April 10, 2014

To: LaDoris Cordell  
From: Consuelo J. Rodriguez ED.D.  
Re. SJSU Task Force on Racial Discrimination

Thank You for this opportunity to share the following information as the former SJSU Associate Dean for Educational Equity in Undergraduate Studies. The purpose of this document is to provide the Task Force with added and, I believe, valuable information. This letter focuses specifically on President Fullerton’s leadership and vision during my tenure at SJSU.

1. On July 1982, President Gail Fullerton hired me as Director of Student Affirmative Action (SAA). My role was to specifically focus on underrepresented students. President Fullerton confided in me that along with her academic goals for SJSU were her concerns regarding diversity issues at SJSU.

Based on interactions with some deans, staff, faculty, students and community, I was able to observe an immediate problem. Important leaders in the greater community as well as the campus community perceived that the SAA program was not an important function to administration. I suggested to Dr. Fullerton that the SAA program needed the same validation afforded to the program at the CSU Chancellor’s Office (CHOFF). Thus, the SAA Office reported to the Dean for Undergraduate Studies but President Fullerton provide me with direct access to her office when she or I deemed it necessary which strengthened the role of SAA at SJSU; however, this created dissension among some of the top campus administrative leadership and some faculty. SAA consisted of three components: 1) Student Outreach/Recruitment; 2) Student Retention and 3) Educational Faculty Enhancement. All of which focused on diversity concerns.

2. Director of Student Outreach/Recruitment, Retention and Educational Faculty Enhancement: President Fullerton was contacted by the feeder school districts who indicated that they did not want SJSU on their campus due to SJSU “in-house” competitions among colleges/departments/programs recruiting students on their campuses. Thus, she broadened the title and responsibilities of this office.
President Fullerton charged me with the responsibility of focusing on the problems shared with her and to provide her with recommendations and a plan. I submitted the following which she approved:

a. Development of an Outreach/Recruitment Coordinating Council which encompassed all units on campus that recruited students.

b. A Junior High School Recruitment Plan to be implemented at the Junior High School level by all programs represented in the Outreach/Recruitment Coordinating Council.

c. On-going meetings with the feeder School Districts Superintendents and Community College Presidents was established which I attended with President Fullerton.

d. On-going meetings with Principals from feeder schools were also established.

e. SJSU Institutional Research Office (IR): SJSU-E/E Office collaborated with the Office of IR on data collection and methodology relative to The E/E Office and the campus needs. Yearly E/E Reports were written and submitted to the CHOFF and SJSU.

3. Office of Educational Equity (E/E) was established in the late 1980’s, as a result of achievements gained via SAA. I was appointed Associate Dean for Educational Equity. With that came a directive from President Fullerton that the SAA Student Retention Component be expanded. The following was implemented:

a. The Faculty Mentor Program (FM) was established under the purview of SAA Retention Services with a commensurate increase in staff. Each Faculty Mentors received a.20FTE for mentoring 10 underrepresented students which had an outstanding effect on the retention of underrepresented students.

b. The SAA Educational Faculty Enhancement component of SAA focused on addressing diversity issues with faculty. Most CSU campuses used workshops, and retreats to address diversity training with faculty. The plan I submitted and approved was more inclusive and incorporated all campus Colleges/Departments. It consisted of the following:
• A standing SAA Educational Faculty Enhancement Committee (EFEC) be established campus-wide and each College appointed a faculty member to serve on this Committee as a representative of their college.

• The Educational Faculty Enhancement Committee (EFEC) met monthly with the Associate Dean for E/E to solely discuss student diversity issues related to faculty concerns (e.g. curriculum, student issues, classroom issues, teaching pedagogy, campus policy issues).

• Each E/E Faculty Committee member would intern meet with their College faculty to maintain a credible flow of information and discussion on diversity. While this process may seem cumbersome, the results were exceedingly successful in establishing a viable and reliable cross-campus network of problem-solving and open communications. While the plan was approved by Dr. Fullerton, it took my leadership, that of some Deans/Chairs, but it was primarily “The Faculty members on this Committee” that made this Committee a productive and collaborative process. This does not mean that issues of dissension did not occur, they most certainly did!

c. SAA Outreach/Recruitment Component- It’s important to note that this unit continued to operate in the E/E Office as described above.

