

Unit: College of Liberal Arts      Date: 12/1/17      Email: l-dorsey@tamu.edu  
Contact: Dr. Leroy G. Dorsey, Assoc. Dean for Inclusive Excellence, Strategic Initiatives, and Graduate Instruction

The College of Liberal Arts (CLLA) consists of 12 departments, 5 interdisciplinary programs, and 7 centers and institutes. We have 7,402 undergraduates, 829 graduates, and we awarded 2,438 degrees, including master's degrees and doctoral degrees, in 2016-17. CLLA consists of 489 faculty (comprised of 133 APT and 356 tenured/tenure track faculty) and 184 staff members. CLLA seeks to be a national leader in climate, inclusion, and diversity on campus and among peer institutions. Some of our programs, now collectively identified as Interdisciplinary Critical Studies (ICS)—including, but not limited to, Africana Studies, Religious Studies, Film Studies, Latino/a and Mexican American Studies, and Women's and Gender Studies—particularly emphasize diversity-related research. CLLA offers 96 of the ICD courses for the core curriculum and send ~14% of our majors to study abroad. We have a broad reach to students beyond our own majors as we offer 62% of the core curriculum. We aim to incorporate climate, inclusion, and equity into decision-making for faculty and staff populations too. In the College Strategic Plan, our goals include emphasizing research “which addresses the human social categorization and the social construction of differing groups,” as well as monitoring the “diversity climate across the college” to “ensure that each department has a welcoming and supportive climate.” These goals are addressed through innovative strategies, specific initiatives, and by aiming to hold unit leaders accountable in demonstrating the effectiveness of their diversity plans.

### Peer Strategies and Comparisons

Our peers this year were the University of Wisconsin-Madison (UW-M), Purdue University (PU), and University of Texas (UT). PU replaced the University of Illinois from last year given the availability of its diversity strategy information online; University-level strategic plans related to climate, inclusion, equity, retention, etc. were available for the peers we chose. Their plans parallel similar concepts and tactics at our university and in the CLLA, particularly. Conceptually speaking, our peers recognized that accountability should occur at all levels of administration (UT); and diversity strategies need specific metrics, measurable outcomes, defined timelines, and robust assessment for monitoring progress (UW-M). Regarding climate, peers noted many strategies, including providing more resources so that more freshmen can interact with one another, and providing training related to educating participants involved in recruitment, teaching, and mentoring (PU, UT, UW-M). Peers addressed equity by recognizing that: the work related to diversity should be incentivized and that fundraising efforts should target diversity as a strategic priority (UW-M); unit heads should pay attention to ensure diversity in senior staff positions (UT); finally, that units should call for student success programs to address the gap between majority/minority students and their retention and graduation rates (PU). Specific actions our peers have taken for recruitment included: increasing financial aid packages for students, and requiring implicit bias training for faculty search committee chairs (UT). Specific actions our peers have taken for retention included: embedding diversity-related material—specific to a discipline—in new courses; expanding undergraduate research opportunities and learning communities for students of color; and developing both faculty and staff mentoring programs (PU). Specific actions our peers have taken for unit climate included: increasing the number of faculty participating in professional development opportunities regarding inclusive teaching practices, and increasing the number of students completing their one credit diversity requirement before their junior year (UW-M). Specific actions our peers have taken for equity included providing leadership development for mid-career faculty of color (UT), and engaging holistic evaluation rubrics rather than rely heavily on the GRE and GPA for graduate admissions (PU). Our initiatives in the CLLA mirror some of our peers' goals and processes, enhancing many and offering new pathways to success.

