

University of South Dakota

USD RED

Inclusive Science Initiative Program

7-2019

Program Evaluation 2018 – 2019(Annual Report)

The Government Research Bureau

Follow this and additional works at: <https://red.library.usd.edu/isi>

Recommended Citation

The Government Research Bureau, "Program Evaluation 2018 – 2019(Annual Report)" (2019). *Inclusive Science Initiative Program*. 5.

<https://red.library.usd.edu/isi/5>

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by USD RED. It has been accepted for inclusion in Inclusive Science Initiative Program by an authorized administrator of USD RED. For more information, please contact dloftus@usd.edu.

University of South Dakota
Howard Hughes Medical Institute Grant
Program Evaluation 2018 - 2019
Prepared by the Government Research Bureau
Updated | July 2019

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
Introduction.....	3
Institutional Data	3
Faculty and Staff Survey	4
Wawokiya Mentoring Program.....	40
Entering Mentoring Evaluations.....	45
Crossroads Workshop	51

Introduction

In September 2017, the HHMI project contracted with USD's Government Research Bureau (GRB) to conduct an evaluation of grant performance. The evaluation includes three primary elements, the reporting of three essential institutional data points, a campus climate survey administered to all faculty and staff, and a quantitative summary of research productivity from the grant. While it is too early in the life of the grant for research to have been presented or published, this report will summarize the first two elements to date. This report also includes summary evaluations of project activities. This second annual report will summarize available data for this year while also drawing comparisons with data from last year when appropriate.

Institutional Data

In developing grant goals, the project team decided on the following essential outcomes for the project:

- An increase in the number of American Indian, black and Hispanic students enrolled in science majors, with an annual average growth of 6-8% during and immediately after the funded period (annual increase based).
- An increase in the retention of American Indian, black and Hispanic students in the sciences, with an annual average growth in the First-time Full-time retention rate of 10-15% during and immediately after the funded period.
- An increase in the number of science degrees awarded to American Indian, black and Hispanic students, with an annual average growth of 6-8% during and immediately after the funded period.

To assess progress toward these goals going forward, we established a baseline for each of these data points for fall 2017. Table 1, on the next page, provides the data for each of these measures for the fall 2017 compared to fall 2018. For each measure we include both a narrow interpretation of science degrees (labeled as N) including just Biology, Chemistry, Medical Biology, Physics, and Sustainability majors as well as a broader interpretation of STEM fields (labeled as B) which includes all of the above as well as Addiction Studies, Communication Sciences and Disorders, Computer Science, Health Sciences, Mathematics, Medical Laboratory Science, Nursing, Political Science, Psychology, Social Work and Sociology. All data is reported for undergraduate (UG) students only.

Table 1: Institutional Data on Minority Representation in UG Science Degrees Fall 2017 and 2018

	American Indian		Black		Hispanic		White	
	N	B	N	B	N	B	N	B
Enrollment in science majors								
2017	11	45	16	69	23	102	473	1896
2018	10	43	15	65	22	104	472	1930
First year retention for science majors¹								
2017	71.4%	57.4%	66.7%	60.3%	70.0%	60.7%	82.8%	79.2%
2018	63.3%	52.8%	64.1%	68.5%	77.8%	72.3%	80.6%	73.8%
Fourth year retention for science majors								
2017	50.0%	36.8%	50.0%	40.9%	45.0%	36.8%	72.5%	66.6%
2018	46.2%	30.7%	50.0%	44.3%	52.6%	41.3%	69.4%	55.2%
Number of science degrees awarded								
2017	1	7	0	9	3	14	89	534
2018	5	14	0	10	3	19	80	459

It would be unrealistic to expect significant change in these specific student outcomes during the first year of grant implementation. The data in Table 1 are consistent with that expectation. While the total number of science degrees awarded was slightly lower in 2018 than in 2017 for both the narrow and broad definitions of the measure, there were no other notable changes from the baseline established in the previous year.

Faculty and Staff Survey

One of the goals of the HHMI grant project is to ultimately change improve the institutional culture as it relates to diversity. Institutional culture includes “the attitudes, dispositions, beliefs, and values of campus stakeholders and their influence on institutional practices and policies.”² To evaluate improvement in institutional culture, we will track survey responses over time. The GRB developed the survey instrument in coordination with students enrolled in an Applied Government Research course in Fall 2017. The GRB Director and students canvassed the existing research and available instruments to

¹ Data for retention rates includes initial enrollments from fall 2006 to fall 2017. The percentage includes students who are still enrolled or have completed a Bachelor’s degree.

² PIER:Progress towards Inclusive Excellence through Reflection document

develop a comprehensive survey instrument that would both evaluate improvements over time and allow for the grant project to identify specific areas for improvement. In fall of 2018, we deleted a handful of questions that were determined to be redundant. The revised survey instrument is included as Appendix A. The survey was sent via email to all campus faculty and staff and was open for completion from February 22 – April 9, 2019. We received a total of 194 valid responses. To provide some context of the diversity of respondents, Table 2 provides a breakdown of respondents by reported ethnicity. It is important to note that not all respondents answered this question.

Table 2: Survey Respondent Ethnicity Spring 2019

	Black/ African American	Native American/ American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian American/ Pacific Islander	Hispanic/Latino American	Multiracial/ Biracial	White/ Euro- American
Faculty	1	3	3	3	1	53
Staff	3	2	3	3	3	58
Total	4	5	6	6	4	111

While the goal of the project is to improve the institutional culture overall, we are particularly interested in the perceptions and beliefs of faculty, especially those that teach in the sciences. Hence, responses are first presented for only science faculty and all faculty. Then, results for staff are presented in brief. We expect improvements over time to be most concentrated among science faculty. However, including the other data points provides a more comprehensive assessment of institutional culture.

Science Faculty and All Faculty

A total of 35 faculty in science related fields completed the survey³. Of those 7 (20%) were in the non-medical natural sciences and 28 (80%) were in Health and Biomedical Sciences. In addition, 14 (40%) indicated they were female, and 18 (51%) indicated male.⁴ The overwhelming majority of science faculty respondents (71.4%) indicated that they were white of non-Hispanic origin, 3 respondents (7.1%) indicated they were Hispanic, 3 respondents (7.1%) indicated they were Asian American/Pacific Islander, 2 respondents (4.8%) indicated they were Native American/American Indian/Alaskan Native, 2 respondents (4.8%) indicated they were other, and one respondent (2.4%) indicated they were Black/African-American.

Survey questions were grouped into relevant blocks. Table 3, on the next page, provides science faculty and all faculty responses for the first block of questions. These questions asked faculty to reflect on their perspectives and awareness of the student experience of diverse students.

³ For the purpose of this survey, “Science Faculty” include any faculty that indicated there were a in the Natural Sciences or Health and Biomedical Sciences

⁴ Three respondents did not answer this question.

Table 3: Spring 2019 Science Faculty and All Faculty Survey Responses Q1 – Q9⁵

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements:									
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know	Total N
Q1	Family structure often affects students' academic decisions.	Science Faculty	48.6% (30.6%)	48.6% (55.6%)	2.9% (8.3%)	0.0% (0.0%)	0.0% (0.0%)	0.0% (5.6%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	43.2% (43.4%)	53.1% (48.2%)	2.5% (4.8%)	0.0% (0.0%)	0.0% (0.0%)	1.23% (3.6%)	81 (83)
Q2	Socioeconomic status often affects students' perceptions.	Science Faculty	48.6% (44.4%)	42.9% (50.0%)	5.71% (0.0%)	2.9% (0.0%)	0.0% (0.0%)	0.0% (5.6%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	50.6% (50.6%)	42.0% (44.6%)	4.9% (2.4%)	1.23% (0.0%)	0.0% (0.0%)	1.23% (2.4%)	81 (83)
Q3	It is important to hold all students to the same expectations regardless of individual circumstances.	Science Faculty	8.6% (16.7%)	42.9% (33.3%)	14.3% (16.7%)	25.7% (30.6%)	8.6% (0.0%)	0.0% (2.8%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	12.4% (15.6%)	35.8% (37.4%)	18.5% (18.1%)	27.2% (25.3%)	6.2% (2.4%)	0.0% (1.2%)	81 (83)
Q4	I am aware of prominent issues on Native American reservations.	Science Faculty	25.7% (25.0%)	60.0% (55.6%)	8.6% (8.3%)	5.7% (2.8%)	0.0% (5.6%)	0.0% (2.8%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	25.9% (26.5%)	60.5% (57.8%)	9.9% (4.8%)	3.7% (4.8%)	0.0% (3.6%)	0.0% (2.4%)	81 (83)
Q5	I am aware of prominent issues in inner city communities.	Science Faculty	25.7% (13.9%)	48.6% (52.8%)	14.3% (11.1%)	8.6% (11.1%)	0.0% (8.3%)	2.9% (2.8%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	23.8% (19.5%)	47.5% (53.7%)	17.5% (13.4%)	7.5% (7.3%)	1.3% (4.9%)	2.5% (1.2%)	81 (83)
Q6	I am aware of the educational challenges faced by diverse racial and ethnic groups.	Science Faculty	34.3% (8.3%)	51.4% (58.3%)	11.4% (19.4%)	2.9% (5.6%)	0.0% (2.8%)	0.0% (5.6%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	30.9% (19.3%)	59.3% (60.2%)	8.6% (12.1%)	1.2% (3.6%)	0.0% (2.4%)	0.0% (2.4%)	81 (83)

⁵ 2018 responses are in parentheses

Table 3: Spring 2019 Science Faculty and All Faculty Survey Responses Q1 – Q9 Continued

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements:									
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know	Total N
Q7	I am aware of the different teaching traditions of other cultures.	Science Faculty	11.4% (5.6%)	48.6% (27.8%)	20.0% (22.2%)	20.0% (33.3%)	0.0% (8.3%)	0.0% (2.8%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	14.8% (4.8%)	51.6% (36.1%)	16.1% (19.3%)	14.8% (31.3%)	1.2% (6.0%)	1.2% (2.4%)	81 (83)
Q8	I value efforts to expand access to and achievement in my discipline by all students.	Science Faculty	65.7% (63.9%)	34.3% (27.8%)	0.0% (2.8%)	0.0% (2.8%)	0.0% (0.0%)	0.0% (2.8%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	61.7% (60.2%)	35.8% (32.5%)	0.0% (4.8%)	1.2% (1.2%)	0.0% (0.0%)	1.2% (1.2%)	81 (83)
Q9	I enjoy interacting with people from different cultures.	Science Faculty	74.3% (33.3%)	22.9% (52.8%)	2.9% (11.1%)	0.0% (2.8%)	0.0% (0.0%)	0.0% (0.0%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	70.4% (34.9%)	27.2% (50.6%)	2.5% (8.4%)	0.0% (6.0%)	0.0% (0.0%)	0.0% (0.0%)	81 (83)

There are a few noteworthy patterns in the responses. First, within the 2019 responses, the responses of all faculty members are not substantially different from those of science faculty alone. This is a change from last year in which science faculty were less likely to indicate strong agreement to the statements:

- Family structure often affects students' academic decisions. (Moved from 30.6% in 2018 to 43.4% in 2019).
- Different people are subject to different social expectations. (Moved from 30.6% in 2018 to 40.1% in 2019).
- I am aware of the sociocultural characteristics of diverse racial and ethnic groups. (Moved from 8.3% in 2018 to 17.1% in 2019).
- I am aware of the educational challenges faced by diverse racial and ethnic groups. (Moved from 8.3% in 2018 to 19.3% in 2019).