The following is a synopsis of The Good, The Bad and The Ugly:

4. Gail Fullerton’s Presidential Tenure: In addition to what has been addressed above, President Fullerton appointed and hired more women and women of color to high ranking positions at SJSU (e.g. Provost, Deans, Associate Deans, Faculty, Staff, Campus Affirmative Action Officer (who reported directly to the President) than other Presidents. She also approved, instituted and supported more academic programs that addressed the underrepresented student population than most other presidents (e.g. Educational Opportunity Program, SAA, Upward Bound). President Fullerton also had a Community Advisory Board (Latino and Black) but I cannot state whether this was in place prior to my hire.
5. President Gail Fullerton Retires: I will only speak to that which I have knowledge regarding diversity.

a. The Office of Educational Equity was shut down and I was transferred to Student Academic Services. While I was at Student Academic Services, several women of color were terminated in that unit. I was transferred to the Office of Career Planning and Placement where I retired due to related health issues.

b. The Educational Opportunity Program’s (EOP) budget and staffing was seriously cut back and it was transferred to the Office of Admissions.

c. Upward Bound Program no longer exists due to Federal Funding cut backs but the intent was that campuses were to absorb this and other programs (e.g. EOP, SAA).

d. SJSU Community Advisory Board: The Latino Advisory Board did continue under President Coret’s presidency but I cannot speak for the Black Advisory Board nor weather either are in operation today.

e. Appointments of Women: The Women that President Fullerton appointed were reassigned to other departments, campus programs or returned to teaching. A number of women of color have been terminated or demoted (e.g. directors, staff, affirmative action officer, and faculty) at SJSU.

f. Campus Climate Committee: The only diversity/equity committee that I know of which stayed in place was the Campus Climate Committee (established after the Office of E/E was closed down), but it has never been given the resources or position of authority to address the multitude of issues of diversity.

MY KEY POINT IS THAT LEADERSHIP MUST COME FROM THE PRESIDENT AND THE TOP ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP OF THE CAMPUS. THE PRESIDENCY OF ANY CAMPUS IS KEY TO WHAT HAPPENS ON A GIVEN CAMPUS. THOSE (PRESIDENTS) WITH A HUMAN INTEREST OF SUPPORTING DIVERSITY AND ALL OF ITS RELATED ISSUES, WILL COMMAND RESPECT FROM MOST OF THE CAMPUS LEADERSHIP AS DID
PRESIDENT GAIL FULLERTON. I BELIEVE THAT SHE LAID THE FOUNDATION TO MAKE SJSU A CAMPUS THAT CARED FOR AND WELCOMED ALL STUDENTS, STAFF AND FACULTY. SJSU HAS CLEARLY TURNED IT BACK ON INCORPORATING DIVERSITY AND IS PLAGUED BY “INSTITUTIONAL RACISM” WHICH MUST BE ADDRESSED AT ALL LEVELS (e.g. CHOFS, ADMINISTRATION, FACULTY, STAFF, STUDENTS, DONORS AND THE BOARD) AT SJSU.

Just having an office of diversity is insufficient but a good start to address the work that Educational Faculty Enhancement Component of SAA did which was to have open dialogue on issues of diversity affecting students across campus. I know there are good people working at SJSU that care and believe in SJSU, as I and as other alumni and community do but unless, this issue is addressed the disease of “Institutional Racism” will continue to cripple SJSU.

I want to conclude with the philosophy from my professor who marched with Dr. Martin Luther King (Dr. Charles Chang/UCLA) and my mentor, (Dr. Nettye G. Goddard/SJSU): “All” institutions of education can always be and do better. The challenge lies in all of “us” taking “the risk” to be “CHANGE AGENTS” and address the injustices of non-diversity.

I am available to the Task Force to respond to any questions or comments.
April 4, 2014

Hi Professor Halualani

Thank you for attending our Task Force meeting last night. Your presentation was informative and enlightening. We look forward to receiving your recommendation for a Diversity Office at SJSU. As you prepare your recommendation, the Task Force members ask that you consider whether or not the following recommendations previously floated by the members ought be a part of your recommendation or are duplicative of what is in your recommendation:

• Engage the faculty senate, campus staff and interested student leaders in the development of a campus climate plan of action.

• Throughout the year the campus should maintain a published website and calendar that reaffirms the campus pride in its diversity.

• The campus climate committee model should be employed and expanded to include an opportunity for every member of the administration, faculty staff and student leadership to rotate through the committee as a contributing member.

