



Cultural Climate Survey Outcomes 2019



Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Matters

Survey was administered by Insight View Finder and sponsored by both a Gateway Technical College Innovation Grant and the Lumina Foundation Talent Hub.

Report was prepared by CoopLew.



Executive Summary

This executive summary provided summative information for the reader and specific findings by the researchers.

Gateway Technical College's strategic plan, Vision 2021, is centered around six Drivers of Excellence, factors that are critical to the college's ongoing success.

- Foster Employee Engagement
- Attract and Develop Engaged Students
- Deliver Program and Service Excellence
- Create and Strengthen Connections with Employers, Education, and Community
- Create an Equitable and Inclusive Campus Climate
- Steward College Resources Effectively

In January 2019, Gateway Technical College (Gateway) retained the services of CoopLew, LLC, to conduct a campus climate study to include both quantitative and qualitative analysis. This climate study was both instructive and informative for the Vision 2021 strategic plan, with specific relevance to the ***“create an equitable and inclusive campus”*** driver of excellence. Viewfinder™ survey instruments were used to complete the quantitative part of the research, and CoopLew, LLC, performed qualitative data compilation. CoopLew, LLC completed the qualitative part via on and off-campus focus groups with faculty, staff, administrators, and students. This summary reflected findings from quantitative and qualitative efforts.

During April 1, 2019, through April 4, 2019, CoopLew consultants conducted in-person focus groups on the campuses of Kenosha and Racine while the Elkhorn campus participated via video conferencing. The total number of in-person or video conference focus groups conducted on campus was twenty-two. Conference calls were used to complete three of the focus groups. The Gateway's Multicultural Program solicited participants of respective groups. Groups Solicited and the Focus Group Itinerary were in the Appendix of this report. Demographics for faculty, administrators, and staff were:

Gender: Female (34), Male (16)

Ethnicity: African American/Black (20) Asian American (1) Caucasian/White (8)
Hispanic/Latino (8) Multiracial (1) Native American (1)
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (0) Other (3)

Faculty: Part-time (1) Full-time (7) Instructor (5) Adjunct (2) Other (0)

Admin.: President, Vice President (2) Associate Vice President, Dean, Associate Dean (4)
Executive Director, Manager, Director, Assistant/Associate Director, Department Chair (5)

Staff: Part-time (3) Full-time (37) Temporary (1) Contract (0) Salaried (9) Hourly (5)
Disabled (1)

Demographics for students were:

Gender: Female (41), Male (11)

Ethnicity: African American/Black (17) Asian American (2) Caucasian/White (9)
Hispanic/Latino (15) Multiracial (6) Native American (0)
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (0) Other (3)

Citizenship: Born in U.S. (40) Naturalized U.S. Citizen (3)
Legal Permanent Resident (6) International (F-1, J-1,) (1)
DACA/DREAMer (1) Other (1)

Age: 16-20 (19) 21-24 (6) 25-30 (10) 31-40 (7) 41-50 (3) 51-60 (4) 61+ (2)

Type: Part-time (27) Full-time (over 12 credits) (20) Transfer (3)
Low-income (4) Student with a disability (2) First generation (neither parent has a
4-year degree) (14) Online (2)
Re-entry from incarceration/criminal record (0) Other (0)

Degree Sought:

Associates (35) Technical Diploma (9) Certificate only (2)
Other (5, ELL, GED, GED)

Semesters at Gateway:

One (6) Two (13) Three (5) Four (9) Five (1) Six (4) Seven (1) Eight (3)
Nine or more (5)

Four questions established by stakeholders of Gateway's Learning Success were used to draw data for qualitative analyses. Members of the Gateway team and the questions used are listed below.

- Dr. Tammi Summers, Dean Learning Success
- Jomarie Coloriano, Multicultural Student Support Specialist
- Interpreters for the hard-of-hearing

Responses to focus group questions and notes provided by interpreters for hard-of-hearing participants were compiled by the CoopLew consultants, themed, and categorized under the *Four Pillars of Diversity*. The 3-step process was chosen for the sake of simplicity and to ensure concise recording from response to targeted areas of concern or praise. The descriptive summaries of on-campus focus group constituents are in the Appendix of this report.

Quantitative analyses resulted after the purchase of Viewfinder™ survey instruments and data compilation by CoopLew, LLC. This Executive Summary reflects significant findings, recommendations, and conclusions based upon data provided by Viewfinder™ to Gateway and from Gateway to CoopLew, LLC.

