Executive Summary of Activities

Cultural Audit Committee

College of Education, Indiana State University

April 2007 to August 2008

Date of Report: March 11, 2009

Conclusions on the College of Education Climate

The climate of the College of Education at Indiana State University is perceived by its staff and faculty, students, and external stakeholders as basically accepting of various racial, ethnic, and cultural groups with a fairly strong tendency toward focusing on commonalities and minimizing differences, judging from the results of the IDI. The survey responses did not demonstrate a lot of variability among the groups of stakeholders or standout areas of weakness in terms of bias in the treatment of various ethnic, racial, or cultural groups. However, non-majority versus majority students did vary significantly in terms of whether they had experienced insensitivity toward ethnic, racial or cultural groups and a specific discomfort with affirmative action. Non-majority students also agreed less often than majority students with the statement that cultural relations in the College are positive. Generally speaking, however, the status quo seems acceptable to all groups associated with the College.

A second theme that emerged in the results was the impact of continued socialization in the College environment. One of the only significant demographic factors for faculty and staff responses regarding climate was length of employment. Students, too, varied in terms of their length of time as a student. Compared to graduate students, undergraduates generally viewed the climate in the College as less integrated and endorsed the idea that all students should take specific courses on diversity. Further, they were less likely to have made friends with people from other ethnic, racial, or cultural groups or to have challenged others about derogatory comments or to have attended non-classroom events and activities related to affirming diversity.

At the same time, the IDI results suggest that the faculty and staff are ready to move in the direction of an ethnorelativistic stance. The perceived sensitivity of faculty and staff of the COE as a whole indicates that they perceive themselves in early ethnorelativism. No IDI results were obtained for students, although this may be an appropriate assessment goal for the future. The surveys of various

1

stakeholders give a glimmer of awareness that all may not be ideal in terms of diversity but it is only a glimmer. The consensus of the cultural audit committee is that the College as a whole, including its students, its staff and faculty, and its external stakeholders, is focused on commonalities among us and good intentioned about interacting with dissimilar others. Our interactions with others may also be characterized by downplaying differences or by remaining unaware of the unique characteristics and issues we and different others bring to those interactions. As a result, the College is poised for movement forward in the direction of honestly appraising differences, appreciating the similarities and differences among us, and identifying and building on the strengths of its many voices."

Members of Cultural Audit Committee

       Brad Balch, COE Dean

       Michele Boyer, Chair of CDCSEP

       Denise Collins, ELAF

       Hemalatha Ganapathy-Coleman, CDCSEP

       Rebecca Libler, COE Associate Dean

       Ginger Miller, Blumberg Center

       Susan Powers, COE Associate Dean

       Linda Sperry, CDCSEP

List of Documents Produced by Cultural Audit Committee

1. Intercultural Development Inventory Profile for College of Education Faculty and Staff, Fall 2007 (analyst: Michele Boyer)
2. Intercultural Development Inventory Profile for Cultural Audit Planning Committee, Summer 2007 (analyst: Michele Boyer)
3. College of Education Climate Survey: Staff/Faculty Results, Spring 2008 (analyst: Michael Shriner)
4. College of Education Climate Survey: Student Results, Spring 2008 (analyst: Michael Shriner)
5. College of Education Climate Survey: External Stakeholder Results, Spring 2008 (analyst: Michael Shriner)
6. College of Education Focus Group: Faculty Results, Spring 2008 (analyst: Michael Shriner)

Presentation Made by Members of the Cultural Audit Committee

       Balch, B. V., Boyer, M. C., Collins, D., Ganapathy-Coleman, H., & Sperry, L. L. (2007, November). *A commitment to cultural responsiveness: Organizing a cultural audit.* Presentation to the President's Commission for the Enhancement of Diversity Resources, Indiana State University.