Judge LaDoris H. Cordell (Ret.)
Recommendation for SJSU’s Special Task Force on Racial Discrimination:

Composed by Dr. Rona T. Halualani, Professor of Intercultural Communication, San Jose State University (Former Special Assistant to the President, Director of Institutional Planning and Inclusive Excellence for SJSU, 2007-2009; National Consultant on Diversity and Inclusion in Higher Education)

• Indeed, San Jose State University represents a special campus community and has some wonderful leverage points from which to build sustained diversity excellence. My recommendations for future action are delineated below.

1) SJSU Needs an Intentional, Long-Term Diversity Strategy (via an Updated Diversity Master Plan):

As it currently stands, there is no evidence of a concerted or intentional, organizational approach/strategy to diversity and inclusion at SJSU. Unfortunately, institutional reactions to recent events may not ensure long-term, sustained, institutionalized diversity action. Such an approach or strategy is needed to make major strides and sustain targeted momentum in diversity achievement on all levels. Higher educational institutions can no longer rest on the “laurels” of past diversity efforts or commitments; efforts and commitments in this vein must be continually re-articulated and planned out to actualize true inclusive excellence. (The task force also recommended a Campus Climate Action Plan – this could be made a central part of a larger Diversity Master Plan.)

*Please note that I recommend that the Diversity Commission review the first Diversity Master Plan to see which aspects are functional at this moment and can be reactivated so that “the wheel does not have to be reinvented” (which will be time and labor-intensive).

*I also recommend that a current inventory or mapping of diversity efforts and curricular components be completed so that SJSU can work off of what it currently has and identify the gaps and empty zones. (My team and I did this while I occupied the role and it helped us build the Diversity Master Plan with the campus community.)

2) SJSU Needs to Create a Diversity Infrastructure:

In this regard, I recommend the formation of a key diversity organizational structure that is conducive to facilitating transformative change around diversity and inclusion.
By “key diversity organizational structure,” I refer to a comprehensive, multi-layered division or office (Office of Diversity Engagement and Inclusive Excellence) led by a Diversity Leader (Vice President of Diversity Engagement and Inclusive Excellence) who reports directly to the President and sits on the President’s Cabinet.

This office and role will be charged with the following functions:

a) visioning (“charting the path”) function: the proactive strategizing and planning for the future needs of making SJSU a highly engaged, inclusive, and productive climate around diversity and inclusion;

b) support and engagement function for faculty, staff, leadership, and students (“building up the campus community with skills and perspectives”): the strategic delineation, planning, and provider of professional development training and support for the following campus constituencies:

• faculty members [on issues of inclusive pedagogy and engaged learning through diversity as connected to core subject matter; the idea being that when students are fully engaged around diversity considerations and learning levels, student learning increases in core subject matter as well (disciplinary content, theory, core subject matter, core skills such as writing, research methods, critical analysis, relational building), intercultural competencies, discussion facilitation];

• staff members (on diversity/difference/recognizing privilege/power differences-skill sets, discussion facilitation);

• leadership (on diversity/difference/recognizing privilege/power differences-skill sets, discussion facilitation, mentoring);

• students (on diversity/difference/recognizing privilege/power differences-skill sets, discussion facilitation, allies and coalition building)

c) student success and academic achievement capacity (“facilitating and ensuring” academic excellence for
historically disadvantaged groups): working with all other campus divisions regarding high-impact strategies and interventions for reducing the achievement gaps and facilitating optimal conditions for the student success of all students (women, historically underrepresented racial/ethnic/classed groups).

This above delineated structure requires more than just 2-3 individuals; it will need to be “all hands on deck” with the strategic incorporation of related offices (multicultural center, support services for specific underrepresented groups, related roles, and positions). If not, the momentum driving the diversity work may diminish or cease altogether if it is centered around a few individuals who may move on from the university. Structures stand as more stable vehicles to bring about change and strategic efforts. Universities that are beginning their work in diversity and inclusion often commit to an unfolding organizational structure of at least 2 - 3 layers thick (with the diversity leader, support team, and key related offices and positions framed under the aforementioned functions) over two years. By incorporating key functions to a division that is dedicated to diversity and inclusion, greater credibility and valuation is afforded to that division so that it does not become perceived as a mere “nod” to diversity and inclusion.

*The Office of Diversity Engagement and Inclusive Excellence will be housed in Tower Hall.