The consultant firm stratified recommendations provided after reporting major findings among and between groups using its Institutional Pillars for Transformation™ (IPTs). They were listed below for quick reference:

- **Institutional Leadership & Commitment**
- **Institutional Curricula and Co-Curricula Accountability**
- **Institutional Climate**
- **Institutional Senior-Level Representation/ Composition**

Each Pillar served to frame recommendations within major components of institutional infrastructure and was hoped to guide considerations for accountability and measurement during post-research activity. Definitions and proposed uses of the Pillars are provided in the Conclusion of the Executive Summary.

The following were qualitative questions asked, observations, and statistically significant differences discovered from the analyses.

Focus Group Questions:

Question 1: From your perspective, experience, and observation, what is Gateway doing effectively to create an inclusive climate for diverse students, faculty, staff, etc. (keeping in mind that diversity includes race, ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic class, religion, sexual orientation, disability, etc.)?

- What specific programs, projects, services activities strategies are working? What concrete results have you witnessed in the classroom and across the campus – in specific departments, areas, etc.?

Question 2: From your perspective, experience, and observation, what does Gateway need to address, improve, transform, change invent, etc. to be more successful at inclusion for diverse students, faculty, and staff (keeping in mind that diversity includes race, ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic class, religion, sexual orientation, disability, etc.)?

Question 3: What specific programs, strategies, curricula, activities, services, etc. are not working as well as they could—in the classroom and across campus? What specific areas or departments could do a more effective job of serving, recruiting, retaining, and including diverse students, faculty, and staff?

Question 4: What specific steps and recommendations do you believe would have the most impact on creating an inclusive climate in the classrooms and across campus at Gateway? What resources do you believe are necessary to make these steps and recommendations a reality?

Question 5: What changes would you recommend for ensuring that classroom and campus experiences include more students from underrepresented groups (define underrepresented) and occur in environments that foster equal treatment and safe participation?

Summary of Qualitative Observations

Seven themes surfaced during the Gateway focus groups. Theme perspectives differed slightly between students, faculty, staff, and administrators, and from primary site experience. CoopLew narrowed varying perceptions into five (5) common themes. These descriptions are listed below, followed by student, FSA, and consensus items.

- **College Access** – Indicating success, a need for improved, or difficulty in college navigation from physical, psychological, and structural perspectives.
- **Leadership Accountability** – Indicating an expectation of leadership to act on values, principles, plans, and policies projected as the core for the College or specific units.
- **Leadership Visibility** – Indicating a desire for engagement with an increased familiarity with senior administrators, influential groups, and decision-making personnel at all levels.
- **Pro/Con Collaboration** – Indicating perceptions that the College may or may not encourage intersectionality and or cross-engagement to improve success, recruitment, retention, or general advancement.
- **Structural Inconsistency** – Indicating a lack of continuity in services, arbitrary allocation of privileges, and preconceived benefits for select recipients by design, circumstance, or processes utilized for delivery of services.

CoopLew consultants found the focus group portion of this report to be both exciting and revealing of Gateway. First, participant conversations were particularly robust, and nearly every session had someone in attendance (a compliment to the organizing office). The structure for each session worked very well for ensuring that all participants had time to speak and to ask follow-up questions.

Next, experiencing less formal focus groups such as the fireside chat and engaging in a relaxation exercise in the Multicultural Resource Center, provided the consultants with hands-on experience about how students relations took place at the College. This experience helped to better articulate why respondents preferred specific environments, how they prefer to bond, and where ideations about integration, collaboration, diversity, and equity were most likely to take place.

Moreover, the experience was helpful during the assignment of qualitative themes and response grouping. Consultants drew from several comments and gestures while searching for theme names that capture the spirit of the groups assembled throughout the face-to-face conversations. As a result, and as mentioned in the Emerging Concerns section of this report, issues behind some perceptions of inequities were seen by the consultants as “shadows” that may surface later in a significant way if unattended. CoopLew dubbed shadows as “unwritten rules, concealed perceptions, unstated expectations, and patterns of behaviors that could undermine progress.” Themes above embody significant phenomena about Gateway that participants frequently alluded to, but never voiced.