List of Documents Shared in Committee and via  E-Mail

1. Barclay, L., & Craig, C. (2007, October). *Minority teacher shortage in Indiana.* Paper proposed to the Indiana State Superintendent of Public Instruction on behalf of the Greater Indianapolis Branch of the NAACP.
2. Bartlett, L., Johnson, L., Lopez, D., Sugarman, E., & Wilson, M. (2005, May). *Teacher induction in the Midwest.* Paper presented at the Midwest Teacher Induction Policy Summit. Chicago, IL.
3. Bartlett, L., Johnson, L., Lopez, D., Sugarman, E., & Wilson, M. (2005). *Teacher induction in the Midwest.* Executive Summary.  Santa Cruz, CA: New Teacher Center, University of California.
4. Bennett, M., & Bennett, J. (1995). Understanding culture. Handout distributed in *Intercultural Development Inventory Manual*. Portland, OR: Intercultural Communication Institute.
5. Garcia, S. B., & Ortiz, A. (2006). *Preventing disproportionate representation: Culturally and linguistically responsive pre-referral interventions.* Practitioner Brief by the National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems. Austin, TX: University of Texas.
6. Hammer, M., & Bennett, M. (1998). The developmental model of intercultural sensitivity*. Intercultural Development Inventory Manual*. Portland, OR: Intercultural Communication Institute.
7. Hammer, M., & Bennett, M. (1998). Interpreting your intercultural development inventory (IDI) profile. *Intercultural Development Inventory Manual*. Portland, OR: Intercultural Communication Institute.
8. Indiana Association for Infant and Toddler Mental Health. (2007, Fall). *Newsletter, Vol. 1, No. 4.*
9. Indiana Disproportionality Committee. (2007). *The journey.* Quarterly Newsletter of the Indiana Disproportionality Committee*, Vol. 1, No. 2.*
10. Indiana State University. (2005-06). *Affirmative action plan*. Terre Haute, Author.
11. Kea, C., Campbell-Whatley, G. D., & Richards, H. V. (2004). *Becoming culturally responsive educators: Rethinking teacher education pedagogy.* Denver, CO: National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems.
12. National Academy of Education. (2007). *Report on race-conscious student assignment policies: Social science research and Supreme Court cases.*
Washington, DC: Author.
13. President's Commission for the Enhancement of Diversity Resources. (2005-2007). *Embrace diversity brochure*. Terre Haute: Indiana State University.
14. Rendón, L. I., Lee, W. Y., Clark, E. C., & Tobolowsky, B. F. (2007, Summer). Shattering barriers: Affirming diversity in higher education. *Education Policy and Practice Perspectives, 3,* 1-8*.*
15. Strong, M. (2005, Dec.) *Mentoring new teachers to increase retention.* Research Brief #05-01. Santa Cruz, CA: New Teacher Center, University of California.
16. School of Education, Indiana State University. (n.d.) *Diversity plan.* Terre Haute, Author.
17. Strong, M. (2006, Jan.) *Does new teacher support affect student achievement?* Research Brief #06-01. Santa Cruz, CA: New Teacher Center, University of California.
18. The University of Queensland. Equity and Diversity Self-Audit Instrument for Organisational Areas.
19. Virginia Tech University. Virginia Tech Faculty Assessment of Campus Climate.

20. Virginia Tech University. Virginia Tech Undergraduate Student Assessment of Campus Climate.
21. Washburn, S. (2007, Jan.) *Overview of school-wide positive behavior support (SW PBS): Rationale, critical features, examples, and current status.* Presentation to the Indiana Office of Civil Rights Steering Committee, Indianapolis.
22. What to say when an employee makes offensive racial remarks. Handout from *Practical Supervision* distributed in *Intercultural Development Inventory Manual*. Portland, OR: Intercultural Communication Institute.

List of Invitations Shared Via E-Mail

1. The Minority Teacher Pipeline, Professional Presentation to Educators, November 2, 2007, Indiana Government Center South Auditorium.
2. Statewide Forum to Promote Cultural Competence in Education, July 18, 2008, Indiana Department of Education and Indiana Black Expo, Inc.
3. Response to Intervention (RtI): Strategies for Reading and Math, Satellite Broadcast by the National Association of State Directors of Special Education, March 14, 2007, Blumberg Center.
4. Response to Intervention (RtI): Non-Academic Barriers to Achievement-Addressing School-Based Mental Health and Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, Satellite Broadcast by the National Association of State Directors of Special Education, May 9, 2007, Blumberg Center.
5. Films at Indiana State University, November 14, 2007, January 15, 2008, February 7, 2008, February 26, 2008, April 8, 2008, President's Commission for the Enhancement of Diversity Resources.

