Chair, Marian Harris, will communicate this to EC and Faculty Assembly leadership. FAC members discussed the following aspects of this policy:

* Perhaps if a certain number of classes have been taught by an adjunct over a certain number of years, that position should qualify to get rolled into a full-time lecturer position, i.e. consistently 6 classes taught by the same adjunct/part-time lecturer over 5 years.
* Chair, Marian Harris, and FAC member, D.C. Grant, met with the chair of Lecturer Affairs, Linda Dawson, and Lecturer Affairs past chair and current member, Libi Sundermann. They shared a document of a similar policy with her; Marian will share this with FAC members.
* \*Add language to this policy for bringing in “clinical” instructors and other unique instructional needs, i.e. “exceptions can be made for clinical and professional adjunct faculty” to broadly address both.
* Recently, SWCJ went through the recruiting process to establish a pool of part-time lecturers. Perhaps this option could be encouraged by the policy.
* NHCL has a similar method for securing their clinical instructors and they vote on the pool annually.
* In some academic units, there are policies that were put into place in 2010-2012 that are not being enforced.
* For this policy, how do we get buy-in from faculty who are not lecturers?
* Concerns with the full-time hiring process.
* The turn around on a competitive hire is about a year to 1.5 years, thus, an academic unit would have to begin that process immediately upon filling the position with a non-competitively hired person to follow this policy.
  + The non-competitive hiring happens again and again because academic units can’t get/find/commit long-term funding for a competitively hired person with a longer contract.
* Is there a way to change the way we allocate the budget for hiring?
* It’s not clear how lines (lecturer, competitive, non-competitive, tenure-track) are recommended and why some are approved and some are not approved.
  + According to the Faculty Code, Faculty have purview over appointment, but faculty feel like they don’t have a voice or authority in the process because the steps lack transparency, i.e. there is the unit list (PPPA, for example), then the SIAS list, then the dean list, then the EVCAA approves some on the list and not others.
  + Overall, faculty would like more clarity.

**ACTION:** Jim Thatcher, Urban Studies representative, volunteered to include \*new language into the policy in time for the May 16 meeting. D.C. Grant will forward the Lecturer Affairs Policy language to Jim. Marian Harris will communicate to EC and Faculty Assembly leadership that the next draft of this policy won’t be ready for review until the following academic year.

1. **Climate Survey** – *Marian Harris* **Appendix A**

D.C. Grant had prepared a Request for Proposal to Rankin & Associates that Marian Harris sent along to them. She received a proposal back from Rankin and Associates (Appendix A) and then shared it with EVCAA, Melissa Lavitt. The feedback was that it was a good proposal for a climate survey, but that it was expensive (total cost: $71,920). The EVCAA had paid for a Faculty of Color climate survey that was conducted in summer 2016 (the results are confidential), so she didn’t want to conduct another climate survey too soon, especially with the Tri-Campus Climate survey in the works. Marian emphasized that FAC is insistent that faculty, staff, and students be surveyed and not just faculty.

Marian also met with Turan Kayaoglu, who is leading the Faculty Development Council, about the need for a campus climate survey that includes faculty, staff, and students. The Executive Council and Strategic Plan Coordinating Committee (SPCC) agree that this is a need at UW Tacoma. Mark Pendras, Faculty Assembly chair, asked Marian to meet with Richard Wilkinson, Associate Vice Chancellor for Organizational Effectiveness and Development, who has submitted a climate survey proposal for Strategic Initiative Funding to SPCC. His proposal is different in several ways: it takes a narrative approach and focuses on UW Tacoma employees (including student employees) but not all students. Marian plans to meet with Melissa again before the May 16 FAC meeting. She asked that FAC members champion a campus climate survey for faculty, staff, and students during 2017-2018 while she is away on sabbatical.

A FAC member wondered if the survey doesn’t get implemented in Fall 2017, will they have to wait until Fall 2018? No one knew for sure. FAC agreed that it would be a waste of money to do a haphazard climate survey and that we need a survey that will accurately capture what goes on at UW Tacoma.

1. **Childcare Advisory Committee –** *D.C. Grant*

D.C. Grant attended on behalf of FAC and UW Tacoma. He shared the group’s minutes. They mainly discussed the Bright Horizons program. There was no direct feedback for UW Tacoma, but it appears that UWS and UWB are both moving forward on childcare initiatives on their campuses.

**ACTION:** D.C. will invite CAC’s chair, Amy Hawkins, to attend the first FAC meeting of 2017-2018. FAC tentatively scheduled this meeting for 9/25/17 at 3pm. FA Admin will work to confirm that meeting and secure Amy Hawkins a parking pass.