CoopLew observed a college in the throes of growth and development. It’s constituency, while engaged heavily with veteran and recruitment affairs, was rapidly expanding with other interests and cultures, this expansion posed a circumstance for Gateway that was common in higher education, but unique for Gateway because it undoubtedly called for more flexible thinking about whom the College was serving, where, and why. As the College goes forward with results of its focus groups, and ultimately, results of its climate research, it will be essential to expand its vetting processes to

ensure that a broader net for input is cast. Casting a full net could deter undercurrents of dissension among emerging populations. In short, paying attention to the growth and emergence of new student and personnel interests may serve as a proverbial “ounce of prevention” that keeps full-blown and unforeseen disruptions from occurring. Regularly scheduled student/administration speak-outs appeared useful for keeping pace with student interests.

Summary of Major Findings

Identity questions about sexuality, religious belief, ability/disability, and veteran experiences as well as questions addressing campus issues (diversity training, representation, sense of welcoming, integration, safety, overall experience) were provided to all respondents. Two thousand, two hundred forty-four (2,244) responses were used as a representative pool of Gateway’s 22,493-person constituency. Respective sample sizes were students (1,518 /68%), faculty (347/15%) and administrators/ staff (379/17%). Responses from each sample were collected over approximately eight weeks during spring and summer semesters 2019. The survey contained fifty-six (56) items, which included seventeen (17) demographic, twenty-two (22) forced-choice, and seventeen (17) Likert Scale. To analyze the comparison between the four groups, analysis of variance (ANOVA) testing was conducted to determine which groups differed on selected survey items. These analyses represented significant mean differences for each group on the selected items. A probability value (p -value) $< .05$ was used to determine significant differences between group responses.

Major Findings

Campus-wide:

Perceptions of mandatory diversity training (p. 132, p. 148)

- Administrators and staff (M = 4.16) were more likely than students (M = 3.86) to feel that administrative leaders should be required to participate in mandatory diversity training.
- Administrators and staff (M = 4.13) were more likely than faculty (M = 3.98) to feel that faculty should be required to participate in mandatory diversity training.
- Administrators and staff (M = 4.13) were more likely than students (M = 3.88) to feel that faculty should be required to participate in mandatory diversity training.
- Administrators and staff (M = 3.81) were more likely than students (M = 3.52) to feel that students should be required to participate in mandatory diversity training.
- Faculty (M = 3.81) were more likely than administrators/staff (M = 3.33) to agree that they have received adequate diversity training to engage with students and employees at our college.

Perceptions of a welcoming environment (p. 134-136)

- Students (M = 4.54) were more likely than faculty (M = 4.04) to agree that the campus was welcoming for international individuals.
- Students (M = 4.47) were more likely than faculty (M = 4.32) to agree that the campus was welcoming for low-income individuals.
- Students (M = 4.47) were more likely than faculty (M = 4.21) to agree that campus is welcoming for Middle Eastern individuals.

- Students (M = 4.29) were more likely than administrators/staff (M = 4.08) to agree that campus is welcoming for undocumented individuals.
- Students (M = 4.29) were more likely than faculty (M = 4.04) to agree that campus is welcoming for undocumented individuals.

Perceptions of safety (p. 137)

- Students (M = 4.03) were more likely than faculty members (M = 3.81) to agree that their families feel they are safe on campus.

Reports of Incidents and Discrimination (p. 125-131)

- More than half of student respondents did not express experiencing any incidents and discrimination.
- Bullying and discrimination based on gender, race/ethnicity, age, and political views were the incidents students reported experiencing the most.
- Around 80% of students who responded to this item suggested that inequalities and discrimination should be addressed during student orientation.
- Around 72% of students who responded to this item suggested that inequalities and discrimination should be addressed in their program/major classes.
- Around 50% of student respondents expressed that other students caused the incidents they experienced, while 43% of student respondents revealed that faculty members caused the conflicts.
- Around half of faculty respondents did not express experiencing any incidents and discrimination.
- Bullying, retaliation, and discrimination based on political views, race/ethnicity, gender, and age were the incidents faculty reported experiencing the most.
- A little over half of the faculty respondents expressed that students caused the incidents they experienced, while 41% of faculty respondents indicated that other faculty members caused the conflicts.
- Around 40% of administrators and staff respondents did not express experiencing any incidents and discrimination.
- Bullying and discrimination based on age, gender, race/ethnicity, and political views were the incidents administrators and staff experienced the most.
- Around 61% of administrators and staff respondents reported staff members causing offenses while approximately 31% and 33% of administrators and staff respondents reported that faculty members and students respectively caused the incidents.