These changes indicate some improvement in awareness of science faculty members.⁶

Most statements received agreement from a substantial majority of both science faculty and all faculty. However, there were a few statements for which the majority was smaller or there was not a clear majority in agreement. These include:

- It is important to hold all students to the same expectations regardless of individual circumstances.
- I am aware of the different teaching traditions of other cultures.

In one case the statement is asking about a very specific knowledge base that faculty may not have been exposed to in their professional training. In the others, disagreement with the statements actually indicates a higher level of awareness of the role that individual circumstances can play and the challenges of adjusting to a different culture.

Table 4, on the next page displays the results of the next block of questions. These questions ask faculty to report on their perceptions and awareness of their behaviors in interacting with students.

⁶ Given the small number of observations, none of the changes reach the threshold of statistical significance.

Table 4: Spring 2019 Science Faculty and All Faculty Survey Responses Q10 – Q24⁷

When Interacting with Under Represented Minority (URM) students:									
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know	Total N
Q10	I realize my own background and experiences may influence my effectiveness.	Science Faculty	54.3% (47.2%)	42.9% (50.0%)	2.9% (0.0%)	0.0% (2.8%)	0.0% (0.0%)	0.0% (0.0%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	52.0% (51.8%)	42.9% (44.6%)	2.6% (0.0%)	1.3% (3.6%)	1.3% (0.0%)	0.0% (0.0%)	77 (83)
Q11	I am aware some teaching techniques will be less effective for URM students.	Science Faculty	28.6% (27.8%)	57.1% (47.3%)	14.3% (16.7%)	0.0% (0.0%)	0.0% (2.78%)	0.0% (5.6%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	31.6% (27.7%)	54.0% (49.4%)	11.8% (8.4%)	1.3% (2.4%)	1.3% (2.4%)	0.0% (9.6%)	77 (83)
Q12	I am aware lack of progress may be attributed to cultural differences.	Science Faculty	20.0% (11.1%)	65.7% (44.4%)	8.6% (30.6%)	5.7% (8.3%)	0.0% (0.0%)	0.0% (5.6%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	23.7% (13.3%)	60.5% (54.2%)	9.2% (19.3%)	5.3% (6.0%)	1.3% (0.0%)	0.0% (7.2%)	77 (83)
Q13	I am aware not all members of other socioeconomic groups think or act the same way.	Science Faculty	65.7% (38.9%)	34.3% (61.1%)	0.0% (0.0%)	0.0% (0.0%)	0.0% (0.0%)	0.0% (0.0%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	67.5% (48.2%)	31.2% (49.4%)	0.0% (2.4%)	0.0% (0.0%)	1.3% (0.0%)	0.0% (0.0%)	77 (83)
Q14	I am aware I may need to adjust teaching methods to meet students' cultural needs.	Science Faculty	31.4% (22.2%)	54.3% (58.3%)	11.4% (8.3%)	2.9% (5.6%)	0.0% (0.0%)	0.0% (5.6%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	34.2% (28.9%)	54.0% (51.8%)	9.2% (7.2%)	1.3% (8.4%)	1.3% (1.2%)	0.0% (2.4%)	77 (83)
Q15	I am aware of my own racial, ethnic, or cultural identity.	Science Faculty	54.3% (50.0%)	40.0% (44.4%)	5.7% (0.0%)	0.0% (2.8%)	0.0% (0.0%)	0.0% (2.8%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	54.0% (45.1%)	39.5% (51.2%)	5.3% (1.2%)	1.3% (0.0%)	0.0% (1.2%)	0.0% (1.2%)	77 (83)
Q16	I am aware of my own racial, ethnic, or cultural prejudices.	Science Faculty	31.4% (33.3%)	57.1% (52.8%)	11.4% (5.6%)	0.0% (2.8%)	0.0% (0.0%)	0.0% (5.6%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	36.8% (31.7%)	50.0% (51.2%)	11.8% (8.5%)	0.0% (3.7%)	1.3% (1.2%)	0.0% (3.7%)	77 (83)

Table 4: Spring 2019 Science Faculty and All Faculty Survey Responses Q10 – Q24 Continued

When Interacting with Under Represented Minority (URM) students:									
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know	Total N
Q17	I am aware I might have to change the way I socialize with students depending on their cultural background.	Science Faculty	40.0% (19.4%)	45.7% (61.1%)	11.4% (11.1%)	2.9% (2.8%)	0.0% (0.0%)	0.0% (5.6%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	37.7% (27.2%)	46.8% (55.6%)	10.4% (9.9%)	2.6% (4.9%)	1.3% (0.0%)	1.3% (2.5%)	77 (83)
Q18	I believe gender-neutral language makes everyone feel more included.	Science Faculty	34.3% (13.9%)	31.4% (50.0%)	25.7% (27.8%)	5.7% (5.6%)	2.9% (0.0%)	0.0% (2.8%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	35.1% (23.5%)	32.5% (35.8%)	20.8% (21.0%)	5.2% (14.8%)	5.2% (1.2%)	1.3% (3.7%)	77 (83)
Q19	It is important to have a student body that includes URM populations.	Science Faculty	71.4% (61.1%)	20.0% (38.9%)	8.6% (0.0%)	0.0% (0.0%)	0.0% (0.0%)	0.0% (0.0%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	62.7% (56.1%)	28.0% (34.2%)	8.0% (6.1%)	0.0% (1.2%)	0.0% (0.0%)	1.3% (2.4%)	77 (83)
Q20	It is important to have faculty that include URM populations.	Science Faculty	65.7% (60.0%)	28.6% (37.1%)	5.7% (2.8%)	0.0% (0.0%)	0.0% (0.0%)	0.0% (0.0%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	64.0% (53.1%)	29.3% (37.0%)	5.3% (7.1%)	0.0% (1.2%)	0.0% (0.0%)	1.3% (1.2%)	77 (83)
Q21	It is important to have staff that include URM populations.	Science Faculty	68.6% (58.3%)	11.4% (38.9%)	17.1% (2.8%)	2.9% (0.0%)	0.0% (0.0%)	0.0% (0.0%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	61.3% (52.4%)	25.3% (36.6%)	10.7% (9.8%)	1.3% (0.0%)	0.0% (0.0%)	1.3% (1.2%)	77 (83)
Q22	It is important to have administrators that include URM populations.	Science Faculty	68.6% (58.3%)	17.1% (38.9%)	11.4% (2.8%)	2.9% (0.0%)	0.0% (0.0%)	0.0% (0.0%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	59.2% (52.4%)	27.6% (36.6%)	10.5% (9.8%)	1.3% (0.0%)	0.0% (0.0%)	1.3% (1.2%)	77 (83)

⁷ 2018 responses are in parentheses

Table 4: Spring 2019 Science Faculty and All Faculty Survey Responses Q10 – Q24 Continued

When Interacting with Under Represented Minority (URM) students:									
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know	Total N
Q23	It is important for educational professionals to receive training in cultural diversity.	Science Faculty	54.3% (50.0%)	28.6% (41.7%)	8.6% (2.8%)	5.7% (5.6%)	0.0% (0.0%)	2.9% (0.0%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	55.3% (43.9%)	27.6% (37.8%)	10.5% (12.2%)	2.6% (3.7%)	2.6% (1.2%)	1.3% (1.2%)	77 (83)
Q24	It is important for educational professionals to receive training in multicultural pedagogy.	Science Faculty	48.6% (38.9%)	25.7% (47.2%)	17.1% (5.6%)	2.9% (5.6%)	2.9% (0.0%)	2.9% (2.8%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	50.0% (37.8%)	27.6% (42.7%)	15.8% (9.8%)	1.3% (4.9%)	2.6% (2.4%)	2.6% (2.4%)	77 (83)

Again, in all cases a majority of science faculty and all faculty agree or strongly agree with every statement. Science faculty are also not notably different from all faculty in response to any question.

This is a change from last year in which science faculty were slightly less likely to indicate strong agreement to the statements:

- I am aware I might have to change the way I socialize with students depending on their cultural background. (Moved from 19.4% in 2018 to 27.2% in 2019).
- I believe gender-neutral language makes everyone feel more included. (Moved from 13.9% in 2018 to 23.5% in 2019).

The next block of questions asked faculty to report specifically on actions they might take as a part of their normal teaching and advising practices. Table 5, on the next page, displays these responses.

Table 5: Spring 2019 Science Faculty and All Faculty Survey Responses Q25-Q30⁸

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements: In working with underrepresented students, I ...									
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know	Total N
Q25	Consider it an obligation to familiarize myself with their culture and history.	Science Faculty	28.6% (11.1%)	34.3% (41.7%)	28.6% (30.6%)	5.7% (11.1%)	0.0% (0.0%)	2.9% (5.6%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	29.2% (14.3%)	39.0% (37.7%)	27.8% (29.9%)	2.8% (15.6%)	0.0% (0.0%)	1.4% (2.6%)	72 (78)
Q26	Am able to understand and relate to their culture and experiences.	Science Faculty	14.3% (5.6%)	45.7% (27.8%)	31.4% (36.1%)	8.6% (19.4%)	0.0% (0.0%)	0.0% (11.1%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	15.3% (7.7%)	41.7% (33.3%)	34.7% (32.1%)	8.3% (16.7%)	0.0% (2.6%)	0.0% (7.7%)	72 (78)
Q27	Am sensitive to their fear of racism or prejudice.	Science Faculty	48.6% (20.0%)	48.6% (60.0%)	2.9% (11.4%)	0.0% (0.0%)	0.0% (0.0%)	0.0% (8.6%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	38.9% (26.0%)	52.8% (58.4%)	5.6% (9.1%)	0.0% (1.3%)	0.0% (1.3%)	0.0% (3.9%)	72 (78)
Q28	Consider the implications of what is being taught in relation to each student's identity (unique dispositions, behaviors, and experiences).	Science Faculty	14.3% (2.8%)	57.1% (58.3%)	17.1% (27.8%)	11.4% (2.8%)	0.0% (0.0%)	0.0% (8.3%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	18.1% (11.5%)	58.3% (60.3%)	16.7% (18.0%)	6.9% (3.9%)	0.0% (0.0%)	0.0% (6.4%)	72 (78)
Q29	Change my verbal behavior (accent or tone) when a cross-cultural interaction requires it.	Science Faculty	20.0% (2.8%)	42.9% (30.6%)	28.6% (27.8%)	2.9% (16.7%)	0.0% (2.8%)	5.7% (19.4%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	16.7% (9.0%)	38.9% (28.2%)	31.9% (33.3%)	4.2% (15.4%)	2.8% (2.6%)	5.6% (11.5%)	72 (78)
Q30	Change my nonverbal behavior when a cross-cultural situation requires it	Science Faculty	14.3% (2.8%)	54.3% (36.1%)	25.7% (22.2%)	0.0% (16.7%)	0.0% (2.8%)	25.7% (19.4%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	13.9% (12.8%)	45.8% (37.2%)	29.2% (21.8%)	2.8% (12.8%)	2.8% (2.6%)	5.6% (12.8%)	72 (78)

⁸ 2018 responses are in parentheses

Again, in all cases a majority of science faculty and all faculty agree or strongly agree with every statement. However, more faculty also opted for the “Neither agree nor disagree” category indicating less certainty or more neutral feels about their responses to these questions. In most cases the responses of all faculty members are not dramatically different from those of science faculty alone. There is one exception. Science faculty were slightly more likely to indicate strong agreement to the statement:

- In working with underrepresented students, I am sensitive to their fear of racism or prejudice.