1. **2017-2018 Chair for Faculty Affairs Committee**

Chair, Marian Harris, called for nominations for the 2017-2018 FAC chair. This person should be familiar with and interested in continuing the work of the committee. This person will also need to attend EC meetings and represent FAC. They will be given a course release or stipend as compensation for their leadership work. D.C. Grant was willing to self-nominate if no one else expressed interest. As no other members were interested, Jim Thatcher seconded the nomination of D.C. Grant for 2017-2018 Faculty Affairs Committee chair.

**VOTE:** 6 yes, 0 no, 1 abstain, 0 absent (7 eligible to vote.)

1. **Final Report & June 6, 2017 Meeting**

FAC will review the 2016-2017 final report when Marian circulates it and give her feedback.

At the 6.6.17 (1:30pm-2:30-pm, CP 206 C) meeting, FAC will work on setting the agenda for the 2017-2018 academic year.

1. **Adjourn**

**Appendix A**



**University of Washington Tacoma Campus Climate Survey Project Proposal**

**Proposal Submitted by: Rankin & Associates Consulting March 22, 2017**

**Introduction**

**Rankin & Associates Consulting**

*(For information on R&A Associates, please see* [*www.rankin-consulting.com*](http://www.rankin-consulting.com/)*)*

Rankin & Associates have been working with higher education institutions for the past 20 years. (A list of our clients is provided in Appendix D). We are committed to assisting campuses and organizations in assessing their environments for learning, living, and working. We support educational and organizational program planners and policy makers in identifying their successes and strengths and provide potential best practices for addressing challenges**.** We provide (1) assessment of the current campus/organizational climate via focus groups, interviews, and

surveys to identify current strengths and challenges; (2) analysis and synthesis of the data collected; (3) summary reports and presentations; and (4) recommend strategic initiatives to build on the success and address the potential challenges offered by community members in the assessment process. We have assisted over 170 campuses/organizations including community

colleges, Research I institutions, liberal arts institutions, law schools, technology institutions, and non-profit organizations in reviewing their climates for learning, working, and living. These campuses/organizations have successfully completed the process and developed specific initiatives to improve their climate for working and learning.

**Institutional Contact**

Marian S. Harris, PhD, MSW, LICSW, ACSW

Professor

University of Washington Tacoma

Social Work & Criminal Justice Program

1900 Commerce Street

Tacoma, WA 98402-3100

253-692-4554 [mh24@uw.edu](mailto:mh24@uw.edu)

**Overview of the Project**

**Project Title**

An Examination of the Learning and Living Environment for faculty, staff, and students at the

University of Washington, Tacoma (UW Tacoma).

**Project Objective and Summary of Related Literature**

***Project Objective***

Provide UW Tacoma with institutional/community information, analysis, and recommendations as it relates to climate.1 This information will be used in conjunction with other data to provide UW Tacoma with an inclusive view of their community. It is expected that the contractor and the institutional contact person will be in frequent communication to ensure project expectations are met. In an effort to gather a variety of data and assess the climate for faculty, staff, and students at UW Tacoma, Rankin and Associates Consulting which has extensive experience conducting educational and institutional climate assessments and developing strategic planning initiatives based on those assessments, prepared this proposal.

***Summary of Related Literature***

One of the primary missions of higher education institutions is the discovery of and distribution of knowledge. Academic communities expend a great deal of effort fostering climates that nurture this mission with the understanding that climate has a profound effect on

the academic community’s ability to excel in teaching, research, and scholarship. The climate on college campuses not only affects the creation of knowledge, but also affects members of the academic community who, in turn, contribute to the creation of the campus climate.

Reinforcing the importance of campus climate, several national education association reports advocate creating a more inclusive, welcoming climate on college campuses. Nearly two

decades ago, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the American

1 Climate in educational institutions not only affects the creation of knowledge, but also has a significant impact on members of the academic community who, in turn, contribute to the creation of the educational environment (Bauer,

1998, Kuh & Whitt, 1988; Peterson, 1990; Rankin, 1994, 1998, 1999, 2003; Smith, 2009; Tierney, 1990). Preserving a climate that offers equal learning opportunities for all students and academic freedom for all is one of the primary responsibilities of educational institutions.

Council on Education (ACE) suggested that in order to build a vital community of learning a college or university must provide a climate where

…intellectual life is central and where faculty and students work together to strengthen teaching and learning, where freedom of expression is uncompromisingly protected and where civility is powerfully affirmed, where the dignity of all individuals is affirmed and where equality of opportunity is vigorously pursued, and where the well-being of each member is sensitively supported (Boyer, 1990, p. 9).