### 1. RECRUITMENT (All new initiatives are marked with a \*. Initiatives unique to TAMU are marked with a #.)

**Students.** CLLA Undergraduate Recruitment Program: Strategies targeted first-gen students particularly for outreach by the CLLA Student Council via personalized letters, emails, and phone calls to high school seniors that had been admitted but had not yet decided to attend; the same seniors were invited to four different College Experience events that allowed them to shadow student Council members to their classes, and participate in panels and lunch with faculty, students, and advisors for panels held by faculty, advisors, and students. These efforts resulted in a 27% increase in Hispanic freshmen from '15-'16 to '16-'17 (252 to 320); a 37.8% increase in Asian students (45 to 62). Unfortunately, African-American students decreased by 6.7% (45 to 42) with these same efforts. CLLA needs to work more closely with the recruiting offices in Dallas and Houston to utilize the biographical data in Compass reports and focus more outreach efforts on students of color, and to consider replacing the recently vacated college recruiter position. Of course, the University's overall image as an institution that is not welcoming to URM students hampers our College efforts. Departmental/CLLA Recruiting: Depts. engage several strategies. Outreach: SOCI made recruitment visits to HBCUs and HSIs with the dept. crediting its efforts to a highly diverse group of graduate student recruiters—women 69%, students of color 60%, and intl. students 16%. ECON visited high schools in the South Texas region to recruit and noted that 37 undergrad students expressed interest in its MA program; ECON will follow up with emails to continue encouraging the students as they near graduation. On-campus hosting: HIST sponsored a 3-day campus conference for the Natl. Assoc. for Chicano/a Studies (no additional data reported). HISP's Faculty Showcase brought potential Ph.D. students to campus, noting that of the 5 students joining the program this year 4 had attended the event. Special Funding: ECON dedicated 6 years (rather than the typical 4 years) of funding to a Hispanic Ph.D. student to ensure her acceptance and success: since her MA work had left her unprepared for doctoral work, her first year involved her investment in math and stats coursework. The CLLA has intentionally structured its #Merit Fellowship to attract graduate students intending to pursue research that addresses societal inequalities. This led to a 30% acceptance—which is like previous Merit Fellowship acceptances—but the meaningful difference with the new program is that all 30% will be engaged in research to address inequalities. POLS

graduate minor in “Race, Ethnicity and Gender” has proven to be a major attraction in recruiting Ph.D. students: among 74 applicants for admission to the doctoral program in 2016, 52% were from underrepresented groups such as women and ethnic minorities; admission was extended to 27 of these applicants, 14 of whom are members of underrepresented groups. Retention of these students has been 100%. Considerations moving forward include: 1) several other depts. engage in similar types of endeavors but have no specific data as to their impact, meaning that protocols involving assessment are needed for any depts. engaged in such initiatives; 2) for expanded recruiting and robust funding to enhance acceptances, cost is a factor (increased stipend funding is needed from the university; new efforts from CLLA Development and alumni funding will be investigated but that success can only carry us so far); 3) recruiting of African American students remains problematic as they constitute only ~5% of the CLLA student demographics (more collaboration with university outreach efforts could help).

**Faculty. #Pool Certification:** Dept. heads are required to submit their search committee pool of candidates to the CLLA Dean, Assoc. Dean of Faculty, and the Assoc. Dean for Inclusive Excellence. Heads must document their search committee efforts to build a diverse pool and have it approved by CLLA administration before conducting on-campus interviews. All search committee members must attend STRIDE training. SOCI’s efforts in its current searches have borne fruit: in one position, the short list reflects 6 women, 1 man, 6 Latinx, 1 unknown; and the other position reflects 2 women, 1 man; 1 Latinx, 2 unknown. Other depts., such as ECON and POLS, provide extensive documentation of their efforts to reach out beyond typical outlets, but find marginal success in generating diverse pools regarding gender and race. While gender is nearly balanced in the College (female 47%/male 53%), faculty numbers representing traditionally underrepresented groups are weak: African-American 5% (state level 13%), Hispanic 11% (state level 39%). Considerations moving forward include: thematic hiring of faculty whose scholarship is diversity-related to enhance probability of more diverse pools; more CLLA engagement with dept. preparation of search committees; the development of rolling, soft targets for faculty of color increases over the next 4 years to assess sustained progress.