Despite the increase in responses in the “Neither agree nor disagree” category, there is a slight increase in “Strongly Agree” and “Agree” from last year’s report for many questions and fewer responses in the “Don’t Know” category. For example, last year only 11.1% of science faculty indicated that they strongly agree with the statement “I consider it an obligation to familiarize myself with their culture and history”, compared to 28.6% this year.

The next block of questions ask faculty to report on specific behaviors in which they might engage. Those responses are reported in Table 6, on the next page.

Table 6: Spring 2019 Science Faculty and All Faculty Survey Responses Q31-34⁹

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements:									
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know	Total N
Q31	I volunteer my time toward programs at the University of South Dakota that add to my experience and knowledge of other cultures.	Science Faculty	20.0% (11.1%)	22.9% (44.4%)	31.4% (22.2%)	20.0% (19.4%)	5.7% (0.0%)	0.0% (2.8%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	17.1% (18.2%)	32.9% (33.8%)	27.1% (22.1%)	18.6% (23.4%)	4.3% (1.3%)	0.0% (1.3%)	70 (77)
Q32	I regularly read a periodical that supports cultural views very different from my own.	Science Faculty	17.1% (8.3%)	22.9% (22.2%)	34.3% (19.4%)	17.1% (30.6%)	5.7% (11.1%)	2.9% (8.3%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	14.3% (15.6%)	32.9% (27.3%)	25.7% (15.6%)	21.4% (28.6%)	4.3% (7.8%)	1.4% (5.2%)	70 (77)
Q33	I consider representation of diverse and minority perspectives when designing the readings list for my courses.	Science Faculty	11.4% (0.0%)	22.9% (19.4%)	48.6% (36.1%)	8.6% (25.0%)	8.6% (8.3%)	0.0% (11.1%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	18.6% (14.3%)	35.7% (31.2%)	32.9% (22.1%)	8.6% (22.1%)	4.3% (3.9%)	0.0% (6.5%)	70 (77)
Q34	I participate in cultural events and programming that add to my experience and knowledge of other cultures.	Science Faculty	20.0% (16.7%)	48.6% (47.2%)	20.0% (22.2%)	8.6% (8.3%)	2.9% (2.8%)	0.0% (2.8%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	22.5% (19.5%)	46.5% (50.7%)	21.1% (16.9%)	8.5% (9.1%)	1.4% (1.3%)	0.0% (2.6%)	70 (77)

In this block we see more differences between science faculty and all faculty. For example, when asked if they regularly read a periodical that supports cultural views very different from their own, only 40% of science faculty indicated agreement, compared to 47.15% of all faculty. Likewise, only 34.29% of science faculty indicated that they consider representation of diverse and minority perspectives when designing the readings list for their courses, compared to 54.28% of all faculty. Changes from 2018 are a bit mixed. In 2019, only 42.9% of science faculty agreed that they volunteer time toward programs at the University of South

⁹ 2018 responses are in parentheses

Dakota that add to my experience and knowledge of other cultures, down from 55.5% in 2018. However, the rate of agreement for science faculty increased from 19.4% in 2018 to 34.3% in 2019 for considering representation of minority and diverse perspectives when designing the readings list for courses. Within this block, we can also see that there is room for substantial improvement for all faculty on most of these questions. Table 7, on the next page, presents the results from our next block of questions. These questions pertain to the organizational behavior of the faculty member's department and/or college.

Table 7: Spring 2019 Science Faculty and All Faculty Survey Responses Q35-48¹⁰

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements: In my department/college we...									
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know	Total N
Q35	Discuss the importance of diversity and inclusive excellence in our faculty meetings.	Science Faculty	20.0% (33.3%)	48.6% (33.3%)	11.4% (5.6%)	14.3% (16.7%)	2.9% (5.6%)	2.9% (5.6%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	21.2% (20.3%)	43.9% (40.5%)	16.7% (5.4%)	15.2% (17.6%)	1.5% (8.1%)	1.5% (8.1%)	66 (74)
Q36	Integrate inclusive excellence related measures into measurement and continuous quality improvement activities	Science Faculty	17.1% (11.1%)	40.0% (33.3%)	20.0% (16.7%)	8.6% (19.4%)	2.9% (5.6%)	11.4% (13.9%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	21.5% (10.8%)	32.3% (35.1%)	26.2% (13.5%)	10.8% (20.3%)	3.1% (8.1%)	6.2% (12.2%)	66 (74)
Q37	Conduct ongoing assessments of the department's/college's inclusive excellence related activities.	Science Faculty	17.1% (8.3%)	40.0% (38.9%)	14.3% (13.9%)	14.3% (16.7%)	2.9% (8.3%)	11.4% (13.9%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	18.8% (9.5%)	31.3% (35.1%)	26.6% (14.9%)	12.5% (17.6%)	1.6% (10.8%)	9.4% (12.2%)	66 (74)
Q38	Collect and maintain accurate and reliable demographic data to monitor the impact of inclusive excellence on student success and outcomes	Science Faculty	22.9% (16.7%)	20.0% (30.6%)	22.9% (11.1%)	11.4% (8.3%)	5.7% (8.3%)	17.1% (25.0%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	18.8% (12.3%)	18.8% (28.8%)	31.3% (12.3%)	15.6% (11.0%)	3.1% (12.3%)	12.5% (23.3%)	66 (74)
Q39	Establish culturally responsive goals and policies, for the department.	Science Faculty	17.1% (16.7%)	20.0% (25.0%)	25.7% (19.4%)	20.0% (22.2%)	5.7% (8.3%)	11.4% (8.3%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	15.6% (12.3%)	29.9% (21.9%)	25.0% (21.9%)	20.3% (21.0%)	3.1% (12.3%)	6.3% (11.0%)	66 (74)

¹⁰ 2018 responses are in parentheses

Table 7: Spring 2019 Science Faculty and All Faculty Survey Responses Q35-48 Continued

			Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements: In my department/college we...						
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know	Total N
Q40	Create departmental conflict and grievance resolution processes that are culturally responsive to identify, prevent, and resolve conflicts or complaints.	Science Faculty	14.3% (8.3%)	20.0% (19.4%)	28.6% (19.4%)	11.4% (22.2%)	11.4% (5.6%)	14.3% (25.0%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	10.9% (6.9%)	25.0% (12.3%)	28.1% (26.0%)	17.2% (21.9%)	6.3% (11.0%)	12.5% (21.9%)	66 (74)
Q41	Communicate the department's/college's progress in implementing and sustaining inclusive excellence to all constituents.	Science Faculty	14.3% (8.33%)	31.4% (30.6%)	25.7% (22.2%)	14.3% (16.7%)	8.6% (5.6%)	5.7% (16.7%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	15.4% (5.4%)	24.6% (27.0%)	29.2% (24.3%)	18.5% (17.6%)	4.6% (9.5%)	7.7% (16.2%)	66 (74)
Q42	Conduct assessment of training needs for staff and faculty in inclusive excellence.	Science Faculty	11.4% (5.6%)	17.1% (30.6%)	25.7% (22.2%)	14.3% (19.4%)	17.1% (5.6%)	14.3% (16.7%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	9.4% (5.4%)	14.1% (21.6%)	31.3% (18.9%)	23.4% (23.0%)	12.5% (16.2%)	9.4% (14.9%)	66 (74)
Q43	Identify staff composition (ethnicity, race, language capabilities) in relation to the demographic composition of our students.	Science Faculty	17.1% (5.6%)	8.6% (25.0%)	25.7% (19.4%)	28.6% (16.7%)	8.6% (5.6%)	11.4% (27.8%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	14.1% (2.7%)	14.1% (21.6%)	26.6% (24.3%)	28.1% (20.3%)	6.3% (8.1%)	10.9% (23.0%)	66 (74)
Q44	Make use of other programs on campus that specialize in serving persons with diverse cultural backgrounds as a resource for faculty and staff training.	Science Faculty	17.1% (13.9%)	45.7% (41.7%)	11.4% (11.1%)	8.6% (8.3%)	0.0% (2.8%)	17.1% (22.2%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	15.6% (9.6%)	45.3% (37.0%)	18.8% (11.0%)	6.3% (16.4%)	1.6% (5.5%)	12.5% (20.6%)	66 (74)

Table 7: Spring 2019 Science Faculty and All Faculty Survey Responses Q35-48 Continued

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements: In my department/college we...									
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know	Total N
Q45	Maximize recruitment and retention efforts for staff who reflect the cultural diversity of our students.	Science Faculty	17.1% (8.3%)	20.0% (30.6%)	22.9% (16.7%)	11.4% (11.1%)	5.7% (5.6%)	22.9% (27.8%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	15.6% (8.2%)	25.0% (30.1%)	23.4% (15.1%)	14.1% (12.3%)	6.3% (11.0%)	15.6% (23.3%)	66 (74)
Q46	Maximize recruitment and retention efforts for faculty who reflect the cultural diversity of our students.	Science Faculty	11.4% (11.4%)	22.9% (34.3%)	22.9% (22.9%)	14.3% (11.4%)	5.7% (2.9%)	22.9% (17.1%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	12.7% (14.1%)	27.0% (32.4%)	23.8% (16.9%)	14.3% (11.3%)	4.8% (8.5%)	17.5% (16.9%)	66 (74)
Q47	Include the principles of inclusive excellence in staff orientation and ongoing training programs.	Science Faculty	17.1% (8.3%)	28.6% (44.4%)	20.0% (11.1%)	11.4% (11.1%)	0.0% (8.3%)	22.9% (16.7%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	14.1% (5.5%)	29.7% (32.9%)	21.9% (16.5%)	15.6% (13.7%)	1.6% (12.3%)	17.2% (19.2%)	66 (74)
Q48	Include the principles of inclusive excellence in faculty orientation and ongoing training programs.	Science Faculty	17.1% (8.3%)	25.7% (44.4%)	28.6% (13.9%)	8.6% (13.9%)	2.9% (8.3%)	17.1% (11.1%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	15.9% (8.2%)	25.4% (35.6%)	27.0% (16.4%)	15.9% (16.4%)	3.2% (11.0%)	12.7% (12.3%)	66 (74)

The responses to these questions are more varied than early blocks with fewer respondents indicating strong agreement and slightly more indicating disagreement. There were also more faculty indicating that they did not know the answer to the question. There do not, however, appear to be substantial differences between the science faculty as a subset and all faculty for these questions. It is worth noting that for several statements, less than a majority of respondents indicated agreement, though there were also no statements in which the majority indicated disagreement. Taken as a whole, this block confirms there is still substantial room for improvement when it comes to concrete actions taken at the department/college level.