During that same time period, The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) (1995) challenged higher education institutions “to affirm and enact a commitment to equality, fairness, and inclusion (p. xvi).” AAC&U proposed that colleges and universities commit to “the task of creating…inclusive educational environments in which all participants are equally welcome, equally valued, and equally heard (p. xxi).” The report suggested that in order to provide a foundation for a vital community of learning, a primary mission of the academy

must be to create a climate that cultivates diversity and celebrates difference.

In the ensuing years, many campuses instituted initiatives to address the challenges presented in the reports. In 2005, Milem, Chang, and Antonio proposed that,

Diversity must be carried out in intentional ways in order to accrue the educational benefits for students and the institution. Diversity is a process toward better learning rather than an outcome (p. iv).

The report further indicates that in order for “diversity initiatives to be successful they must engage the entire campus community” (p. v).

Campus environments are “complex social systems defined by the relationships between the people, bureaucratic procedures, structural arrangements, institutional goals and values, traditions, and larger socio-historical environments” (Hurtado, et al., 1998, p. 296). As such, the literature suggests that members of different social groups experience the campus climate differently based on their group membership and group status on campus (Rankin, 2005, 2008). The term campus climate refers to the learning, living, and working environments of colleges and universities. After an examination of the literature and experiences in assessing campus climate, Rankin and Reason (2008) described the campus climates the “current attitudes, behaviors and standards and practices of employees and students of an institution” (p. 264). A number of theoretical models conceptualize and describe the campus climate at colleges and universities (Hurtado, 1994; Hurtado, et al., 1998; Milem, Chang, & antonio, 2005; Rankin & Reason, 2008; Smith et al., 1997). The model proposed by Rankin informs the conceptual framework for climate assessment projects conducted by Rankin & Associates.

As colleges and universities continue to more accurately reflect the diverse makeup of society, institutions have focused on the importance of creating a campus environment that not only includes, welcomes, and accepts people of difference, but also responds to issues of diversity (Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Malaney, Williams, & Geller, 1997; Rankin & Reason,

2008; Smith, 2009; Roger Worthington, 2008). Although colleges and institutions attempt to foster welcoming and inclusive environments, they are not immune to negative societal attitudes and discriminatory behaviors. As a microcosm of the larger social environment, college and university campuses also reflect the pervasive prejudices of society (Eliason, 1996; Nelson & Krieger, 1997). Consequently, campus climates have been described as racist for students and employees of color (Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Rankin & Reason, 2005) “chilly” for women (Hall

& Sandler, 1984; Hart & Fellabaum, 2008), and “hostile” for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer-spectrum, trans-spectrum, community members (Dilley, 2002; Rankin, 2003; Rankin, Weber, Blumenfeld, & Frazer, 2010).

Rankin’s model2 was designed to provide higher education administrators with the tools

to assess and transform their campus climates. *The Transformational Tapestry Model*® (TTM) includes assessment protocols and recommendations for creating strategic initiatives and implementation and accountability practices. The model is presented through a power and privilege lens, a lens we have found to be more inclusive because it incorporates an understanding that each of us has and understands our own power and privilege. Our power and privilege perspective is grounded in critical theory and assumes that power differentials, both earned and unearned, are central to all human interactions (Brookfield, 2005). Unearned power and privilege is associated with membership in certain dominate social groups (e.g., White, heterosexual, able-bodied) (Johnson, 2005). Because we all hold multiple social identities we have the opportunity and, we assert, the responsibility to address the oppression of underserved social groups within the power/privilege social hierarchies on our campuses.

The model is instituted via a transformational process that capitalizes on the inclusive power and privilege perspective. The model has been implemented at over 150

campuses over the past twenty years using the assessment process we present in this proposal as a means of identifying current successes and challenges with regard to climate issues.

2 For a more detailed description of the Transformational Tapestry Model, the reader is directed to Rankin & Reason, 2008.

***Projected Outcomes***

 UW Tacoma will learn how students, faculty, and staff experience and perceive the

climate for living and learning UW Tacoma and how the community responds to them (e.g. governance issues, pedagogy, curricular issues, professional development, inter- group/intra-group relations, respect issues, etc.)

 UW Tacoma will develop specific actions to address institutional changes and cultural shifts.

**Scope of the Work3**

**Overview of Strategies**

As noted above, the climate assessment will be based on the Transformational Tapestry Model

and tools developed and copyrighted by the contractor. An overview of the five phases of the project is presented below. An outline of the phases of the project is also provided in the projected time-line offered in Appendix B.