Ethnic and Personnel Groups:

Students of Color (p. 122)

- There was no difference found in the students of color perceptions of campus climate based on gender, LGBTQ+ status, and veteran status.
- Students of color with a disability (M = 4.55) were more likely than students of color without a disability (M = 4.20) to express that they feel welcome in the classroom.

African American/Black Students (throughout p. 63-124)

- There were no differences found in African American/Black student perceptions of their religious/spiritual beliefs based on gender identity, LGBTQ+ status, disability, and veteran status.
- There was no difference found in African American/Black student perceptions of political views/worldviews based on gender identity, LGBTQ+ status, disability status, and veteran status.

Caucasian/White Students (throughout p. 63-124)

- There were no differences found in Caucasian/White student perceptions of their religious/spiritual beliefs based on gender identity and LGBTQ+ status.
- Caucasian/White students who did not identify with a disability (M = 2.85) were more likely than Caucasian/White students who did identify with a disability (M = 2.19) to feel that they could express their religious/spiritual beliefs on campus.
- Caucasian/White students who did not identify with a disability (M = 2.88) were more likely than Caucasian/White students who did identify with a disability (M = 2.29) to feel that they could express their religious/spiritual beliefs in the surrounding community.
- Caucasian/White students who did not identify as a veteran (M = 2.81) were more likely than Caucasian/White students who did identify as a veteran (M = 1.72) to feel that they could express their religious/spiritual beliefs on campus.
- There was no difference found in Caucasian/White student perceptions of political views/worldviews based on gender identity, LGBTQ+ status, and veteran status.
- Caucasian/White students who did not identify with a disability (M = 2.87) were more likely than Caucasian/White students who did identify with a disability (M = 2.19) to feel that they can openly express their political views/worldviews on campus.
- Caucasian/White students who did not identify with a disability (M = 2.85) were more likely than Caucasian/White students who did identify with a disability (M = 2.21) to feel that they can openly express their political views/worldviews in the surrounding community.
- Caucasian/White students who were not veterans (M = 2.81) were more likely than Caucasian/White students who were veterans (M = 1.97) to feel that they can openly express their political views/worldviews on campus.
- There was no difference found in Caucasian/White student perceptions of campus climate for students with disabilities based on gender identity.

Hispanic/Latino Students (throughout p. 63-124)

- There were no differences found in Hispanic/Latino student perceptions of their religious/spiritual beliefs based on gender identity.
- Hispanic/Latino students who did not identify with a disability (M = 3.27) were more likely than Hispanic/Latino students who did identify with a disability (M = 1.78) to feel that the campus community respected the religious/spiritual holidays they celebrate.
- There was no difference found in Hispanic/Latino student perceptions of political views/worldviews based on gender identity, LGBTQ+ status, and veteran status.

Faculty Perceptions (throughout p. 63-103)

- There were no differences found for perceptions of religious/spiritual beliefs based on gender identity.
- There were no significant differences found in perceptions of campus climate for political views/worldviews by gender identity.

Administrator and Staff Perceptions (throughout p. 63-103)

- There were no differences found for perceptions of religious/spiritual beliefs based on gender identity.
- Racial/ethnic identity and LGBTQ+ status groups were too small to disaggregate for religious/spiritual belief perceptions.
- There were no significant differences found in perceptions of campus climate for political views/worldviews by gender identity.
- Racial/ethnic identity and veteran status groups were too small to disaggregate for further analyses for political view/worldview perceptions.

Religious/Spiritual Affiliations:

All Students (p. 63-84)

- African American/Black students (M = 3.34) were more likely than White students (M = 2.80) to feel that they could express their religious/spiritual beliefs in the surrounding community.
- Hispanic/Latino students (M = 3.19) were more likely than White students (M = 2.76) to feel that they could express their religious/spiritual beliefs on campus.
- Hispanic/Latino students (M = 3.23) were more likely than White students (M = 2.77) to feel that students respected their religious/spiritual beliefs.
- Hispanic/Latino students (M = 3.30) were more likely than White students (M = 2.86) to feel that the faculty respected their religious/spiritual beliefs.
- Hispanic/Latino students (M = 3.25) were more likely than White students (M = 2.79) to feel that administrators respected their religious/spiritual beliefs.
- Hispanic/Latino students (M = 3.25) were more likely than White students (M = 2.83) to feel that the staff respected their religious/spiritual beliefs.
- Students without a disability (M = 2.96) were more likely than students with a disability (M = 2.45) to feel that their religious/spiritual beliefs were welcomed on campus.
- Students who were not veterans (M = 2.91) were more likely than students who were veterans (M = 2.23) to feel that their religious/spiritual beliefs were welcomed on campus.
- There were no differences found in student perceptions of their religious/spiritual beliefs based on gender identity.