When asked in an open-ended question about ways in which they have made departmental changes to establish a setting in which underrepresented students felt more confident about their ability to succeed, faculty highlighted other ways in which their departments have addressed this challenge:

- "We have a peer mentoring program, a tutoring program, and several student organizations with diverse faculty advisors. We also have an Inclusive Excellence and Diversity standing committee which conducts programming, e.g., speaker panels."
- "The most significant move we have made is to purposely diversify our faculty."
- "[We] participated in inclusive excellence and mentoring training."
- "We have a diversity statement included with our mission. We talk in faculty meetings that we set policies in our syllabus but consider individual students' circumstances when we implement them. We encourage all faculty to attend diversity events on campus."
- "[We] offer a variety of student groups that reflect the department's (and more specifically, the clinical psychology's) commitment to creating a welcoming/affirming environment for diverse students and faculty; offer diversity focused service and training; offer diversity focused courses
- "[We] try to recruit a diverse population when hiring tutors for the math emporium."
- "Faculty members have adopted a reasonably flexible approach to help underrepresented student complete course assignments and succeed in our programs."
- "Group activities and advising/mentoring."

Other faculty highlighted ways in which they have individual addressed this challenge:

- "I have worked with under-represented students in class- reaching out to them when they struggle to come in for extra instruction. (this is a personal, not departmental change)"
- "I have global and population centered classes, so we discuss other cultures, differences and the burden of disease."
- "Strives have been made at the program, not department level to welcome all students and incorporate responsive program policies"
- "I have received training through the HHMI grant on facilitating mentoring, which has inclusive content. I have gone to HHMI conferences that are focused on this topic and am going to another one this May. I have a mentoring component in my intro course and set up my office hours and locations to be inclusive for my students.

However, other faculty note that within their departments very little is being done in this area indicating that they either do not know of any actions being taken or that their department has not done anything.

Finally, one faculty member indicated that they did not think these activities were their responsibility, stating, "This is an administrative task."

When asked in an open-ended question about the ways they have assessed those departmental changes, faculty offered a few positive examples specifically related to inclusive excellence :

- "We do track the numbers of diverse students in our major. We recently developed goals relative to diversity/inclusivity that we track in Nuventive."
- "Pretty easy to compare the tutor population vs the general student population."
- "By looking at the attendance rates of my mentoring students coming to their schedule appointments. I've done some informal research and I noticed my first-generation college students or students of diverse backgrounds were not coming to their appointments set up in my office. Thus, I started changing and meeting them in buildings where they have classes so they would feel familiar with the area. My percentage of students attending their mentor meetings has increased. I also make sure that in my office has many artifacts that represent different cultural and religious groups so that they feel a sense of familiarity instead of just a sterile professors office."

Others indicated that they were engaged in assessment activities, but didn't explicitly mention diversity or inclusive excellence in their measures. For example,

- "We regularly assess our learning goals and objectives for all students. Each goal and learning objective are assessed a minimum of two times in each five-year cycle."
- "through program accreditation outcome evaluations; contact with students and faculty"
- "The program assesses the implicit as well as explicit structure of the curriculum and program"
- "Assessment is part of our external accreditation, which is required."

However, several faculty noted that they are unaware or have not noticed assessments and again others indicated that they did not think these activities were their responsibility but rather an administrative responsibility.

When asked in an open-ended question if there are there other specific visible actions or initiatives, both formal and informal, that they pursued in an effort to increase the participation and graduation rates of underrepresented groups, faculty highlighted both department and individual examples:

- "We have made a very purposeful step forward to recruit more international students with diverse backgrounds."
- "Our mentoring program is for all students and I think it helps connect faculty to all students, which is what inclusivity is all about."
- "working with academic advisors (Trio, athletics, etc); attend diversity focused training through the CTL; continue to attend to personal growth/development"
- "Whenever I go to a conference or training, I always come back and debrief my department in our next faculty meeting. I encourage my colleagues to attend as much diversity

activities on campus as possible by always emailing them and all of our students when those opportunities are. In sharing these diverse rich experiences with my faculty staff and my students I'm hoping that this helps with them on their path to cultural sensitivity to make our environment a more inclusive environment through the professors' interaction with the students and the other students' interaction with students of diverse backgrounds."

As was the case with the previous question, faculty also mentioned more general steps their departments were taking that explicitly target underrepresented students.

- "Individual faculty will mentor students as time and circumstances permit."
- "We excel in advising and mentoring for all program students"
- "We try to increase graduation rates for all students but have not looked for specific strategies for UG specifically."

And again, several other faculty noted that they are unaware or have not noticed actions or initiatives. Finally, one faculty member indicated frustration that they were being surveyed on the topic and stated,

- "Overall, I think everyone does a good job at being culturally sensitive. We should not be over focusing on cultural differences and "color", we are all people and need to be perceived by our character. I do not see color or other races, just people. We are all Americans and that should unite us - not constantly talk about under-represented as the social, economic and physical determinants affect everyone - white kids too! The social determinants are what should be focused on."

The next block of questions also pertains to activities at the department or college level. These responses are reported in Table 8 on the next page.

Table 8: Spring 2019 Science Faculty and All Faculty Survey Responses Q49-55¹¹

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements: In my department/college we...									
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know	Total N
Q49	Are informed about the university structures in place to address cross-cultural, ethical, and legal conflicts in education.	Science Faculty	17.1% (8.3%)	45.7% (33.3%)	14.3% (16.7%)	11.4% (30.6%)	5.7% (5.6%)	5.7% (5.6%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	15.4% (8.2%)	46.2% (38.4%)	10.8% (13.7%)	13.9% (24.7%)	7.8% (8.2%)	6.2% (6.9%)	65 (73)
Q50	Are informed about the university structures in place to address complaints or grievances by students about unfair, culturally insensitive, or discriminatory treatment.	Science Faculty	22.9% (13.9%)	34.3% (36.1%)	11.4% (19.4%)	14.3% (13.9%)	2.9% (11.1%)	14.3% (5.6%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	21.5% (9.6%)	36.9% (43.8%)	15.4% (15.1%)	12.3% (15.1%)	4.6% (11.0%)	9.2% (5.5%)	65 (73)
Q51	Are informed about the university structures in place to address complaints or grievances by faculty or staff about unfair, culturally insensitive, or discriminatory treatment.	Science Faculty	22.9% (8.3%)	34.3% (33.3%)	14.3% (22.2%)	11.4% (13.9%)	2.9% (8.3%)	14.3% (13.9%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	20.0% (5.5%)	35.4% (38.4%)	20.0% (19.2%)	10.8% (16.4%)	4.6% (13.7%)	9.2% (6.9%)	65 (73)
Q52	Are informed about the university structures in place to address complaints or grievances by students about difficulty in accessing services or denial of services.	Science Faculty	20.0% (16.7%)	31.4% (30.6%)	14.3% (11.1%)	22.9% (8.3%)	0.0% (8.3%)	11.4% (25.0%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	16.9% (5.5%)	33.9% (34.3%)	20.0% (17.8%)	16.9% (21.9%)	1.5% (10.0%)	10.7% (11.0%)	65 (73)

¹¹ 2018 responses are in parentheses

Table 8: Spring 2019 Science Faculty and All Faculty Survey Responses Q49-55 Continued

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements: In my department/college we...									
Q53	Are informed about the university structures in place to address complaints or grievances by faculty or staff about difficulty in accessing services or denial of services.	Science Faculty	17.1% (5.6%)	34.3% (30.6%)	14.3% (22.2%)	20.0% (22.2%)	0.0% (11.1%)	14.3% (8.3%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	16.3% (5.5%)	32.3% (37.0%)	16.9% (17.8%)	18.5% (21.9%)	3.1% (8.2%)	12.3% (10.0%)	65 (73)
Q54	Carefully follow university and BOR policy in addressing student complaints or grievances.	Science Faculty	25.7% (22.2%)	37.1% (41.7%)	11.4% (16.7%)	2.9% (0.0%)	0.0% (2.8%)	22.9% (16.6%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	29.2% (20.6%)	33.9% (45.2%)	12.3% (13.7%)	4.6% (1.4%)	1.5% (2.7%)	18.5% (16.4%)	65 (73)
Q55	Carefully follow university and BOR policy in addressing faculty complaints or grievances.	Science Faculty	22.9% (16.7%)	34.9% (33.3%)	11.4% (19.4%)	5.7% (2.8%)	2.9% (5.6%)	22.9% (22.2%)	35 (36)
		All Faculty	26.2% (16.4%)	30.8% (39.7%)	10.8% (15.1%)	6.2% (5.5%)	6.2% (5.5%)	20.0% (17.8%)	65 (73)

In this block of questions there do not appear to be substantial differences between the science faculty as a subset and all faculty for these questions. There are some meaningful positive changes from last year though. When asked whether they were informed about the university structures in place to address cross-cultural, ethical, and legal conflicts in education, 62.8% of science faculty either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, up from 41.6% in 2018. The number of respondents indicating strong agreement also increased notably for these statements:

- In my department/college we are informed about the university structures in place to address complaints or grievances by students about unfair, culturally insensitive, or discriminatory treatment.
- In my department/college we are informed about the university structures in place to address complaints or grievances by faculty or staff about unfair, culturally insensitive, or discriminatory treatment.
- In my department/college we are informed about the university structures in place to address complaints or grievances by faculty or staff about difficulty in accessing services or denial of services.

Similar changes were noted for all faculty.

Finally, faculty were also asked to rank the USD on a variety of aspects according to a multicultural organizational development model. For each question the scale ranged from 0-30 and was placed along the bottom of the figure below. Values 0-10 roughly corresponded to the monocultural category, 11-20 will the transitional, and 21-30 with the multicultural.

MONOCULTURAL		TRANSITIONAL		MULTICULTURAL	
<i>Exclusionary</i>	<i>Passive Club</i>	<i>Compliance</i>	<i>Affirming</i>	<i>Redefining</i>	<i>Multicultural</i>
Committed to the dominance, values, and norms of one group. Actively excludes in its mission and practices those who are not members of the dominant group.	Actively or passively excludes those who are not members of the dominant group. Includes other members only if they “fit” the dominant norm.	Passively committed to including others without making major changes. Includes only a few members of other groups.	Committed to making a special effort to include others, especially those in designated protected “classes.” Tolerates the differences that those others bring.	Actively works to expand its definition of inclusion, diversity and equity. Tries to examine and change practices that may act as barriers to members of non-dominant groups.	Actively includes a diversity of people representing different groups’ styles and perspectives. Continuously learns and acts to make the systemic changes required to value, include and be fair to all kinds of people.
Values and promotes the dominant perspective of one group, culture or style.		Seeks to integrate others into systems created under dominant norms.		Values and integrates the perspectives of diverse identities, cultures, styles and groups into the organization’s work and systems.	

Table 9 provides the results of these questions for both science faculty and all faculty for 2018 and 2019.