***Phase I: Initial Campus Meetings: Preparing the Campus and Ownership of the Process by the Community****.*

Phase I is centered on preparing the campus for involvement in the process from modifying the process methodology to “fit” the specific campus to developing a communication/marketing plan for distribution of the project’s findings. This includes consensus building among constituent groups (faculty, staff, students, and administrators) who must feel fully engaged in and have ownership of the process for it to be successful. The first task in Phase I is the creation of a campus team to assist in coordinating these efforts. AT UW Tacoma, this team will be the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC). The FAC is essential and the members of the team are crucial to the project’s success. In our experience, the most successful teams are comprised of students, faculty (representing various ranks and disciplines), and staff representing various grades and positions (e.g., clerical, housing and food service, physical plant). We also have found that successful teams are representative of the salient social identity groups that comprise the community (e.g., socioeconomic class, race, gender, spirituality, sexual

orientation).

A three-hour introductory meeting (s) is held with the FAC to familiarize members with the process, to provide a rationale for the project, to review the project’s process/timeline, and to answer questions on both the project’s methods and the process. It is important to note here that the entire process of the Transformational Tapestry Model is transparent. The project’s transparency is shared with the FAC and the campus community throughout the process. We find that if this transparency is not articulated and supported by the campus leadership that the overall process is jeopardized.

We also engage in an internal campus systems analysis. The review may include some of

3A summary of the Scope of the Work is presented in Appendix A.

the following; (a) examining the campus mission and organizational charts; (b) reviewing previous research/institutional data with regard to climate; and (c) examining local, regional, and state environments (e.g., recent legislation). The review is also used to help inform the second phase of the internal assessment, the construction of a survey of the campus climate.

***Phase II: Developing the Campus-Wide Contextualized Assessment/Marketing & Communication Plan/Institutional Research Board Proposal***

Phase II proposes that an institution conduct an internal assessment of the campus climate via a generalized survey. The survey questions are informed by the bank of questions offered to the FAC by Rankin & Associates, data gathered and reported in Phase I, and the demographic make-up of the institution. The survey construction is accomplished through a series of meetings with the FAC. The ADA compliant surveys are offered via either an on-line or paper/pencil format. We offer both mediums cognizant that all members of our campus community may not have ready access to computers. We also recognize some of our prospective participants may not have English as their first language and provide for the instrument to be offered in several languages (e.g., Spanish, Mandarin).

The survey examines participant responses to their personal campus experiences, their perceptions of campus and their perceptions of institutional actions including administrative policies and academic initiatives regarding campus climate. Although this approach to the survey construction is time-consuming, when compared to the use of a standardized instrument, it has the advantage of providing a “campus-specific” tool. One of the benefits of this approach is that the results provide directly actionable items for the campus. All findings associated with the analysis of quantitative data, both the successes and the challenges, are shared with the campus community, reinforcing the transparency of the assessment process.

The survey instrument provides multiple opportunities for respondents to offer comments in response to open-ended questions. Although other researchers (Allan & Madden,

2006) have found that qualitative analysis of this type of data can lead to findings that contradict the quantitative data, this has not been our experience. The qualitative analysis of respondent comments often allows for a greater depth of understanding of the quantitative survey results. Like Allan and Madden (2006), however, we believe a mixed method approach is the most appropriate approach to the assessment of climate issues on college campuses. As is the case with the quantitative findings, the qualitative analysis of respondents’ comments is

shared with the campus community.

Phase II of the project also involves reviewing and approving the marketing and communication plan (e.g., project “talking points,” possible survey incentives, letter of invitation to participate, FAQ’s) (Examples provided in Appendix F).4 Finally, the project is reviewed via the campus Institutional Review Board. Approval by the IRB is a required prerequisite of the assessment.

***Phase III: Survey Implementation/Data Analysis***

Once the project is approved, the survey is distributed to the entire population of faculty, staff, administrators, and students. In our experience, the drawbacks of random sampling (the voice of only the majority is reported) and randomized stratified sampling (many voices are still missed) around these issues is not adequate to address the successes and challenges surrounding equity issues on campus (Heckathorn, 1997). The assessment will be administered to all faculty, staff, administrators, and students at UW Tacoma. The contractor will develop the instrument, distribute the instrument in collaboration with the FAC, counsel the working group on distribution methods/techniques to ensure maximum return rates, monitor the implementation process, and collect the resulting data. The system employed will ensure confidentiality of respondents. Updates via frequency distributions by various student demographics are provided to the FAC every 4-5 days to assist in more targeted subsequent invitations to participate.