Political Views/Worldviews:

All Students (p. 85-103)

- Hispanic/Latino students (M = 3.16) were more likely than White students (M = 2.78) to feel that they could express their political views/worldviews on campus.

- Hispanic/Latino students (M = 3.14) were more likely than White students (M = 2.77) to feel that they could express their political views/worldviews in the surrounding community.
- Hispanic/Latino students (M = 3.18) were more likely than White students (M = 2.79) to feel that they could express their political views/worldviews in the classroom.
- Students without a disability (M = 2.92) were more likely than students with a disability (M = 2.35) to feel that their political views/worldviews were welcomed on campus.
- Students who were not veterans (M = 2.88) were more likely than students who were veterans (M = 2.30) to feel that their political views/worldviews were welcomed on campus.
- There was no difference found in perceptions of political views/worldviews based on gender identity.

Veterans:

All Students (p. 104-107)

- The sample size of this group was too small to disaggregate information for further comparative analyses.

Students with Disabilities:

All Students (p. 108-115)

- There were no significant differences between gender identities for students with disabilities' perceptions of campus climate.

Gender/Sexuality Expression:

All Students (p. 116-122)

- Racial/ethnic groups, gender identity, veteran status, and disability status groups were too small to disaggregate for further comparative analyses.

Infrastructural Findings:

Relationship between Racial/Ethnic Groups' Perceptions and Safety and Security

- Asian American faculty had the highest agreeance with thoughts that the Campus Safety and Security are qualified to deal with aspects of diversity.
- Asian American faculty had the highest agreeance with thoughts that the Campus Safety and Security should reflect the diversity of students.
- Asian American faculty had the highest agreeance with thoughts that there was enough Safety and Security personnel.
- African American/Black faculty had the highest agreeance that Campus Safety and Security should be required to participate in ongoing diversity training.
- Multiracial faculty had the highest agreeance that Campus Safety and Security should always be armed.

Recommendations (Expanded listing on Pg. 149)

In keeping with the Institutional Pillars for Transformation™ (IPTs) proposed for framing the results of this study, recommendations were provided as follows:

Institutional Leadership & Commitment – The college demonstrates an ongoing commitment to expectations for integrated and intersected behaviors, resource investment, public communications, diversity-related expansions, and mission significance. *Content of planning and strategic documents, reward patterns, frequency and security of accountability assessments, etc.*

- Reframe the purpose of this campus climate survey to the campus population.
- Develop and distribute policy and accountability measures for administrative leaders and board member diversity training.
- Expand infrastructure for diversity leadership, advocacy, and accountability.
- Establish on-going campus climate assessments.
- Position diversity as a core responsibility for all Gateway personnel.
- Reconstruct award and recognition criteria to include diversity-based innovation.
- Ensure that provisions for constituent feedback are secure and privileged from retaliation.

Institutional Curricular & Co-Curricular Accountability – The college integrates tenets for accountability throughout its infrastructure that measure the progress of diversity-related scholarly, co-curricular, administrative, and programmatic activity. *Integrated activities, diversity pedagogy, promotion, tenure, award achievement, training, affinity, discipline, etc.*

- Create and review the impact of cross-site and integrated Gateway activities.
- Create scenario-based diversity issues to explore faculty efficacy and demonstration of classroom equity and inclusion.
- Hold process forums to educate constituents about efforts taken to ensure inclusive engagement of intended audiences.
- Support student and staff affinities that forward Gateway aspirations for climate change.
- Create a campus culture where diversity and inclusion initiatives are made more visible.