Table 9: Spring 2019 Science Faculty and All Faculty Survey Responses Multicultural Organizational Development Model¹²

Question		Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Dev
Slide the bar to where you perceive USD falls on this model with regard to policies and procedures.	Science Faculty	10 (10)	30 (25)	18.5 (17.2)	4.9 (3.8)
	All Faculty	0 (1)	30 (29)	17.6 (17.0)	5.9 (5.8)
Slide the bar to where you perceive USD falls on this model with regard to informal campus culture/norms.	Science Faculty	4 (4)	30 (25)	16.0 (13.5)	6.5 (4.6)
	All Faculty	0 (0)	30 (25)	14.9 (12.4)	6.3 (5.7)
Slide the bar to where you perceive USD falls on this model with regard to research.	Science Faculty	8 (4)	30 (27)	18.2 (14.3)	5.6 (5.6)
	All Faculty	1 (2)	30 (28)	16.7 (14.4)	6.5 (5.9)
Slide the bar to where you perceive USD falls on this model with regard to leadership.	Science Faculty	1 (3)	30 (30)	16.0 (14.8)	6.6 (6.9)
	All Faculty	0 (0)	30 (30)	18.1 (13.9)	6.4 (7.9)
Slide the bar to where you perceive USD falls on this model with regard to mission.	Science Faculty	5 (4)	30 (30)	19.2 (16.7)	5.6 (6.0)
	All Faculty	0 (0)	30 (30)	19.0 (17.2)	5.9 (6.2)
Slide the bar to where you perceive USD falls on this model with regard to student services and organizations.	Science Faculty	5 (4)	30 (30)	19.7 (17.9)	5.6 (6.0)
	All Faculty	0 (4)	30 (30)	19 (18.3)	5.9 (6.2)
Slide the bar to where you perceive USD falls on this model with regard to courses and instruction.	Science Faculty	2 (5)	30 (23)	17.5 (15.1)	5.7 (4.6)
	All Faculty	0 (3)	30 (30)	16.2 (14.6)	6.3 (5.7)

There are several things worth noting in Table 9. First, science faculty do not differ substantially from all faculty on any of these measures. Second, the mean values for every question place USD squarely in the transitional category, with mean scores ranging from 16.2 to 19.7 in 2019. Finally, there is slight improvement across a variety of measures from the same measure in 2018. While these are not large differences, they are moving in a positive direction.

¹² 2018 responses are in parentheses

Staff

University staff members were also included in the survey. While they are not directly targeted by the HHMI grant activities, their responses do provide one measure overall institutional culture as it relates to diversity. However, we will not explore these patterns in as great of depth. We provide below only the values from 2019 as they were not notably different on any measure between the two years. .

The first set of questions in this section (Q1-Q7) asked participants about their awareness of factors that may affect student's academic decisions and about their perceptions of and expectations for student responsibility, as well as their awareness of and attitudes towards cultural differences. Table 10, on the next page, presents the results from our next block of questions. A substantial majority of staff agreed that family structure (95.69%) and socioeconomic status (97.85%) affect students' academic decisions. A much smaller percentage, but still a majority, of staff (56.99%) agreed that it is important to hold students to the same expectations regardless of individual circumstances, while 22.58% neither agreed nor disagreed and 17.20% disagreed. The majority of staff agreed that they were aware of issues on Native American reservations (73.12%) and in inner cities (72.05%), but agreement was lower for inner city issues than Native American reservation issues. A majority (95.47%) of staff agree that they enjoy interacting with people of different cultures.

The next set of questions (Q8-Q19) assessed participants' perceptions and awareness of their behaviors in interacting with students. Table 11, on the following page, presents the results from our next block of questions.

Table 10: Spring 2019 Staff Responses Q1 – Q7

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements:								
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know	Total N
Q1	Family structure often affects students' academic decisions.	37.6%	58.1%	3.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	93
Q2	Socioeconomic status often affects students' perceptions.	47.3%	50.5%	1.1%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	93
Q3	It is important to hold all students to the same expectations regardless of individual circumstances.	22.6%	34.4%	22.6%	12.9%	4.3%	3.2%	93
Q4	I am aware of prominent issues on Native American reservations.	22.6%	50.5%	16.1%	6.5%	2.2%	2.2%	93
Q5	I am aware of prominent issues in inner city communities.	23.7%	48.4%	19.4%	6.5%	1.1%	1.1%	93
Q6	I am aware of the educational challenges faced by diverse racial and ethnic groups.	28.0%	58.1%	10.8%	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%	93
Q7	I enjoy interacting with people from different cultures.	57.0%	35.5%	6.5%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	93

Table 11: Spring 2019 Staff Responses Q8–Q19

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements: When interacting with Under Represented Minority (URM) students,								
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know	Total N
Q8	I realize my own background and experiences may influence my effectiveness.	45.5%	44.3%	5.7%	1.1%	2.3%	1.1%	88
Q9	I am aware not all members of other socioeconomic groups think or act the same way.	58.0%	38.6%	2.3%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	88
Q10	I am aware of my own racial, ethnic, or cultural identity.	48.9%	44.3%	4.6%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	88
Q11	I am aware of my own racial, ethnic, or cultural prejudices.	29.9%	49.4%	16.1%	3.5%	0.0%	1.2%	87
Q12	I am aware I might have to change the way I socialize with students depending on their cultural background.	37.5%	44.3%	11.4%	3.4%	2.3%	1.1%	88
Q13	I believe gender-neutral language makes everyone feel more included.	27.3%	27.3%	23.9%	10.2%	6.8%	4.6%	88
Q14	It is important to have a student body that includes URM populations.	43.0%	40.7%	10.5%	1.2%	0.0%	4.7%	86
Q15	It is important to have faculty that include URM populations.	45.5%	42.1%	5.7%	1.1%	0.0%	5.7%	88
Q16	It is important to have staff that include URM populations.	44.3%	38.6%	10.2%	1.1%	0.0%	5.7%	88
Q17	It is important to have administrators that include URM populations.	43.2%	38.6%	11.4%	1.1%	0.0%	5.7%	88
Q18	It is important for educational professionals to receive training in cultural diversity.	44.3%	45.5%	9.1%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	88
Q19	It is important for educational professionals to receive training in multicultural pedagogy.	39.8%	43.2%	11.4%	2.3%	0.0%	3.4%	88

The next block of questions asked staff to report specifically on actions they might take as a part of their normal advising practices and everyday interaction with students. Table 12 displays these responses.

Table 12: Spring 2019 Staff Responses Q20– Q24

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements:								
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know	Total N
Q20	Consider it an obligation to familiarize myself with their culture and history.	18.1%	38.6%	30.1%	10.8%	1.2%	1.2%	83
Q21	Am able to understand and relate to their culture and experiences.	10.8%	47.0%	28.9%	10.8%	0.0%	2.4%	83
Q22	Am sensitive to their fear of racism or prejudice.	30.1%	54.2%	12.1%	1.2%	0.0%	2.4%	83
Q23	Change my verbal behavior (accent or tone) when a cross-cultural interaction requires it.	14.5%	37.4%	31.3%	7.2%	2.4%	7.2%	83
Q24	Change my nonverbal behavior when a cross-cultural situation requires it.	14.5%	44.6%	26.5%	6.0%	0.0%	8.4%	83

A majority (56.62%) of staff agreed that have an obligation to familiarize themselves their students' culture and history, while 30.12% neither agree nor disagree. A majority (57.83%) also agreed that they are able to understand and relate to their students' culture and experience, although 28.92% neither agreed nor disagreed. A substantial majority (84.34%) of staff agreed that they sensitive to students' fear of racism or prejudice, with only 1.20% disagreeing. Furthermore, a majority of staff indicated that they change their verbal behavior (51.81%) and nonverbal behavior (59.04%) when a cross-cultural situation requires it.

Staff were also asked about time they volunteer towards cultural programs and their participation in cultural events. These responses are reported in Table 13, on the next page. A plurality (39.76%) agreed that they volunteer their time towards programs at the University of South Dakota that add to personal experiences and knowledge of other cultures, while 26.51% disagreed. However, a majority (55.42%) of staff agreed that they participate in cultural events and programs. A plurality (42.69%) agreed that they regularly read a periodical with culturally divergent views.

Table 13: Spring 2019 Staff Responses Q25– Q27

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements:								Total N
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know	
Q25	I volunteer my time toward programs at the University of South Dakota that add to my experience and knowledge of other	12.1%	27.7%	31.3%	21.7%	4.8%	2.4%	83
Q26	I regularly read a periodical that supports cultural views very different from my own.	9.8%	32.9%	24.4%	25.6%	7.3%	0.0%	82
Q27	I participate in cultural events and programming that add to my experience and knowledge of other cultures.	14.5%	41.0%	28.9%	8.4%	6.0%	1.2%	83

As was the case with faculty, staff were asked to report on the extent to which their department or colleges were engaging in particular activities to support inclusiveness. A larger proportion of staff indicated that they did not know about what their departments were doing, and a few staff indicated that they were not a part of any particular department or college on campus. The responses to these questions are reported in Tables 14 and 15 on the subsequent pages

Table 14: Spring 2019 Staff Responses Q28-41

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements: In my department/college we...								
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know	Total N
Q28	Discuss the importance of diversity and inclusive excellence in our faculty meetings.	17.1%	35.5%	17.1%	13.2%	1.3%	15.8%	76
Q29	Integrate inclusive excellence related measures into measurement and continuous quality improvement activities.	21.1%	36.8%	21.1%	6.6%	2.6%	11.8%	76
Q30	Conduct ongoing assessments of the department's/college's inclusive excellence related activities.	16.0%	22.7%	26.7%	13.3%	2.7%	18.7%	75
Q31	Collect and maintain accurate and reliable demographic data to monitor the impact of inclusive excellence on student success and outcomes.	16.0%	32.0%	18.7%	8.0%	5.3%	20.0%	75
Q32	Establish culturally responsive goals and policies, for the department.	14.5%	36.8%	21.1%	10.5%	2.6%	14.5%	76
Q33	Create departmental conflict and grievance resolution processes that are culturally responsive to identify, prevent, and resolve conflicts or complaints.	13.2%	17.1%	25.0%	14.5%	4.0%	26.3%	76
Q34	Communicate the department's/college's progress in implementing and sustaining inclusive excellence to all constituents.	10.5%	35.5%	21.1%	10.5%	5.3%	17.1%	76
Q35	Conduct assessment of training needs for staff and faculty in inclusive excellence.	11.8%	31.6%	22.4%	14.5%	6.6%	13.2%	76
Q36	Identify staff composition (ethnicity, race, language capabilities) in relation to the demographic composition of our students.	9.2%	21.1%	17.1%	22.4%	7.9%	22.4%	76

Table 14: Spring 2019 Staff Responses Q28-41 Continued

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements: In my department/college we...								
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know	Total N
Q37	Make use of other programs on campus that specialize in serving persons with diverse cultural backgrounds as a resource for faculty and staff training.	17.1%	40.8%	13.2%	10.5%	5.3%	13.2%	76
Q38	Maximize recruitment and retention efforts for staff who reflect the cultural diversity of our students.	11.8%	29.0%	22.4%	13.2%	6.6%	17.1%	76
Q39	Maximize recruitment and retention efforts for faculty who reflect the cultural diversity of our students.	9.2%	23.7%	25.0%	9.2%	6.6%	26.3%	76
Q40	Include the principles of inclusive excellence in staff orientation and ongoing training programs.	13.3%	33.3%	18.7%	13.3%	5.3%	16.0%	75
Q41	Include the principles of inclusive excellence in faculty orientation and ongoing training programs.	12.0%	24.0%	24.0%	5.3%	4.0%	30.7%	75