3) Commitment of SJSU and the Chancellor to Maintaining this Office/Role For At Least Five (5) Years:

SJSU’s leadership and the Chancellor needs to make a commitment to keeping this office/role in place for a minimum time period of five (5) years;

4) Annual Operational Budget and Resources for Staff Positions and Faculty in Residencies for This Office/Role:

The Office of Diversity Engagement and Inclusive Excellence will have a robust operating base budget for the following:

a) 2 staff positions (coordinator, administrative assistant) to help facilitate the office;

b) 1-2 work study/student/grad student assistant positions;

c) base money for reassigned time for two (2) Faculty Fellows (.2 or 1 3-unit course for each Faculty Fellow; $4951 each) to serve on key special projects for the office;
d) annual base money of $100,000 for specific initiatives and programming.

5) Reactivation of the Campus Climate Committee which is connected to the Office of the President and is formalized through an Academic Senate Policy

6) Incorporation of a Diversity-Related Priority (or Set of Priorities) into the Key Responsibilities of Each Vice President on the Cabinet:

Each Vice President will be assigned a diversity-related priority goal to continually work on and achieve. The President will evaluate and review the Vice Presidents’ performance on these priorities in the annual review process. These priorities will be built into each VP role for future searches.

7) A Campus Climate Study/Assessment (with actual experience-based climate items and behavioral outcome items via a survey and focus groups) Should Be Conducted Every Other Year:

The results of this study/assessment need to be presented to the campus and the leadership needs to respond with meaningful actions within six months of the public unveiling of the data.
April 13, 2014

Dear Ms. Poole and SJSU Diversity Task Force Members,

I am very disheartened to see what had happened at SJSU and the SJSU diversity task force. Recommendation #7 and #8 with regards to campus climate from the document ‘Recommendation as of April 11” is at best an endorsement of the exclusion of Asian Americans at SJSU; at worst it is continuing institutionalized discrimination against Asian Americans.

Only Vietnamese Americans, many of whom were from the ESL classes, were used by Dr. Murray to represent the 32 percent of Asian American in the focus groups in the campus survey report of 2011 (data collection done in 2009, 12% of students were Vietnamese). I wonder if this kind of sampling would have been acceptable to the task force and you if she had used Nigerian Americans, many of whom are from ESL classes, to represent African Americans. Will this form of sampling method withstand peer review? Is this an accurate depiction of the campus climate at SJSU?

The Vietnamese focus group had the least amount of time (less than one hour), the least amount of questions asked, and were not asked racially-sensitive questions. Other focus groups were asked some of these questions:

- 6% of the students whose first language is not English report being discriminated against (sic) “frequently,” or “occasionally” on campus – how would you explain that statistic?
- 56.5% of gay, lesbian, or bi-sexual students reported feeling uncomfortable disclosing their sexual orientation on campus – how would you explain that statistic?
- In the original survey, 5% (5) of student respondents commented that SJSU spends too much time highlighting diversity which they felt was “divisive” and created “separation among groups.” Has this been your experience? If not how might you explain it?
- In the original survey, 50% of African American students indicated they were uncomfortable discussing racially sensitive issues on campus. Has this been your experience? If not how might you explain it?

Based on what the students wrote from the 2006 online survey and 2009 focus groups, it is clear that a lot of the administrative staff, faculty and teaching staff at SJSU are quite racially insensitive and not respectful of diversity. I think this is amply demonstrated (maybe obfuscated?) by how this ‘diversity’ task force has 100 percent of the ‘community’, 67% of the CSU staff and 43% of the SJSU faculty being represented by African Americans. Can this kind of racial makeup ensure ALL American students will be treated fairly? NO. As can be seen by how the focus groups are carried out, some races are treated more fairly than others. In fact, 20 percent of SJSU students, the Chinese American, the Filipino Americans, the Pacific Islanders, were EXCLUDED from the focus groups.

In other words, one fifth of SJSU students were reduced to zero fifths because essentially they were not counted at all! (by the way, the whites were recruited for the focus groups only because it was realized that the report was not truly ‘diverse’) What kind of sampling method is this?
Yet the SJSU diversity task force has recommended that this ‘campus climate report’ be not only commended but to continue with another such report in the future. Is this a new form of the ‘Chinese Exclusion Act?’ I am not a sociology major but this kind of behavior is very similar to the definition of institutionalized discrimination against Asian Americans (excluding Vietnamese, many of whom in the ESL classes, of course)

a zero fifth SJSU student
From: Susan Murray  
Sent: Monday, April 14, 2014 2:16 PM  
To: Cordell, LaDoris  
Subject: Re: request for your response to a student's letter