Summary of Intercultural Sensitivity Inventories

CAC Committee vs. Faculty/Staff

Two groups of staff/faculty (Cultural Audit Planning Committee and COE faculty, except for members of the Cultural Audit Planning Committee) were given the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI), from which two types of Intercultural Sensitivity (Developmental and Perceived) were determined. It is typical for perceived sensitivity to be higher than developmental sensitivity. Along the dimensions from ethnocentric to ethnorelative, the Planning Group's Perceived Sensitivity was in the range of Adaptation (middle-stage ethnorelativism) and its Developmental Sensitivity was in Acceptance (early-stage ethnorelativism). In comparison, COE faculty and staff responses to the IDI indicated that Perceived Sensitivity was in the range of Acceptance (early-stage ethnorelativism), and Developmental Sensitivity was in the range of Minimization (late-stage ethnocentrism). This information is helpful in the determination of how educational experiences should be targeted to move individuals along the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale.

Summaries of Climate Surveys

The climate surveys were developed in sequence and offered to three groups at different times during the 2007-08 academic year. The first survey was distributed to staff/faculty in the fall of 2007. The

second survey was distributed to students via the web.  The first call to students late in the fall semester 2007 received a poor response, so a second call was made in the spring semester of 2008. The third survey was distributed to external stakeholders in April of 2008.

<u>Staff/Faculty (n = 31)</u>

Faculty demographics included a) length of employment, b) majority vs. non-majority culture, and c) gender. Each of these independent variables was significant for a few of the 84 questions on the staff/faculty climate survey.

Spearman rank-order correlations revealed three statements that were moderately associated with *length of employment*.  The longer one was employed at ISU, the more likely one was to agree with the following statements:
 (a) College committees are representative of the gender distribution in the COE,
 (b) In my department or center, expectations concerning promotions and career advancement are made clear, and
 (c) In recent searches for new faculty, my department or center has made serious efforts to hire racial/ethnic minorities and women.

Only six staff/faculty self-identified as being from a *non-majority* culture.  All six individuals strongly agreed with two statements:
 (a) My department or center head meets with me as appropriate to discuss my performance, career, and/or promotions, and
 (b) In my department or center, expectations concerning promotions and career advancement are made clear.
 By contrast, on those same two statements there was considerable variation across the 25 staff/faculty that identified as being from the majority culture.

Based on *gender*, males (n= 10) and females (n=21) differently endorsed only one statement. Women endorsed the statement, "There is a desire among my colleagues to enhance diversity in my department or center" significantly more often than men.

<u>Students (n = 370)</u>

Student demographics included four variables: (a) majority vs. non-majority culture, (b) male vs. female gender, (c) on-campus vs. distance education student, and (d) undergraduate vs. master's vs. post-master's class standing. Some questions out of 85 on the student climate survey stood out as having significantly different Chi-square distributions based on each of these demographic variables.  The student group varied on a larger number of questions than did either the faculty/staff or the external stakeholders.

*Majority Status*

Majority (n= 272) vs. non-majority (n=98) students varied in their distribution of responses on 6 different questions and did not vary on 79 questions.  Questions that they differed on included the following:

(a) Please rate the racial, ethnic, and cultural integration in the COE,

(b) Please rate the racial, ethnic, and cultural relations in the classroom in the COE,

(c) Affirmative Action leads to the admission of under-qualified students,

(d) How often have you read, heard, or seen insensitive or disparaging comments or material in the COE about race/ethnic minorities,

(e) In the past year, how often have you made a derogatory comment or joke about gays, lesbians, bisexuals, or transgendered persons?,

(f) In the past year, how often have you made a derogatory comment or joke based on a religion other than yours?

The Chi-square statistic used to identify the differences simply says that there were differences between the observed and expected frequencies in the number of persons who strongly agreed, agreed, disagreed, or strongly disagreed on each of the 6 questions.  Post-hoc  t-tests showed that majority students responded with higher ratings on the statements (a), (b), (e) and (f).  Non-majority students more often agreed with statement (c) and responded with a higher rating on (d).

*Gender*

Male (n= 105) vs. female (n= 265) students varied in their distribution of responses on 4 different questions and did not vary on 81 questions.  Female students agreed significantly more often than males with the following questions:

(a) I often feel that I don't "fit in" very well with other students in my education classes,

(b) I often feel that I have to change some of my personal characteristics in order to "fit in" in the COE,

(c) Faculty members in the COE attempt to integrate racial, ethnic and cultural issues into courses, and

(d) Faculty members in the COE attempt to integrate gender issues into courses.