Table 15: Spring 2019 Staff Responses Q42-48

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements: In my department/college we...								
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know	Total N
Q42	Are informed about the university structures in place to address cross-cultural, ethical, and legal conflicts in education.	11.8%	52.6%	13.2%	9.2%	2.6%	10.5%	76
Q43	Are informed about the university structures in place to address complaints or grievances by students about unfair, culturally insensitive, or discriminatory treatment.	13.2%	48.7%	14.5%	6.6%	4.0%	13.2%	76
Q44	Are informed about the university structures in place to address complaints or grievances by faculty or staff about unfair, culturally insensitive, or discriminatory treatment.	11.8%	51.3%	9.2%	7.9%	5.3%	14.5%	76
Q45	Are informed about the university structures in place to address complaints or grievances by students about difficulty in accessing services or denial of services.	14.5%	43.4%	14.5%	7.9%	6.6%	13.2%	76
Q46	Are informed about the university structures in place to address complaints or grievances by faculty or staff about difficulty in accessing services or denial of services.	13.2%	46.1%	14.5%	7.9%	5.3%	13.2%	76
Q47	Carefully follow university and BOR policy in addressing student complaints or grievances.	22.4%	40.8%	13.2%	5.3%	2.6%	15.8%	76
Q48	Carefully follow university and BOR policy in addressing faculty complaints or grievances.	21.1%	40.8%	13.2%	4.0%	2.6%	18.4%	76

When asked in an open-ended question about ways in which they have made departmental changes to establish a setting in which underrepresented students felt more confident about their ability to succeed, staff highlighted multiple other ways in which their departments have addressed this challenge:

- "Our department offers gatherings specific to each program but invites the other programs to participate as well. Our programs are very diverse by design, thus crossing the cultural lines."
- "Participated in staff training, individual discussions, ongoing small and large groups. Actively work with local community leaders and educators to identify underrepresented group needs/goals and work to implement fulfilling those needs/goals in our recruitment and students' services offerings."
- "Through listening and responding to student feedback, which has been instrumental in the design of student support services"
- "Hierarchy level and student workshops, peer mentoring, faculty mentoring classes, inclusive teachings practices workshops, installation of lecture technology, developed Exploring Culture Awareness cards."
- "The department has invested in a student support center that provides students with advisors, faculty and staff who are committed to helping them succeed."
- "We have provided programming with nationally and locally recognized speakers directed to minority students. We have established peer mentoring that can help URM students succeed academically We have a dedicated study space for URM students"
- "Implementing a common read program that reflects experiences of a variety of students. Removing gender binary from application materials."

Other staff highlighted ways in which they have individually addressed this challenge:

- "I frequently attend events that are aimed at serving underrepresented students in order to connect with these students and demonstrate support of such programming. During or after the events, I often engage in Q&A's and provide input or feedback. I offer additional recommendations after the event when relevant. I also proactively invite and remind underrepresented students to apply for scholarship and internship opportunities and offer assistance with their application."
- "I worked with the AVP of Diversity to conduct a department wide training on the topics of unconscious bias and inclusive excellence. All leaders of our department were also asked to complete Safe Zone training. To date, I am the only one who has done so."
- "I try to imagine myself in other's shoes."

However, other staff note that within their departments very little is being done in this area or indicate that they have no capacity to make any departmental changes.

And others noted areas where the University is falling short, for example:

- "USD does well promoting underrepresented students. Where USD fails is with including people with developmental disabilities on campus. At this point only kindhearted university students and faculty/staff have championed awareness for the most underrepresented group in all societies."

- “Consider a real attitude about minorities in the practice and not only in the "theory". Also, the minority is not only Native American, we have many other cultures at campus that are minorities, but they do not pay attention on that!”

When asked in an open-ended question about the ways they have assessed those departmental changes, staff highlighted:

- “I assess the effectiveness of such events or policy implementation by gauging the number of students in attendance and by observing the level of engagement of these students. I also know the outcome of application submission should I be involved with the application process.”
- “I have personally assessed departmental changes. Have listened to how our recruitment efforts and student support services are helping our students succeed. As a marketer, I work to tell our underrepresented students' stories via photo, video, audio, testimonial mediums.”
- “I have taught a SPED class and invited people with disabilities to share experiences about the special education system and allowed them to advocate for a better system.”
- “Surveys, pre and post”
- “We recently implemented a new survey that students can complete to assess their academic advising experience.”
- “We annually measure retention and eligibility and graduation rates We also take measure of GPA, credits passes/failed We look at major selection among our population and compare to the UG pop.”

However, other staff note that they are unaware or have not noticed assessments:

- “As a department, we have not assessed the impact or changes resulting from increasing our focus on inclusion and diversity.”
- “We have inclusiveness-focused departmental goals, but we have not assessed them yet.

When asked in an open-ended question if there are there other specific visible actions or initiatives, both formal and informal, that they pursued in an effort to increase the participation and graduation rates of underrepresented groups, staff highlighted:

- “Yes, I actively engage underrepresented students by setting up biweekly meetings to get to know and understand their unique needs; I promote events geared toward serving or benefitting these students and often time invite them to go along; I reach out to the ones who are struggling with a particular subject and offer resources to them; I remind these students to finish their FAFSA application and apply for scholarships - so they have a great chance of securing financial assistance for coming academic year; I encourage and remind students to apply for summer internships and work on their applications with them, so as to build their confidence and boost their résumé; I provide one-on-one coaching on time management, goal-setting, or studying skills, etc”
- “Recruiting Native American students is a focus of our NSF REU program”

- "Fully utilize Coyote Connections."
- "I work to always be aware each day of our underrepresented students' needs/goals and establish relationships with said students."
- "Special Olympics College Club has made a significant impact about awareness. Now it is time to see USD establish a program for including people with disabilities in college or work training courses. Get them out of SESDAC, ABS, LIFESCAPE, etc. Although it is great seeing university volunteers at human service providers like SESDAC... people receiving services have reported to me that they feel isolated. If the university is going to send volunteers to places like this... it is only right for places like this to send volunteers into campus classes to build employment and social skills if the environment is appropriate."
- "I always try my best to resolve or find someone to resolve issues."
- "Our office gives funding to enhance curricular unit initiatives."
- "Becoming an adviser in student orgs to see where barriers pop up in student life of URMs."
- "Participating in faculty/staff committees that are focused on student tracking and retention."
- "Try to eliminate barriers to hiring students so they don't worry about finances and can concentrate on academics"
- "Faculty participate in cultural diversity committees on campus and advertise cultural diversity events and programs to students using the department listserv."
- "We have focused on expanding scholarship opportunities for underrepresented groups by promoting scholarships that only students of color are eligible for, and we are also encouraging other donors to lessen the significance of GPA in the scholarship MOA to account for students' access to resources and ability to focus on school. We also promote activities, events and resources across campus that serve underrepresented groups."
- "We coordinated an MLK event for the day with programming specifically targeting URM students"
- "Attending the entering mentoring seminars. Connecting students with scholarships that match their identities."

However, other staff note that they are unaware or have not noticed actions or initiatives. And as before, others indicated that they did not think these activities were their responsibility, for example:

Wawokiya Mentoring Program

In the fall of 2018, the program initiated the Wawokiya Mentoring Program that was designed to provide student to student mentoring experiences for Native American students. In the fall, 9 student mentors were identified. They began mentoring 9 student mentees in spring 2019 (3 of these mentees ultimately left USD during the spring semester). After the semester was completed, five of the remaining six students completed evaluation surveys that were created by program administrators. The GRB was not involved in the creation of this instruments but we entered and analyze the data from the completed hard copy surveys and provide a summary below. Table 16 provides a summary of the responses to the multiple-choice questions and a brief summary of qualitative comments follows.

Table 16: Spring 2019 Wawokiya Evaluation Summary

Question	Scale	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Dev.
Approximately how often did you interact with your ISI Wawokiya Mentor this semester?	1-5 (Not Often-Often)	3	5	4	1
How helpful do you feel these interactions were to you?	1-5 (Not Helpful – Helpful)	3	5	3.8	1.1
Was it difficult meeting with your ISI Wawokiya Mentee this semester?	1-5 (Difficult – Not difficult)	3	5	4	0.7
How would you rate your relationship with your ISI Wawokiya Mentor this semester?	1-5 (Bad – Good)	4	5	4.8	.4
How would you rate your interactions with the ISI Wawokiya Program Coordinator this semester?	1-5 (Bad – Good)	3	5	4.6	0.9
How satisfied were you with the overall ISI Wawokiya Mentoring Program this semester?	1-5 (Dissatisfied – Satisfied)	4	5	4.2	0.4
I would recommend the ISI Wawokiya Mentoring Program to other new USD students.	1-5 (Disagree - Agree)	4	5	4.4	0.5

Students were also asked a variety of open-ended questions in which they could provide more feedback. Overall, most students indicated satisfaction with their experience and would recommend it to other students. A full transcript of responses is provided below but a few observations are worth highlighting:

- **When asked about which interactions with their mentors were most helpful several students cited the study sessions or the assistance they received on planning their schedules. For example one student said, “My mentee and I consistently created weekly schedules, to-do lists, semester plans and goals, and homework and exam schedules that we referenced often in order to ensure that everything was being completed to the best of the mentee’s abilities. I believe that this was very helpful for stress and time management.”**
- **Similarly, when asked about the types of interactions they would like more of, mentees requested more actual tutoring or help studying for exams.**
- **Some students felt the program would be more effective if they were matched with a student that was the same major or if there was greater interaction with other student organizations on campus.**
- **Students also suggested that more meetings with the entire group and greater accountability for the mentors could improve the program.**

Wawokiya Mentor Program Qualitative Evaluations

1. What interactions with your ISI Wawokiya Mentee were the most helpful?

- My mentee and I consistently created weekly schedules, to-do lists, semester plans and goals, and homework and exam schedules that we referenced often in order to ensure that everything was being completed to the best of the mentee’s abilities. I believe that this was very helpful for stress and time management.
- I felt the most helpful were the study sessions and having luncheons.
- I think it was helpful when we would go through my week and all of my assignments to make a plan of action
- We used flash cards to study for an anatomy lab exam.
- Emailing campus resources such as SI, tutoring, and Writing Center appointments

2. What interactions with your ISI Wawokiya Mentor were the least helpful?

- I believe that my mentee and I sometimes had a tendency to be overly social and to sit and chat rather than always working.
- I would say it was the times we talked instead of studying, but we had great talks.
- Whenever we were done making a plan and all I had to do was my homework.
- When we weren’t studying together, we just got together to work on homework.