Survey data will be analyzed to compare the responses (in raw numbers and percentages) of various groups via SPSS (version 24.0). Descriptive statistics will be calculated by salient group memberships (e.g., by gender, by race/ethnicity, by position) and intersections of those identities to provide additional information regarding participant responses. Confirmatory factor analyses will be conducted on the scales embedded in the survey questions, should the FAC decide to use said questions. Where salient, chi-square and t-test statistics will be conducted to examine significance of the findings and determine differences between groups.

The survey also includes qualitative questions that allow respondents the opportunity to further describe their experiences, to expand upon their survey responses, and to add any additional thoughts. Comments are solicited to give voice to the data and to highlight areas of

4For an example of a campus climate website inclusive of a marketing & communication plan, the reader is encouraged to review a recent project, the University of California system <http://campusclimate.ucop.edu/index.html>

concern that might have been missed in the body of the survey. These open-ended comments are reviewed using standard methods of comments analysis. Qualitative Data Analysts will read all comments and prepare thematic narratives of common themes based on the data. This methodology does not reflect a comprehensive qualitative study and comments will not be used to develop grounded hypotheses independent of the quantitative data.

***Phase IV: Development of Report/Sharing the Results with the Community***

Phase III of the model involves the development of the report and the presentation of the results to the campus community. The communication and marketing plan developed by the CSWG is followed throughout the model. In this phase, constituent group representatives on the CSWG maintain communication with their respective constituents throughout the first two phases, providing them with updates and seeking their feedback. The report (examples of reports (websites) are provided in Appendix I) is developed by the contractor and includes the following:

 An executive summary

 Frequency of responses to each individual question

 Cross tabulation for demographic categories selected by the consultant

 Thematic analysis of the open-ended questions

The initial draft is reviewed by a sub-committee of the CSWG and the report revised by the contractor inclusive of the requested revisions. The results are reported out via a series of “town meetings”. The “report-outs” are used for the community to identify advanced organizational challenges and offer recommended actions to address the challenges uncovered in the report. In each “report-out” the respective participants are presented the report’s findings and requested to provide feedback. This feedback may take the form of additional requested

analyses, highlighting additional salient points in the Executive Summary, inserting more qualitative data to give “voice” to the quantitative data, etc. These groups also serve as means for constituent groups to maintain their ownership of the process.

**Appendix A**

**Summary of the Five Phases in the**

**UW Tacoma Climate Assessment Project**

**Phase I. Initial Campus Meeting**

 Proposal presentation

**Phase II. Assessment Tool Development, Communication Plan, IRB Proposal**

 Development of assessment tool

o Development of web based survey

 Develop communication plan for the assessment

o Coordination with the FAC on the marketing and communication plan strategy (e.g., letter of invitation, talking points to be shared among the constituent groups)

 IRB proposal

o Development of proposal in collaboration with institutional contact

**Phase III. Survey Implementation & Data Analysis**

 Survey administration (design, methods, sampling) and monitoring

o Consultation with the FAC and other constituent representatives on the strategy for administration that will yield the highest response rates

 Data coding and database management

 Data analysis (descriptive statistics, frequency tables)

**Phase IV. Development and Presentation of Report**

 Development of draft report (executive summary, data presentation, and report findings)

o The FAC will review the draft report and provide consultant with recommended revisions

o The FAC will review the recommended revisions with the consultant and agree upon said revisions for inclusion in the final report

 Development of final report (executive summary, data presentation, and report findings)

 Presentation of final report to the campus community

**Appendix B**

**Climate Assessment Project**

**Projected Timeline**

**Fall 2017**

September - ***Phase I.*** Initial campus meetings

December

***Phase I.*** Internal and external campus systems analysis/Review of other relevant data (e.g., NSSE, CIRP, COACHE)

***Phase II.*** Begin development of Communication & Marketing

Plan

***Phase II***. Begin survey development

**Spring 2018**

January - ***Phase II***. Complete survey development

February

***Phase II.*** Complete Communication & Marketing

Plan

***Phase II.*** IRB Proposal Development

Approval projected – February 2017

March ***Phase III***. Survey Administration

***Note:*** *Date of survey implementation to be determined by FAC*

April- ***Phase III***. Data Analysis

June

**Fall 2018**

July- ***Phase IV.*** Development of Report

August

September ***Phase IV***. Presentation of Report Results to community

**Appendix C Projected Budget5**

**Phase I. Pre-Planning, Proposal Presentation**

Proposal presentation $4,000.00

**Subtotal for Phase I $4,000.00**

**Phase II. Assessment Tool Development, Communication Plan, IRB Proposal, & Survey Administration**

Development of assessment tool $7,000.00

Development of communication plan $2,000.00

IRB application $2,000.00

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Approximate Subtotal for Phase II** | **$11,000.00** |
| **Phase III.** | **Survey Implementation & Data Analysis** |  |
|  | Survey administration and monitoring\* | $7,020.00 |