Institutional Climate – The college intentionally creates, publicizes, and enforces events, messages, symbols, and values that impact the degree to which all students, faculty, and staff experience a welcoming environment. *Multicultural events, climate assessments, community-college partnerships, Title IX, ADA, EEOC, architecture, marketing, etc.*

- Gather more information about why diversity was not perceived as a College focus.
- Enhance multicultural events with pre-event dialogues, assessment, and inquiry.
- Institutionalize how religious preferences are recognized and supported.
- Conduct forums to assess staff perceptions about the plight of Caucasian/White and undocumented students.
- Conduct educational forums focused on perceptions of privilege from gender perspectives.
- Improve campus aesthetics with cultural and historical artifacts from all populations and eras represented in the Gateway community.
- Publicly clarify and distinguish Gateway diversity expectations for alignment of constituent behaviors and daily engagement/business practices.

Institutional Senior-Level Representation/Composition – The college intentionally plans for the attraction of underrepresented professionals at senior levels and creates mechanisms for relevant recruitment, onboarding, retention, promotion, and pipeline development. *Diverse representation at positions of president, provost, VP, dean, department head, etc.*

- Centralize plans and accountability for Gateway’s attractiveness to underrepresented professionals.
- Develop rigorous and concerted retention programs to improve the diversity index of underrepresented faculty, staff, and administrators.
- Institutionalize hiring processes that attract underrepresented professionals.
- Refine data collection processes to assess turnover circumstances for underrepresented professionals.
- Showcase Gateway system and local community diversity milestones at public, athletic, and cultural venues.

Conclusions

Findings associated with this study, while unique to Gateway, reflected the need for transformative leadership and diversity innovation that was currently in demand across the United States. As the country became more diverse, higher education institutions needed to respond in advance, not in turn, by attuning to best practices for serving students with multiple identities, from different backgrounds, economies, and upbringings.

Significant findings revealed in the Executive Summary included differences found in religious perceptions, expectations for diversity training, perceptions of worldviews, feelings of campus welcoming, safety, and towards Gateway’s overall climate. With none of these differences ranking as priority over the others from the position of the consultant, it seemed clear that building a fully supported, robust, and modernized diversity administration would be an essential step and awaited measure of Gateway’s commitment to addressing gaps in constituent perceptions, which underscored its current climate, especially for students who identified as veterans and underrepresented staff. Moreover, how recommendations were prioritized, approached, measured, and assessed for progress would add to the longevity of this research as well as exponential instances of return on investment.

As noted, recommendations were provided within the IPTs, which was a framework for transformative climate change created by CoopLew, LLC, that allowed for compartmentalized analyses of significant facets of institutional infrastructure. Examination of recommendations within the scope of respective Pillars was hoped to prove helpful to (1) better understand how macro-level diversity decisions impacted campus climate, and (2) identify specific units with individual Pillar responsibility for revised measures/standards of operation and accountability.

Further, examining the results of the study within the Pillars framework was proposed to provide an array of insights that served to identify a chain of impact from Gateway’s publicly declared diversity values to individual behaviors that existed as criteria for annual performance. Usage of the Pillars was also proposed to shed light on structural misalignments that provided a haven for different practices that thwarted college-wide efforts for climate transformation.

The Gateway senior team was encouraged to review findings in this report repeatedly and especially before establishing new diversity-related policies and practices. CoopLew, LLC, was available for further consultation and partnership in Gateway diversity organizational developments after the release of this report.



Recommendations

Institutional Leadership & Commitment – The college demonstrates an ongoing commitment to expectations for integrated and intersected behaviors, resource investment, public communications, diversity-related expansions, and mission significance. *Content of planning and strategic documents, reward patterns, frequency and security of accountability assessments, etc.*

- Reframe the purpose of this campus climate survey to the campus population.
 - Emphasize that the use of the study was to examine diversity and inclusion on campus, as many respondents were confused about its purpose.
- Develop and distribute policy and accountability measures for administrative leaders and board member diversity training.
 - Charge a task force to assess diversity deficiencies among senior and board members.
 - Establish onboarding processes for new senior administrators and board members that identify diversity-related responsibilities for which they will be held accountable.
- Expand infrastructure for diversity leadership, advocacy, and accountability.
 - Establish an administrative position for equity, inclusion, and retention (Vice President).
 - Assess support needs for a chief diversity officer's exercise of authority throughout the Gateway system.
- Establish on-going campus climate assessments.
 - Ensure that qualitative and quantitative climate research efforts occur in synchronized fashion every 3-4 years.
 - Utilize a central senior-level officer to administer and track Gateway transformation.
 - Individual Gateway site outreach and assessment so that each site receives equal attention to site-based circumstances.
- Position diversity as a core responsibility for Gateway personnel.
 - Possibly revisit Gateway's mission to examine how diversity and inclusion can be core elements if desired.
 - Acknowledge belief/trust in students' sense of a welcoming campus and establish annual performance criteria directly related to Gateway diversity core values.
 - Work with academic leadership to improve administration/faculty relations.
- Reconstruct award and recognition criteria to include diversity-based innovation.
- Ensure that provisions for constituent feedback are secure and privileged from retaliation.