**2. RETENTION (All new initiatives are marked with a \*. Initiatives unique to TAMU are marked with a #.)**

**Students. #Academic Intervention for Probation Students:** In fall 2016, 57 students with overall GPAs of less than 2.0 for consecutive semesters (cumulative), or had fallen below 2.0 because of poor grades the semester prior, were placed in specially-designed LBAR 181 sections. Both faculty and a senior academic advisor in the College taught these sections which focused on critical thinking skills, academic success skills and resources, and that focused on the importance of self-reflection in developing paths to success. Students were administered the CAT at the beginning and at the end of the semester. The OIEE identified a sharp increase in critical thinking skills. But since the focus rested on the success rate of students these probation students were enrolled in Spring 2017 in a semester-long, zero-credit course—LBAR 285—fully dedicated to academic success (developed by the assoc. dean for undergrad programs). This time the assoc. dean and four senior College advisors taught the course focusing on individual academic success through time management, the Academic Success Center’s Fresh Start class, lectures by distinguished external speakers, and four reflection papers students wrote on their progress for removing themselves from probation. Also, a student on cumulative or semester probation was required to meet with a college adviser and to review and sign a contract; the contract outlined the conditions of probation, set academic goals, contained individual academic performance self-assessment, and provided academic resources (two of which the student agreed to utilize that semester).

Academic Intervention	Spr '13	Fall '16	Spr '17
# of students on cumulative probation	160	58	79
# of withdrawn students from semester	6	5	5
# of students succeeding	95 (59%)	34 (64%)	45 (61%)
# of students dismissed	59 (37%)	19 (36%)	29 (39%)

Data from spring 2013 (the first semester of instituting the probation checklist) through spring 2017 revealed that the massive infusion of personnel and resources yielded no real differences; retention remained the same across semesters no matter the level of intervention (see chart). However, the data revealed that personalized intervention

was effective. A probation student needs to work closely with a senior college academic adviser on developing a success plan with scheduled follow-ups with that adviser. One-on-one meetings are more time consuming than classes and rely on having the advising personnel available for this personalized help (2 advisor positions are recently vacant), which calls for increasing the number of CLLA advisors. **Regents Scholars Initiative (RSI):** These students (81 last year and 96 this year) participated in a yearlong course built around the acquisition of academic success skills and becoming engaged in campus life. Students of color make up about 75% of the class with most students originating from inner-city schools and the Mexican border; about 70% of students are Mexican-American. As a strategy for retention, data show that first-gen students who participate in the RSI program have better academic success than other first-gen students: between 45-50% of non-RSI, first-gen students were on cumulative probation, while only 7-14% of RSI students were on such probation. One limitation on increasing the number of RSI students results from the requirement that they can only participate with a family income of \$40k or less. CLLA would need a new program for students with family incomes above that requirement (see FIG). **\*#Freshmen Innovation Group (FIG):** Since first-gen students report feeling more isolated than other students, tend to drop-out at a higher rate than other students, and hundreds of students’ family income fall above the RSI cap, the CLLA offered a new learning community called FIG (developed by the assoc. dean for inclusive excellence). Loosely based on UT’s series of one-hour courses in their Freshmen Interest Groups, our fall 2017 FIGs comprised a set of College core courses capped at 25 seats (rather than the typical 200 seats the core courses usually have). Those courses were linked to a one-hour LBAR seminar that had its own academic content plus student success modules. One set of non-RSI, first-generation freshmen move as a cohort taking the three courses together (see chart). The small size of the courses

FIG 1	FIG 2
Fall 2017 SOCT 205—3 hrs. PHIL 111—3 hrs. LBAR 181—1 hr.	Fall 2017 PSYC 107—3 hrs. ANTH 205—3 hrs. LBAR 181—1 hr.
Spring 2018 ENGL 203—3 hrs. LBAR 181—1 hr.	Spring 2018 HIST 106—3 hrs. LBAR 181—1 hr.

(17 in one FIG and 16 in the other) allows for in-depth conversations between students and faculty to focus on and enhance the students’ critical thinking skills, and to give faculty the space to connect with the concerns new freshmen, particularly first-gen students, have. Some of the assignments were geared to help them think about how they’re processing information; other assignments helped them think about how people and the media around them construct identity.