(figure calculated based on 30% return rate using on-line surveys only)

\*to be determined, budget based on 1,755 surveys (30% response rate) [30% response rate minimum at $4.00 per survey (on-line) and/or

$1.00/per page (paper/pencil)]

*[Population Total = 5,850]*

*(5,000 students; 340 faculty and 510 staff)*

**Source:** Dr. Marian Harris correspondence 3-22-17

Data coding and database management $5,000.00

Data analysis, review of findings, and $7,000.00 data interpretation

**Subtotal for Phase III $19,020.00**

**5** Budget is not inclusive of travel costs (accommodations, meals, transportation)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Phase IV.** | **Development and Presentation of Report**  Development of draft report6 | $9,000.00 |
|  | Development of final report  (Estimated 6 hours @ $150.00/hour for requested revisions) | $900.00 |
|  | Presentation of report  (3-5 presentations @ $1,000.00/presentation) | $5,000.00 |
|  | **Subtotal for Phase IV** | **$14,900.00** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Summary of Budget Totals** |  |
| Subtotal for Phase I | $27,000.00 |
| Subtotal for Phase II | $11,000.00 |
| Subtotal for Phase III | $19,020.00 |
| Subtotal for Phase IV | $14,900.00 |

**Total Projected Budget for the project $71,920.00**

6 R&A will provide one draft report and one final report based on requested revisions to the draft by the FAC. Any additional drafts are at a cost of $1,500.00 per draft.