- 3. Was it difficult meeting with your ISI Wawokiya Mentee this semester? Please explain**
- My mentee and I were able to meet almost every week except for a couple times that were either forgotten or conflicted with track practice.
 - We didn't have a hard time meeting, when our schedules didn't match up we just picked a different time and location like the weekend.
 - My mentor was available to meet almost every week and was cooperative in rescheduling. It was difficult with football sometimes when trying to plan a meeting.
 - Our schedules had a lot of overlap. If we missed a scheduled meeting it was hard to make it up. The mentee was sick a few times.
 - Work schedules and classes were hard to schedule around

- 4. What other kinds of help/interaction would you most like from your ISI Wawokiya Mentor?**
- I liked when we went to eat or went to Starbucks, it was kind of a relaxer aside from studying and classes.
 - I think it would be more helpful if my mentor would actually tutor me or offer help with a class
 - Help studying for exams. math help. Essay reviews.
 - More group activities.

- 8. How would you describe your relationship with the other ISI Wawokiya Mentors this semester?**

- I had no issues with any other mentors, but I did not interact with them often.
- We got really close and had a great relationship
- All the other mentors were friendly
- I don't think she interacted much with the other ISI mentors
- Good, professional

- 9. How would you rate your interactions with the ISI Wawokiya Program Coordinator this semester? Comments:**

- I believe that the coordinator has done an excellent job. He was always extremely helpful and easy to contact. I think that he has done a great job building up the program, and it has been a privilege to work with him.
- I wish our schedules weren't so hectic but we managed to meet up.
- I didn't meet with them much but everything seemed to run smooth
- The mentee me with her student athletic advisor weekly

- 10. What other kinds of help/interaction would you most like from the ISI Wawokiya Coordinator?**

- I believe that the coordinator should continue to do what he has been doing, and I believe he should continue to keep in contact with the mentors and mentees.
- I would like help with specific classes like a tutor almost
- I'm not sure
- Was part of the student athletic group

11. Of the activities that you attended this semester, which ones would you suggest ISI Wawokiya should or should not do again, and why?

- No specific activities come to mind, but I believe more activities could be explored.
- I would suggest more activities that we could maybe do outside of college like movies or ice cream.
- I didn't attend any event this semester
- Did not attend

12. What other Academic, Social and/or Cultural Activities would you like to see the ISI Wawokiya Mentoring Program provide?

- I think that ISI program should encourage student to take part in other student organizations and help to provide exposure to on-campus activities outside of the program.
- I would say academic maybe study session and people who actually major in what you major in.
- I think it would be cool to have some activities meeting all of the mentors and mentees.
- Mentee did not attend.
- More academic activities would be helpful, such as studying times, or tutoring.

13. How satisfied were you with the overall ISI Wawokiya Mentoring Program this semester?

Comments

- I feel very fortunate to have been able to participate in such a wonderful program. I feel that the experiences were invaluable, and I am very excited to continue.
- I would've picked someone with my major who has had experiences with classes familiar with mine
- Sometimes I was reluctant to do my homework and listen to my mentor, but I think just having him around to keep me on track helped

14. I would recommend the ISI Wawokiya Mentoring Program to other new USD students.

Comments

- I believe that this program can be very beneficial for students that choose to take advantage of it. The program offers a very unique source of guidance and assistance in a way that many other programs on campus lack.
- It gives you an opportunity to meet other people and helped with my studying habits.
- If you are in need of learning more about USD or how to make a schedule and study for college, I think it would be beneficial to enter this program.

15. Do you have any other suggestions of ways to improve the ISI Wawokiya Mentoring Program?

- I would suggest to continue expansion efforts and to continue keeping close contact with the mentees and mentors to find out what exactly they believe will improve the program.
- All I would recommend having more students with different majors and maybe we get to pick someone close to our major, and maybe show what classes they have taken.
- I think it would be helpful to have some way of holding the mentees more accountable.
- Meeting at the beginning, middle, and end of the semester with all of the mentees and mentors.

Entering Mentoring Evaluations

Entering Mentoring at USD is a facilitator-guided workshop that teaches the principles and best practices of being a mentor. The curriculum is based on the Entering Mentoring textbook produced by the National Research Mentoring Network (<https://nrmnet.net/>). The workshop at USD was comprised of a series of 10 classes offered between January 15th and March 27th, 2019. The workshop was open to faculty, staff, and graduate students. The workshop was facilitated by Robin Miskimins, Jamie Turgeon-Drake and Brian Burrell, all of whom received training from the National Research Mentoring Network. Not every participants attended all 10 of the workshop classes, however 65 participants attended at least some of the workshops. Of those that participated, only 26 (40%) completed the pre-survey and only 11 (16.9%) completed the post-survey. These response rates are significantly lower than in 2018. Of those who completed the pre-survey 5 participants were at the rank of Assistant Professor, 4 were Associate Professors, and three were Full Professors. The remaining participants were a combination of administrators, scientists, graduate students, and other. The majority of participants (57.7%) indicated they were female and the vast majority (80.1%) indicated they were white. The vast majority of participants (92.3%) had never participated in any formal research mentor training before.

Participation in the training series does appear to have resulted in some improvements. However, given the low response rates and lack of pre-post comparisons at the individual level, we should be cautious in interpreting these results.

Tables 17 and 18, on the next two pages, provide a comparison of pre-workshop and post-workshop responses relating to how skilled the participant felt in several areas. In each case the participant was asked to rate their skill from 1-5 with 1 indicating “Not skilled at all” and 5 indicating “Extremely Skilled.” The table also includes a mean response for each to more easily compare changes in direction. For the first four skills, the response averages were higher, indicating greater skill levels, in the post-survey than in the pre-survey. However, in the last three skills the post-survey scores were slightly lower. It is important to remember the aforementioned caveats about sample sizes here though.

Using the same scale, questions 10 and 11 also asked participants to report on their skills in several areas. These results are reported in tables 19 and 20. For these skills, results were again mixed with most of the results for question 11 actually resulting in decreases.

Finally, we asked participants to report on two summative measures. These responses are reported in Tables 21 and 22. Question 12 asked participants how they would rate their overall quality of mentoring on a scale of 1-5 with 1 being “Very Low”, 3 being “Average”, and 5 being “Very High”. The mean response increased by .22 points on the five point scale, or roughly a quarter step on this scale between the pre and post survey. Notably, no participants in the post survey indicated they were at the bottom two levels. Also, 9.1% of participants reported having a very high quality of mentoring in post survey compared to 0% in the pre-survey.

Question 13 asked participants to what extent they felt they were currently meeting their mentee’s expectations on a scale of 1-5 with 1 meaning “Not at all”, 3 meaning “Moderately” and 5 meaning “Completely”. For this question, the average decreased. It is possible that through the training, the mentors realized other ways in which they could improve their mentoring which may feed into perceptions about student expectations.

Table 17: Spring 2019 Mentor Workshop Pre and Post Survey Comparison Question 8

Please rate how skilled you feel you are in each of the following areas:								
		Not skilled at all (1)	(2)	Moderately Skilled (3)	(4)	Extremely Skilled (5)	NA	Mean Response
Active Listening	Pre-workshop	0%	0%	34.6%	38.5%	23.1%	3.9%	3.88
	Post-workshop	0%	0%	0%	63.6%	36.4%	0%	4.36
Providing Constructive Feedback	Pre-workshop	0%	3.9%	26.9%	50.0%	14.4%	3.9%	3.96
	Post-workshop	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	4.0
Establishing a relationship based on trust	Pre-workshop	0%	0%	11.5%	53.9%	30.8%	3.9%	4.20
	Post-workshop	0%	0%	0%	72.7%	27.3%	0%	4.27
Identifying and accommodating different communication styles	Pre-workshop	3.9%	19.2%	34.6%	26.9%	7.7%	7.7%	3.70
	Post-workshop	0%	0%	0%	63.6%	36.4%	0%	4.36
Employing strategies to improve communication with mentees	Pre-workshop	3.9%	19.2%	34.6%	26.9%	7.7%	7.7%	4.22
	Post-workshop	0%	0%	9.1%	63.6%	27.3%	0%	4.18
Coordinating effectively with your mentees' other mentors	Pre-workshop	15.4%	3.9%	26.9%	23.1%	15.4%	15.4%	4.18
	Post-workshop	0%	9.1%	0%	45.5%	27.3%	18.2%	4.11
Working with mentees to set clear expectations of the mentoring relationship	Pre-workshop	7.7%	11.5%	46.2%	15.4%	11.5%	7.7%	3.95
	Post-workshop	0%	9.1%	36.4%	36.4%	18.2%	0%	3.63

Table 18: Spring 2019 Mentor Workshop Pre and Post Survey Comparison Question 9

Please rate how skilled you feel you are in each of the following areas:								
		Not skilled at all (1)	(2)	Moderately Skilled (3)	(4)	Extremely Skilled (5)	NA	Mean Response
Aligning your expectations with your mentees'	Pre-workshop	0%	11.5%	42.3%	30.77%	0%	15.4%	3.74
	Post-workshop	0%	9.1%	18.2%	54.5%	18.2%	0%	3.82
Considering how personal and professional differences may impact	Pre-workshop	3.9%	7.7%	19.2%	57.7%	3.9%	7.7%	4.05
	Post-workshop	0%	0%	27.3%	27.3%	45.5%	0%	4.18
Working with mentees to set research goals	Pre-workshop	0%	15.4%	26.9%	38.5%	0%	19.2%	4.06
	Post-workshop	0%	0%	27.3%	45.5%	18.2%	9.1%	3.90
Helping mentees develop strategies to meet goals	Pre-workshop	0%	16%	20.0%	40%	12.0%	12.0%	4.33
	Post-workshop	0%	0%	36.4%	27.3%	27.3%	9.1%	3.90
Accurately estimating your mentees' level of scientific knowledge	Pre-workshop	0%	15.4%	38.5%	19.2%	0%	26.9%	3.87
	Post-workshop	0%	0%	9.1%	45.5%	18.2%	27.3%	4.13
Accurately estimating your mentees' ability to conduct research	Pre-workshop	0%	23.1%	46.2%	15.4%	0%	15.4%	4.00
	Post-workshop	0%	0%	45.5%	27.3%	18.2%	9.1%	3.7
Employing strategies to enhance your mentees' knowledge and abilities	Pre-workshop	0%	15.4%	38.5%	30.8%	3.9%	11.5%	3.95
	Post-workshop	0%	0%	18.2%	45.5%	27.3%	9.1%	4.1

Table 19: Spring 2019 Mentor Workshop Pre and Post Survey Comparison Question 10

Please rate how skilled you feel you are in each of the following areas:								
		Not skilled at all (1)	(2)	Moderately Skilled (3)	(4)	Extremely Skilled (5)	NA	Mean Response
Motivating your mentees	Pre-workshop	0%	7.7%	42.3%	39.5%	3.9%	7.7%	3.73
	Post-workshop	0%	0%	18.2%	72.7%	9.1%	0%	3.91
Building mentees' confidence	Pre-workshop	0%	7.7%	30.8%	42.3%	11.4%	7.7%	3.95
	Post-workshop	9.1%	0%	9.1%	54.6%	27.3%	0%	3.91
Stimulating your mentees' creativity	Pre-workshop	0%	8.0%	64.0%	16.0%	4.0%	8.0%	3.48
	Post-workshop	0%	0%	0%	63.6%	36.4%	0%	4.36
Acknowledging your mentees' professional contributions	Pre-workshop	3.9%	3.9%	7.7%	57.7%	19.2%	7.7%	3.27
	Post-workshop	0%	9.1%	9.1%	45.5%	36.4%	0%	4.09
Negotiating a path to professional independence with your mentees	Pre-workshop	7.7%	0%	38.5%	38.5%	0%	15.4%	3.6
	Post-workshop	0%	0%	20%	60%	10%	10%	3.89
Taking into account the biases and prejudices you bring to the	Pre-workshop	7.7%	7.7%	42.3%	19.2%	11.5%	11.5%	3.89
	Post-workshop	0%	0%	18.2%	45.5%	27.3%	9.1%	4.1
Working effectively with mentees whose personal background is different from your own (age, race, religion, gender, class, region, culture, family composition, etc.)	Pre-workshop	0%	15.4%	19.2%	38.5%	19.2%	7.7%	4.4
	Post-workshop	0%	0%	0%	54.5%	27.3%	18.2%	4.33