These small cohorts also provided students a ready-made set of peers who could help one another engage in critical thinking and academic acclimation outside of class since the students see themselves as peers. Anecdotal data from their Learning Journals (their midterm reflections on their experiences in the FIGs) revealed success in goals related to retention and climate. For example, students reported the following: “I want to start off by thanking you for this program . . . It can be hard to adapt to such a diverse environment like college, especially if you are a first-generation college student;” “Having the same 17 students in 3 classes has been beneficial to everyone because we’ve all become close. We help each other with our classes—being able to have a small connection of friends within the same classes makes school easier in many ways;” “I really like that the classes are small, because it gives me the comfort that I can go to my professor anytime, without being stressed that there are 300 other students that also need the teacher’s help;” most responses followed this theme of appreciation. FIG students also received a \$1,000 bursary to offset materials needed for any class but the midterm survey data of these cohorts (24 of 33—73% response rate) revealed that 42-50% reported being “very concerned” with the cost of undergraduate education now and paying for it next year. The primary barrier for expanding this initiative is cost: finding depts. willing to lose SCHs by converting a couple of their large-lecture courses into seminar-sized classes, and finding more faculty willing to teach in FIGs to expand the program size (rather than relying on the associate dean for inclusive excellence to teach more than one class a semester). The CLLA Development Team could be tasked with finding donors to fund the program, and/or the Provost’s office could continue its financial support of this initiative (if not increase it for a program that clearly is working now as far as creating a conducive climate for academic success for first-gen/students of color along with core curriculum credit). A major secondary barrier involved recruiting for FIGs. First-gen students appear reluctant to join such programs in multiple colleges, despite the benefits, because of perceived stigmas associated with such programs (these students suffer more from “imposter syndrome” than other students suffer, and some believe first-gen programming reflects their perceived academic/intellectual weakness). This necessitates that CLLA/University create different promotional language and outreach efforts that minimizes those perceptions and increases interest in such programs (that would include outreach specifically targeted to parents/guardians as well). **Mentoring:** POLS assigns each incoming doctoral student two mentors (at least one female or intl. student), also assigned by sub-field interest. This provides opportunities for students to engage with a diverse spectrum of their peers from the very beginning of their graduate experience. There has been a dramatic decline in first year graduate student attrition in the last two years (from 40% to 6% to 0%) in this department. Most depts. reported offering mentoring along a range of peer-to-peer and faculty-led initiatives, including focus on intl. students, Sandwich Seminars, DGS-led workshops for Ph.D. prelims, and undergraduate mentoring. Considerations moving forward include gathering information from students to understand the impact of these mentoring strategies. In addition, faculty need training in how to be effective mentors.

**Faculty. Mentoring:** Several depts. engaged in various senior faculty-to-junior faculty mentoring, particularly benefitting faculty of color. The HIST dept. took a more informal, organic approach. Senior faculty provided professional and academic advice based on need and “disguised mentoring opportunities” such as colloquia, social activities, etc. and created opportunities for younger faculty to observe senior faculty in action thus gaining insight into choosing their mentors. The dept. has not had any junior faculty fail at the tenure level in more than a decade and, in the last five years, it has had two long-time (17-20 year) associate professors get promoted and remain productive thereafter. Other depts. such as PHIL, ANTH, PSYC, and POLS paired senior faculty with newer faculty (weekly to monthly meetings), noting that mentee asst. profs. have succeeded with strong annual and mid-term reviews, and some with unanimous votes for tenure/promotion. Given that not all depts. have such structured mentoring processes nor full mentoring success, the College needs to do a better job of facilitating conversations between depts. to share such strategy information.

**Staff. Reclassifications and Internal Promotions:** This strategy reflected that duties and responsibilities of non-faculty employees occasionally change and increase in overall scope in a way that salary adjustment became necessary. CLLA reviewed non-faculty, position reclassification requests on an annual basis. In FY17 11 reclassification requests were approved; nine staff members were promoted internally. Difficulties included salary compression issues and budget restrictions (new infusion to budget from the university is needed).