**Appendix D Prior Experience**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Institution/Organization** |  |  | **Year Project Initiated** |
| **2000-2001 (16)** |  |  |  |
| **American University (District of Columbia) \*** |  |  | 2000-2001 |
| **DePauw University (IN)\*** |  |  | 2000-2001 |
| **Duke University (NC)\*** |  |  | 2000-2001 |
| **Emory University (GA)\*** |  |  | 2000-2001 |
| **University of Indiana, Bloomington\*** |  |  | 2000-2001 |
| **San Jose State University (CA)\*** |  |  | 2000-2001 |
| **University of Arizona\*** |  |  | 2000-2001 |
| **University of California, Irvine\*** |  |  | 2000-2001 |
| **University of California, Riverside\*** |  |  | 2000-2001 |
| **University of California, Santa Cruz\*** |  |  | 2000-2001 |
| **University of Connecticut\*** |  |  | 2000-2001 |
| **University of Minnesota-Duluth\*** |  |  | 2000-2001 |
| **University of Minnesota-Twin Cities\*** |  |  | 2000-2001 |
| **University of Oregon\*** |  |  | 2000-2001 |
| **Washington State University\*** |  |  | 2000-2001 |
| **Bucknell University (PA)\*** |  |  | 2000-2001 |
| **2002 (5)** |  |  |  |
| **Foothill-DeAnza Community College District** |  |  | 2002 |
| **U.S. Department of Agriculture (Extension)** |  |  | 2002-2006 |
| **St. Cloud State University (MN)** |  |  | 2002 |
| **Alliance For Tolerance And Freedom (PA)** |  |  | 2002 |
| **Millersville University** |  |  | 2002 |
| **2003 (6)** |  |  |  |
| **Monmouth College (NJ)** |  |  | 2003 |
| **Northampton Community College (PA)** |  |  | 2003 |
| **PFLAG (District of Columbia)** |  |  | 2003 |
| **Rural Opportunities, Inc (NY)** |  |  | 2003 |
| **University of Illinois, Chicago (LGBT only)** |  |  | 2003 |
| **University of Hawaii** |  |  | 2003 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Institution/Organization** |  |  | **Year Project Initiated** |
| **2004 (8)** |  |  |  |
| **CALS – NC State College of Agriculture** |  |  | 2004 |
| **Iowa State University** |  |  | 2004 |
| **North Dakota State University** |  |  | 2004 |
| **New York University (LGBT only)** |  |  | 2004 |
| **Oregon State University** |  |  | 2004 |
| **Portland State University (OR)** |  |  | 2004 |
| **Southern Oregon University** |  |  | 2004 |
| **University of Vermont** |  |  | 2004 |
| **2005 (4)** |  |  |  |
| **University of New Hampshire (LGBT only)** |  |  | 2005 |
| **University of Massachusetts, Boston (Race only)** |  |  | 2005 |
| **Syracuse** |  |  | 2005 |
| **SUNY-Oneonta** |  |  | 2005 |
| **2006 (12)** |  |  |  |
| **Lehigh University** |  |  | 2006 |
| **Ramapo College** |  |  | 2006 |
| **North Dakota State University System** |  |  |  |
| *Bismarck* |  |  | 2006 |
| *Dickinson* |  |  | 2006 |
| *Lake Region* |  |  | 2006 |
| *Mayville* |  |  | 2006 |
| *Minot* |  |  | 2006 |
| *MSU-Bottineau* |  |  | 2006 |
| *University of North Dakota* |  |  | 2006 |
| *North Dakota College of Science* |  |  | 2006 |
| *Valley City* |  |  | 2006 |
| *Williston* |  |  | 2006 |
| **2007 (3)** |  |  |  |
| **Messiah College** |  |  | 2007 |
| **Clarkson University** |  |  | 2007 |
| **East Carolina University** |  |  | 2007 |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Institution/Organization** |  |  | **Year Project Initiated** |
| **2008-2009 (29)** |  |  |  |
| **Carleton College** |  |  | 2008 |
| **Wittenberg College** |  |  | 2008 |
| **University of Wisconsin System** |  |  |  |
| *UW-La Crosse* |  |  | 2008 |
| *UW-Milwaukee* |  |  | 2008 |
| *UW-Oshkosh* |  |  | 2008 |
| *UW-Stevens Point* |  |  | 2008 |
| *UW-Baraboo County* |  |  | 2008 |
| *UW-Barron County* |  |  | 2008 |
| *UW- Fond du Lac* |  |  | 2008 |
| *UW-Fox Valley* |  |  | 2008 |
| *UW-Manitowoc* |  |  | 2008 |
| *UW-Marathon County* |  |  | 2008 |
| *UW-Marinette* |  |  | 2008 |
| *UW-Marshfield* |  |  | 2008 |
| *UW-Richland* |  |  | 2008 |
| *UW-Rock County* |  |  | 2008 |
| *UW-Sheboygan* |  |  | 2008 |
| *UW-Washington County* |  |  | 2008 |
| *UW-Waukesha* |  |  | 2008 |
| *UW-Eau Claire* |  |  | 2009 |
| *UW-River Falls* |  |  | 2009 |
| *UW-Whitewater* |  |  | 2009 |
| *UW-Parkside* |  |  | 2009 |
| *UW-Extension* |  |  | 2010 |
| *UW-Green Bay* |  |  | 2010 |
| *UW-Madison* |  |  | 2010 |
| *UW-Platteville* |  |  | 2010 |
| *UW-Stout* |  |  | 2010 |
| *UW-Superior* |  |  | 2010 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2010** |  |  |  |
| **West Chester State University** |  |  | 2010 |
| **Grand Valley State University** |  |  | 2010 |
| **Kutztown University** |  |  | 2010 |
| **Slippery Rock University** |  |  | 2010 |
| **Montgomery County Community College (PA)** |  |  | 2010 |
| **Michigan State University (LGBT only)** |  |  | 2010 |
| **University of California System** |  |  |  |
| *UC-Berkeley* |  |  | 2011 |
| *UC-Davis* |  |  | 2011 |
| *UC-Merced* |  |  | 2011 |
| *UC-Irvine* |  |  | 2011 |
| *UC-Santa Barbara* |  |  | 2011 |
| *UC-Santa Cruz* |  |  | 2011 |
| *UC-San Diego* |  |  | 2011 |
| *UC-San Francisco* |  |  | 2011 |