Judge Cordell,

I agree with the letter writer that there were many more racial-ethnic groups we could have included in the focus group study. The report on Vietnamese students was never intended to represent all Asian American students. The analysis of the experiences of Vietnamese- and Vietnamese-American students was contextualized as the experience of Vietnamese students, not all Asian American students. The Campus Climate Committee determined which groups to include in the focus group study. This was an inductive, qualitative study and not meant to be representative of the entire population of SJSU. The intent was to conduct focus group sessions with select groups (the number was limited mostly by funding for the project and time constraints), to create a deeper understanding of how racism, sexism, and heterosexism operate on a daily basis, and to create working strategies for dealing with such micro aggressions. I assumed that this process would, if proved useful, continue with additional research. I was, and continue to be, as dismayed as the letter writer, with the administration’s lack of response to the focus group study. There are many, many groups on campus that warrant further study, including those mentioned by the author of the letter.

Regarding specific points made by the letter writer: The process of recruiting participants for this study remains confidential to protect those that participated. Each focus group session was allotted the same amount of time – some groups chose to use all the time, others did not. Time spent in each group, in other words, was determined by the focus group participants themselves. Finally, the Interview Schedules in the appendix to the study were guidelines to be used by facilitators (who were not always the principal investigator) – the actual questions asked during each session varied somewhat from these guidelines.

Sincerely, Dr. Susan B. Murray
To: Members of Task Force on Racial Discrimination  
From: Wiggsy Sivertsen, Professor Counselor  
Re: Reflections and Recommendations  

Martin Luther King said “there comes a time when silence is betrayal.” So I have decided to speak out about some concerns I have, and others that faculty, staff, and students have shared with me. My hope this will helpful to all of you who have worked so hard to help SJSU become the kind of place we are be proud to be a part of.

First let me give you some context about who I am and the reason for my comments. I am a professor in Counseling Services in my 46th year of service to this campus and our students. I taught in Sociology as a visiting professor for eleven years, was a member of President Caret’s Campus Climate Committee, and served with Dr. Gabe Reyes until he retired. At that point I chaired the Campus Climate until President Qayoumi wanted to take a different direction.

During the time Campus Climate Committee was functioning we developed two campus climate surveys that were distributed, through email, to students, faculty, staff, and administrators. For some of the staff who did not have access to computers, mainly custodians and some facilities people, we went to their beginning of shift meetings at night and gave them an opportunity to also answer the survey.

Recently, because of the serious concerns some of us had as a result of the very ugly and painful incidents in the residence halls we decided to voluntarily reestablish the Campus Climate Committee and are working on some ideas of things we can do to help our campus heal. This is not a formal committee. All
participants are voluntarily participating. The original CC Committee was also voluntary.

I would like to address some issues that I hope will be helpful to all of you as you finalize your work.

First, let me talk about the students. Our students are very different in many ways than they were 10 years ago. Their average age is lower, no longer 26 years old. They are increasingly more diverse from many parts of the world, (there are 100 different languages spoken on our campus). Many of them are not only going to school full time, but are also working almost 30 hours a week. Some of them are also responsible for the care of their families. When I was teaching, it was not unusual for a student to tell me they were going to miss class because they had to go with a parent to the doctor in order to interpret for them.

It is a rare student that graduates in 4 years. The norm now is up from 5 years to 6 years. Some live in the area, some commute many miles to get to the campus and some live in their cars or “couch surf.” Many more of them live in the residence halls than in years past.

They are so “wired” and have many avenues for communication, cell phones, Facebook, email, etc. As a mental health clinician I have seen a significant raise in serious mental health concerns, which for some offers a significant challenge in accomplishing their class work. Finally, sadly, many of them come to our campus having not been given any education in diversity and respect for people who are not like them. Which in my mind demonstrates a colossal failure of our educational system K through 12.
Clearly we have a responsibility to help our students learn, or better yet unlearn their biases and develop a value of respect and reverence for their fellow students. Having spent many years teaching about the value of diversity I know this will not be accomplished in a day a semester or a year but we must not throw in the towel because of the ugly incidents in the residence hall and just keep vigorously chipping away at the stone of bigotry.

Second, there are approximately 1100+ faculty. Over half of them are part time lecturers who often teach on many campuses in a week. Because of their sporadic presence on campus it is very hard to find ways to communicate our values to them. Frequently they don’t even know if they will have a class until the very first day of the semester. This makes it extremely difficult to provide them with training regarding our values.