*Program Format*

On-campus (n= 285) vs. distance education (n= 85) students varied in their distribution of responses on 6 different questions and did not vary on 79 questions.  On-campus students had significantly higher responses to the following statements:

(a)   How often have you been treated unfairly or harassed in the COE because of gender?

(b)   How often have you been treated unfairly or harassed in the COE because of religion?

(c)   How often have you felt that you were not free to voice your true opinion in classrooms or other public settings in the COE about issues concerning individuals with disabilities?

(d)   How often have you read, heard, or seen insensitive or disparaging comments or material in the COE about religious groups?

Distance-education students had significantly higher responses to these two statements:

(a)  Please rate the racial, ethnic, and cultural integration in the College of Education, and

(b)  How often have you attended non-classroom programs or activities about the history, culture, or social concerns of various racial, ethnic, or cultural groups?

*Class Standing*

Undergraduates (n=265) vs. master's students (n= 58) vs. post-master's students (n=44) varied in their distribution of responses on 11 different questions and did not vary on 74 questions. Class standing was the variable among students that provoked the most differential responses. A post-hoc analysis of variance was performed on class standing.

Questions that undergraduates had a higher response to or agreed with more often compared to graduate students included the following:

(a)  Please rate the racial, ethnic, and cultural integration in the COE, and
(b)  All COE undergraduate students should be required to take at least one course that focuses on racial/ethnic minorities and/or women's history.

Questions that undergraduates had a lower response to or agreed with less often compared to graduate students included the following:

(a)  The COE is placing too much emphasis on achieving diversity,
(b)  Affirmative Action leads to the admission of under-qualified students,
(c)  The COE provides an adequate program of support for students who are experiencing academic difficulty,
(d)   In the past year, how often have you challenged others on racially/ethnically derogatory comments?,
(e)  In the past year how often have you challenged others on sexually derogatory comments?,
(f)  In the past year, how often have you developed friendships with people from different cultures or groups?,
(g)  In the past year, how often have you attended non-classroom programs or activities about gender or issues related to women?, and
(h)  In the past year, how often have you attended non-classroom programs or activities about the history, culture, or social concerns of various racial, ethnic, or cultural groups?

Undergraduate and master's students agreed more often than post-master's students with only one statement:
(a)  All COE graduate students should be required to take at least one course that focuses on racial/ethnic minorities and/or women's history, culture, or perspectives.

Three statements were significant on the Chi-square analysis but not along the four variables of majority status, gender, program format or class standing.  They included the following:

 (a)  The COE is a good place to gain understanding about multicultural issues,

(b) Overall, my experience in the COE has been poor/fair/good/excellent, and

(c) Overall, my experience at ISU has been poor/fair/good/excellent.

External Stakeholders (n = 14)

Only 14 external stakeholders filled out climate surveys. Their surveys contained 6 demographic questions and a total of 38 climate questions. Of the demographic variables, only gender revealed any different distributions based on Chi-square analyses. However, upon performing post-hoc *t*-tests, none of the statements were significant based on gender.

Conclusions of the Climate Survey Analyses

Educational experience, which is correlated with developmental age, seems to be the most important discriminator, if importance is measured as the number of climate questions that were affected. Educational experience was relevant in 10 climate questions. The second most useful discriminator is majority status, which was relevant in a total of 8 climate questions across two groups (staff/faculty and students). However, considering that there were altogether 13 demographic factors or discriminators that were correlated with approximately 80 survey questions about climate in the college, the most trenchant observation may be to focus on how few demographic variables or discriminators correlated in a significant way with any of the climate questions. COE students, staff, faculty, and external stakeholders are relatively homogeneous in their stance toward the climate of the College.

Focus Groups

Focus groups were conceptualized as a follow-up activity to the climate surveys. Calls went out to staff/faculty and students for focus group participation, but very few individuals participated. This lack of involvement is not very interpretable. Internal stakeholders may feel satisfied with the status quo of the college climate or, on the other hand, they may feel afraid or hopeless. More effort to collect first-hand experiences would be needed.

Environmental Scan

A preliminary effort at an environmental scan was made, but given its point of reference as the Statesman Tower, the committee made a decision to delay a full-scale effort until the College settles into its new surroundings. At the same time, the committee believes that an environmental scan is very important and that diversity and community issues need to be considered with regard to the development of the new environment for the College.