| *UC-Los Angeles* |  |  | 2011 |
| *UC-Riverside* |  |  | 2011 |
| *UC-Office of the President* |  |  | 2011 |
| *Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL)* |  |  | 2011 |
| *Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR)* |  |  | 2011 |
| **2012** |  |  |  |
| **California University of Pennsylvania** |  |  | 2012 |
| **Clarkson College** |  |  | 2012 |
| **College of New Jersey** |  |  | 2012 |
| **Fashion Institute of Technology** |  |  | 2012 |
| **University of Missouri, St. Louis** |  |  | 2012 |
| **Missouri University of Science & Technology** |  |  | 2012 |
| **Reed College** |  |  | 2012 |
| **University of Massachusetts, Boston** |  |  | 2012 |
| **Ursuline College** |  |  | 2012 |
| **California University of Pennsylvania** |  |  | 2012 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Institution/Organization** |  |  | **Year Project Initiated** |
| **2013** |  |  |  |
| **SUNY Brockport** |  |  | 2013 |
| **College of Charleston** |  |  | 2013 |
| **Grand Rapids Community College** |  |  | 2013 |
| **Kennesaw State University** |  |  | 2013 |
| **Philadelphia College of Osteopathic Medicine** |  |  | 2013 |
| **Providence College** |  |  | 2013 |
| **Cal State Fullerton** |  |  | 2013 |
| **Cal Poly San Luis Obispo** |  |  | 2013 |
| **2014** |  |  |  |
| **Armstrong State University** |  |  | 2014 |
| **Drake University** |  |  | 2014 |
| **Indiana University of Pennsylvania** |  |  | 2014 |
| **Kansas State University** |  |  | 2014 |
| **Marquette University** |  |  | 2014 |
| **Saginaw State University** |  |  | 2014 |
| **Seattle University** |  |  | 2014 |
| **Southern Polytechnic State University (SPSU)** |  |  | 2014 |
| **Swarthmore College** |  |  | 2014 |
| **2015** |  |  |  |
| **CUNY College of Staten Island** |  |  | 2015 |
| **Kent State University** |  |  | 2015 |
| **SUNY Oneonta** |  |  | 2015 |
| **Stetson University** |  |  | 2015 |
| **Texas A&M Commerce** |  |  | 2015 |
| **Gettysburg College** |  |  | 2015 |
| **Whitman College** |  |  | 2015 |
| **Dartmouth College** |  |  | 2015 |
| **West Chester University** |  |  | 2015 |
| **University of Minnesota Duluth** |  |  | 2015 |
| **Syracuse University** |  |  | 2015 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Institution/Organization** |  |  | **Year Project Initiated** |
| **2016** |  |  |  |
| **A.T Still University of Health Sciences** |  |  | 2016 |
| **Gonzaga University** |  |  | 2016 |
| **Hofstra University** |  |  | 2016 |
| **Ithaca College** |  |  | 2016 |
| **Millersville University** |  |  | 2016 |
| **Salem State University** |  |  | 2016 |
| **Smith College** |  |  | 2016 |
| **Texas A&M Law School** |  |  | 2016 |
| **University of Michigan, Flint** |  |  | 2016 |
| **University of Kansas** |  |  | 2016 |
| *Kansas City* |  |  | 2016 |
| *Medical Center* |  |  | 2016 |
| **University of Missouri System** |  |  | 2016 |
| *UM Columbia* |  |  |  |
| *UM Kansas City* |  |  |  |
| *UM S&T* |  |  |  |
| *UM St. Louis* |  |  |  |
| *UM System Office* |  |  |  |
| **University of Northern Colorado** |  |  | 2016 |
| **University of Tennessee System** |  |  | 2016 |
| *UT Chattanooga* |  |  |  |
| *UT Martin* |  |  |  |
| *UT Health Center* |  |  |  |
| *UT Knoxville* |  |  |  |
| **Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute** |  |  | 2016 |
| **2017** |  |  |  |
| **Boston University Law School** |  |  | 2017 |
| **Iowa State University** |  |  | 2017 |
| **Lock Haven University** |  |  | 2017 |
| **Loyola University – New Orleans** |  |  | 2017 |
| **Miami University (Ohio)** |  |  | 2017 |
| **Michigan Technological University** |  |  | 2017 |
| **New York University** |  |  | 2017 |
| **Rockhurst University** |  |  | 2017 |
| **Shippensburg University** |  |  | 2017 |
| **UCSF School of Dentistry** |  |  | 2017 |
| **University of San Francisco** |  |  | 2017 |

**Appendix E Work Samples**

Most of the assessment projects we facilitate are confidential to the institution/organization. There are a few states that are “open record” states where the final reports are available for review.

We offer the following websites as examples of our work

**1. Communication & Marketing Plan Example**

Kent State University <https://www.kent.edu/voices>

UC System Project Web Site <http://campusclimate.ucop.edu/index.html>

Kansas State University

<http://www.k-state.edu/2025/initiatives/climate-survey/>

**2. Final Report Examples**

Kent State University

All of the reports (each campus and aggregate) are available for review at:

<https://www.kent.edu/voices>

Kansas State University

<http://www.k-state.edu/2025/initiatives/climate-survey/>

UC System Project Web Site

All of the reports (each campus and aggregate) are available for review at:

<http://campusclimate.ucop.edu/index.html>

University of Wisconsin System Project

All of the reports (each campus and aggregate) are available for review at:

<http://www.uwsa.edu/vpacad/climate/>
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