Institutional Curricular & Co-Curricular Accountability – The college integrates tenets for accountability throughout its infrastructure that measure the progress of diversity-related scholarly, co-curricular, administrative, and programmatic activity. *Integrated activities, diversity pedagogy, promotion, tenure, award achievement, training, affinity, discipline, etc.*

- Create and review the impact of cross-site and integrated Gateway activities.
 - Seek out focus groups of various identity groups to examine how similar or different their experiences are on campus.
 - Assign coalitions to corral underrepresented populations, discuss inequities perceived, and design awareness campaign for eradication.
- Create scenario-based diversity issues to explore faculty efficacy and demonstration of classroom equity and inclusion.
 - Address faculty and staff insights about students’ sense of “safety” and “support.”
- Hold process forums to educate constituents about efforts taken to ensure inclusive engagement of intended audiences.
 - Allow staff to educate about diversity considerations embedded in co-curricular programs.
 - Allow faculty to demonstrate expertise gained from diversity training and how this is applied in their classrooms.
 - Allow administrators to demonstrate how measures to reduce bias in admissions and placement should be evaluated.
 - Allow police officers to demonstrate expertise gained from diversity training and how this is applied when dealing with African American/Black individuals and adversity to their armed presence.
- Support student and staff affinities that forward Gateway aspirations for climate change.
- Create a campus culture where diversity and inclusion initiatives are made more visible.
 - Develop training modules that provoke measurable behavioral and perception changes in staff approaches to diverse students, orientations, and professionals.

Institutional Climate – The college intentionally creates, publicizes, and enforces events, messages, symbols, and values that impact the degree to which all students, faculty, and staff experience a welcoming environment. *Multicultural events, climate assessments, community-college partnerships, Title IX, ADA, EEOC, architecture, marketing, etc.*

- Gather more information regarding why diversity is not a central focus of campus culture.
 - Record why many individuals feel diversity and inclusion are not meaningful on campus.
 - Educate about why Gateway emphasizes diversity and inclusion.
- Enhance multicultural events with pre-event dialogues, assessment, and inquiry.

- Institutionalize how religious preferences are recognized and supported.
 - Conduct forums to address student religious expressions by identity.
 - Provide workshops that address gender bias in religious expression.
- Conduct forums to assess staff perceptions about the plight of Caucasian/White and undocumented students.
 - Seek to establish accountability for equity in behavior towards all Gateway students.
- Conduct educational forums focused on perceptions of privilege from gender perspectives.
 - Address student perceptions about gender privilege at Gateway.
 - Address faculty and administration's perceptions about gender privilege at Gateway.
- Improve campus aesthetics with cultural and historical artifacts from all populations and eras represented in the Gateway community.
- Publicly clarify and distinguish Gateway diversity expectations for alignment of constituent behaviors and daily engagement/business practices.

Institutional Senior-Level Representation/Composition – The college intentionally plans for the attraction of underrepresented professionals at senior levels and creates mechanisms for relevant recruitment, onboarding, retention, promotion, and pipeline development. *Diverse representation at positions of president, provost, VP, dean, department head, etc.*

- Centralize plans and accountability for Gateway's attractiveness to underrepresented professionals.
 - Plan to create and support the position of Chief Diversity Officer
 - Identify core system-wide responsibilities needing diversity administrative leadership.
 - Identify and prepare unit leaders for reporting and support to a chief diversity officer.
- Develop rigorous and concerted retention programs to improve the diversity index of underrepresented faculty, staff, and administrators.
- Institutionalize hiring processes that attract underrepresented professionals.
 - Create incentives to hire a Safety and Security force that has demonstrated its application of communication techniques learned from diversity training.
- Refine data collection processes to assess turnover circumstances for underrepresented professionals.
- Showcase Gateway system and local community diversity milestones at public, athletic, and cultural venues.