Table 20: Spring 2019 Mentor Workshop Pre and Post Survey Comparison Question 11

Please rate how skilled you feel you are in each of the following areas:								
		Not skilled at all (1)	(2)	Moderately Skilled (3)	(4)	Extremely Skilled (5)	NA	Mean Response
Helping your mentees network effectively	Pre-workshop	3.9%	19.2%	38.5%	19.2%	7.7%	11.5%	4.18
	Post-workshop	0%	9.1%	63.6%	37.3%	0%	0%	3.18
Helping your mentees set career goals	Pre-workshop	3.9%	15.4%	23.1%	42.3%	7.7%	7.7%	4.26
	Post-workshop	0%	0%	45.5%	45.5%	9.1%	0%	3.64
Helping your mentees balance work with their personal life	Pre-workshop	3.9%	19.2%	23.1%	42.3%	0%	11.5%	4.29
	Post-workshop	0%	0%	54.5%	45.5%	0%	0%	3.45
Understanding your impact as a role model	Pre-workshop	0%	7.7%	23.1%	57.7%	7.7%	3.9%	4.0
	Post-workshop	0%	0%	18.2%	63.6%	18.2%	0%	4.0
Helping your mentees acquire resources (e.g. grants, etc.)	Pre-workshop	3.9%	11.5%	34.6%	26.9%	0%	23.1%	3.3
	Post-workshop	9.1%	9.1%	27.3%	36.4%	9.1%	9.1%	3.00

Table 21: Spring 2019 Mentor Workshop Pre and Post Survey Comparison Question 12

		Very low (1)	(2)	Average (3)	(4)	High (5)	Mean Response
Currently, how would you rate overall quality of your mentoring?	Pre-workshop	3.9%	11.5%	69.2%	15.4%	0%	3.50
	Post-workshop	0%	0%	36.4%	54.6%	9.1%	3.72

Table 22: Spring 2019 Mentor Workshop Pre and Post Survey Comparison Question 13

		Not skilled at all (1)	(2)	Moderately Skilled (3)	(4)	Extremely Skilled (5)	Mean Response
To what extent do you feel that you are currently meeting your mentees' needs	Pre-workshop	7.7%	7.7%	46.2%	38.5%	0%	3.72
	Post-workshop	0%	0%	45.5%	54.5%	0%	3.54

Crossroads Workshop

In December 2019, USD hosted a Crossroads workshop for campus administrators. This workshop is designed to introduce the concepts of systemic racism and develop strategies for addressing racism and cultural biases as institutional problems. Participants in the workshop were asked to complete an evaluation survey at the end of the workshop. The instrument was not created by the GRB but we again entered and analyzed the hand written responses. As we did with the mentoring program, we will first summarize the quantitative data, then briefly highlight important observations from the qualitative data, followed by a full transcript of qualitative responses.

All of the quantitative questions reported below were on a scale of 1-5, with 1 being “not at all” and 5 being “extremely well.” The responses are largely positive indicating that the objectives were met extremely well, however the mean and mode response for the last question are slightly lower than the others. This concern about the ability of USD to turn these ideas into action is echoed in the qualitative comments.

Table 17: Spring 2019 Crossroads Evaluation Summary

How well did today’s training meet the following stated objectives:					
	Min	Max	Mean	Mode	Std. Dev.
Gain a common language and shared analytical frameworks to understand what US dominant culture and system racism are and how these operate	3	5	4.67	5	0.55
Begin exploring how systemic racism intersects with other forms of systemic oppression	3	5	4.52	5	0.64
Begin applying an analytical framework to understand how the University of South Dakota is implicated in the maintenance of white dominant culture and systemic racism	2	5	4.56	5	0.70
Begin exploring the ways the University of South Dakota can be transformed though long-term commitments to race equity and critically consider next steps.	1	5	4.15	4	0.99

Most comments from the workshop indicated an overall positive experience. The comments suggest that participant learned new concepts and are excited to start implementing them. There were a few prominent themes that are worth highlighting

- Many respondents were excited about the workshop, thankful that the university was investing in the conversation, and grateful for having participated.
- The institution continuum tool, courageous space concept, and borderlands concept were repeatedly mentioned as having had the most significant impact on the participants' thinking.
- Many participants voiced concern about next steps, asking questions such as, "How can we move forward in a concerted way?", "Who will lead this initiative?", and "How do we move forward effectively?"

Crossroads Workshop Qualitative Evaluations

2. What 3 ideas/frames/tools from today's workshop had the most significant impact on your thinking and feelings?

- The institution continuum tool was very useful. Also, the example from Crossroads was helpful in aiding out understanding and shorting-out defensiveness
- Continuum to consider where we are at the institutional level. This is deeply emotional work for many, but absolutely necessary
- The borderland analogy or narrative, the continuum, courageous space
- The concept of Power Analysis and the borderlands. Things that maintain the center of the power analysis and marginalizes the borderlands.
- Love the "Courageous Space" concept
- Showing up is important, talking about systemic racism in all areas of campus is important, reminders about what the center is and how people feel in the borderlands.
- Table task given by facilitators after a robust discussion
- Continuum, box, courageous space
- Social constructedness of race
- Necessity of identifying the leading edge, trailing edge in anti-racist work
- Self-reinforcing nature of the center and its institutions.
- How we ask those from borderlands to join us in the center
- Strategies for evaluating our progress on inclusive excellence/diversity
- Ways we can approach making
- The intro with the concept of borderlands
- Creating capacity to do the work
- Utilizing the leading edge to move forward on important change
- Reward behavior you want to see and don't tolerate the bad behavior
- Race is a social construct

- Systematic racism is a gravitational pull – it is the default setting that conditional behaviors are likely to return. It needs constant attention. Focus on those the leading edge to create a movement.
- Move from a 3 to a 4, addressing systemic challenges
- Borderlands concept and Power analysis
- The understanding of the “The Center”, the role of power in racism
- Center/Border
- Intent/impact, center and power, borderlands
- The first day was very intense and beneficial. I saw colleagues thought processes transformed. For me, I gained a new understanding/terminology of the borderlands and my own identity.
- Understanding areas and opportunities and being willing to admit there is an issue
- Dissolving the box versus letting others in, scarcity mentality=no, how to be aware of the pull to 2, design to keep the push to 4, self reminder: everywhere and always
- Definition of racism, pervasiveness of racism
- The spectrum of where our institution falls with regard to racism, asking and discussing how we impact others through our units, Negative- being repeatedly told we are all complicit in institutional racism. Can induce some to become entrenched rather than recognize.
- I liked the concept of the center and borderlands (that is good/clear language). The different levels of change discussion and visual were useful.
- Center/Borders concept, using leading edge elements to help advance the agenda, question about we give the narrative of the center legitimacy

3. What idea/frame/tool from today was the most unclear (you did not understand and wish to go deeper)?

- The paragraph below the center/borderlands picture was initially startling and perhaps confusing. I’m guessing the shock might be necessary.
- White institutional values
- Understanding one’s one identity/race
- Not unclear, more time to dig into I.D.
- The definition of race and whiteness...but I understand it is intentionally ambiguous to empower and maintain the “control”
- How to break down the border without the center feeling threatened
- I hope the tools we are used within an institutional framework for change
- Scarcity and how the “leading edge” thinkers or believers build trust
- Nothing really – but see a need to have well trained people on campus to keep training moving in “right” direction
- How do we tackle this effectively
- Occupation of borderlands by some who are also in center
- I wish that we were given more specific/concrete examples.
- It was all pretty clear

4. What is one question today’s training leaves you with?

- How to move to cross the line into becoming a #4 institution?
- How can we move forward in a concerted way in a united front?
- WHO WILL LEAD THIS INITIATIVE/CHANGE?
- How can I have more hours in the day to do more?
- How can we incorporate this information/way of thinking throughout the organization?
- How will I have a sustainable agenda around antiracism work?
- Help make baby steps to goal
- When confront with demands for change when going from level 3 to a 4, how does one engage in conversation on the merit of the solution rather than recognition of the problem?
- How do we know the work has been done?
- How do we apply our own leadership skills?
- What do I want to do with the rest of my professional life to aid in experiences and justice?
- How do I start and what do I do with the unmovable control?
- How to continue to move forward effectively- you have us the tools, not we need to commit. What next?
- How to share this information with my team?
- How to convince the legislature?
- From a PR perspective, how do you continue to focus on the telling of positive stories at the university when for many constituents that may not be an authentic experience?
- Will leadership support and encourage change?
- I can do better and will as I leave here today.
- How? How to transform a society
- Why deny reverse racism? It can exist at personal or group level without 200 years of history
- I wonder why there is the focus on systemic racism rather than systemic oppression.
- How to engage the trailing edge (it is so big!)

5. What is one way you could apply what you learned today to your own work?

- Being supportive to other folks (leading edgers)
- Put these priorities on all of my agendas for meetings. Highlight and better promote what the offices and units are doing.
- Reaching out to other areas of campus
- Extending information to ALL -> Breaking down silos
- Making sure events that are important to students of color are attended, large and small
- There are so many we have shared as a group today.
- Apply myself and hold people accountable
- Better engagement with colleagues
- Be aware of how I fit in.
- I'm already viewed as a "wave-maker" – nothing to lose if I push harder
- Partnerships to create opportunities for change.
- Relationships; influence begins in my "sphere"
- Integrate it into the program
- I can use the terminology with students and continue working with staff and faculty

- Add mentoring and recruitment review committee
- Staff discussions
- I don't know. This is a lot to take in.
- Recognition of responsibility for impact versus intent
- I want to explore more the extent to which systemic oppression is or is not a subject of sustainability – to me it seems like a subset but I may be missing something.
- Engage the programs that are success stories

6. Any additional comments

- Great experience
- While this comes from the need to accommodate the center, and “intro” for those who aren't familiar with these kinds of training might be good. My observation of the newbie
- Info much appreciated
- Thank you!
- Thank you
- Great content...but now for the work.
- Thank you!
- Thank you! And I appreciate your work!
- One area that is most frustrating is if I believe I am a white male administrator on the leading edge, how do others reinforce what is working and not working in my efforts or journey?
- Several times you shut down a couple of people who were “off script”. It was kind of obvious and opposite of what you were preaching.
- I think a broader framing of systemic oppression would be helpful.
- Keep up the great work.