Like all of us the faculty have to learn to develop an understanding and respect for our students. There are often many ugly things said in the class room. Looking directly at a black of Latino/a student asking “are you sure you are in the right class?”, or when a student with a disability asks for an accommodation the teacher will say “you don’t look disabled.” These are only a couple of examples of ugly behavior on the part of faculty. Fortunately I can give you many examples or situations where faculty have gone the extra mile to help “at risk” students. However, even one ugly indecent is not acceptable.

The challenge is trying to find ways to address these issues. Students are, understandably, frightened to report these incidents for fear of their future in a particular department. So
getting at these particular faculty is very difficult and when these issues do arise, chair people and deans have to develop programs of diversity for their departments with a very clear message that disrespectful behavior will not be tolerated.

The Office of Faculty Affairs should develop innovative and useful programs that make it very clear that all members of the teaching faculty must treat all students and employees with respect, and present some workshops that address these issues. New faculty should be required to attend a day long training that would address all the issues of diversity. Race, ethnic, sexual orientation, gender, religion and issues relating to students with disability. There should also be a section addressing some of the emotional difficulties our students struggle with, and have some workshops to provide appropriate ways of addressing these students needs. Finally, there should be time to discuss the role of the campus Ombudsperson, Office of Student Conduct and Ethical Development, and Office for Equal Opportunity.

Since new faculty would be required to attend this day they should also be paid for their time. This creates a value that makes it clear that we want our students treated with respect. Asking faculty to come to campus early and not paying them is, in itself, an example of disrespect.

Third, as I stated earlier most of our students come to the university with absence of any formal learning about respect for all the “at risk” groups, which in my mind is a real failure of their K-12 educational experience. So we find ourselves having to develop ways of providing them with the kind of learning they need in order to make them aware that the hateful behavior that occurred this fall is totally unacceptable.
Surly we can attempt to teach students about the issues of discrimination and prejudice but to my way of thinking the issues of discrimination and prejudice requires that they learn about prejudice and discrimination and how to recognize it in themselves and how to “heal” from the burden of holding hateful beliefs against a certain class of people. All too often I have heard members of my community (GLBT) make hateful comments about other communities while at the same time complaining about the mistreatment they have experienced.

To not have a required class for all students and required workshops for faculty and staff seems to defeat our efforts of ever hoping to succeed in teaching about the respectful ways of interacting with various cultures that will be a part of our world for a lifetime.

If we really mean our commitments to having a campus of respect we should make every effort to advertise this belief. Having a statement on the Web will not accomplish that. All course greensheets/syllabi should have a non-discrimination statement and should they experience something in the classroom how and where to report it. This would tell students that we are serious and at the same time remind faculty that this is a sacred value of the university. Classrooms should have plaques that state something about inclusion.

From the day the semester begins we should have myriad ways that let students know how happy they are here, (banners, posters etc.). These same efforts should also be directed to all employees, letting them know that they are an invaluable source towards helping our students be successful.
We celebrate our students leaving at graduation. We should also celebrate them when they arrive and throughout the time they are students at SJSU.

Finally we are very appreciative of your hard work. San José is a good place but sometimes we stumble and we know we can do better. You all have devoted a great of time and effort in helping us do better. Four this I and others would like to thank you.
RECOMMENDATIONS

> Chair people and deans have to develop programs of diversity for their departments with a very clear message that disrespectful behavior will not be tolerated.

> The Office of Faculty Affairs should develop innovative and useful programs that make it very clear that all members of the teaching faculty must treat all students and employees with respect and present some workshops that address these issues.

> New tenured and tenure track faculty should be required to attend a paid day addressing issues of discrimination and prejudice. Race, ethnic, sexual orientation, gender, religion and issues pertaining to students with disability. There should also be a section addressing some of the emotional difficulties our students struggle with, and have some workshops to provide appropriate ways of addressing these students needs.

> They should learn about prejudice and discrimination and how to recognize it in themselves and how to “heal” from the burden of holding hateful beliefs against a certain class of people requires that they learn about prejudice and discrimination and how to recognize it in themselves and how to “heal” from the burden of holding hateful beliefs against a certain class of people.

> Students “Green Sheets” should have a non-discrimination statement and should they experience something in the class room, how and where to report it.
>  Classrooms should have a place that state something about inclusion.

>  From the day the semester begins we should have a myriad of ways that let students know how happy they are here, (banners, posters etc.). These same efforts should also be directed to all employees. Letting them know that they are an invaluable resource helping our students be successful.

>  Teacher evaluations (SOCES) should give students an opportunity to comment about their experiences in the classroom that pertain to issues of discrimination.