### 3. UNIT CLIMATE (All new initiatives are marked with a \*. Initiatives unique to TAMU are marked with a #.)

**Multiple Groups. #Common Ground Initiative:** CLLA provided first year students (new and transfers) a common book to read and requested that faculty college-wide engage that reading in some way in their classes to help frame students’ learning experiences during their first year of college. This represented a diversity initiative since the book always has a diversity theme woven into the story that allows the student to consider how difference is perceived and how they personally engage with some of these issues of difference. For fall 2016, the College chose Harvard University’s Dr. Robert Putnam and his book, *Our Kids: The American Dream in Crisis*, which focused on the relationship between inequality and opportunity, and on how the growing class gap among American young people have implications for social mobility. Over the course of three days, Putnam engaged in extensive interactions with multiple groups: held an open Q&A session for POLS students (150 attended); met with the RSI class (approx. 80 students); delivered a free lecture to TAMU at the Bush School (450 attended); lectured an Honors’ Critical Thinking seminar (17 students); held a forum for CLLA staff and faculty (94 attended); and participated in an Aggie Agora lecture event (50 faculty and students). Impact beyond attendance is unknown: the CLLA will need to collect survey data related to the event’s impact from some of these events in the future, including collecting data from faculty to determine how many instructors engaged the Common Ground book in their classes. **#Difficult Dialogues (DD):** Students, faculty, staff, and several campus organizations participated in a series of workshops that allowed participants to open up about their experiences with racism and offer possible solutions to issues; participants could thus become the change agents in their respective environments. Last year there were 9 sessions (328 participants) that included a round

table format with 6-8 people per table to facilitate robust discussion; trained facilitators at each table; ground rules established; vignettes based on student journal entries about campus race relations; and discussions about combatting racial microaggressions. Completed survey feedback forms totaled 258 (79% completion). Indicators of impact included: the local student newspaper covering several sessions; invitations to conduct these sessions from student diversity leaders, a freshman mentoring organization, a student conference for graduate students of color, and a course on music and diversity; and receiving a competitive internal grant to conduct research on this project. Highlights/themes from participants included: 1) 97% of majority group participants and 94.3% of minoritized group participants reported that they will recommend the session to others; those in the majority group sessions were most likely to say yes (87.6%) compared to no (2.9%), undecided (5.3%) and neutral (3.5%) on whether they had adequate resources to engage in discussions regarding race and racism on campus after attending this session, while those in the minoritized group sessions reported 75% yes compared to no (4.5%), undecided (6.8%), and neutral (12.5%); 2) that participants expressed appreciation for feeling empowered to stand up against racism (“I feel like my voice to speak up against racism is valid now,” having the tools to confront microaggressions (“Tonight has given me many resources to use and pull from to better prepare myself”), recognizing the prevalence of racism (“Being a White girl, I was surprised at many of the journal entries, since I am not normally exposed to racism,”) feeling validated (“[I learned] that many people have gone through similar experiences”), learning to speak up for others (“I think, after this discussion, that it’s important to address racism on campus, NOT be a bystander”), and recognizing differences within minoritized groups (“Racism comes in all shapes and sizes and just because a person’s experience is different than yours does not mean they didn’t experience racism.”). Collaborating with CTE will allow the DD to continue for 2017-18. The university has invited the DD team to create online diversity modules on “Ground rules for facilitating dialogues” and “Recognizing and combating racial microaggressions” to serve as resources for instructors on our campus. Considerations moving forward include: 1) establishing baseline climate data to understand the actual impact on the College-wide environment with these findings; 2) attaining the funding to sustain and increase the size of this operation to engage more than 3% of the College population; 3) finding new ways to promote these workshops among the College (perhaps incentives by depts.) so that attendance goes beyond the “usual suspects” who generally attend such opportunities anyway (and identifying how many participants are new and from what units); and 4) developing a survey instrument to capture longitudinal data. **#Aggie Agora (AA):** This 2016-17 initiative (continued from the previous year) involved hosting a series of lectures aimed at facilitating public discourse about issues surrounding democracy and civic engagement for students, faculty, staff, and the community; it also collaborated on occasion with DD. AA hosted visiting speakers of local, national, and international renown who get the chance to speak to and interact with multiple audiences. Last year there were varying formats: 4 small “Coffee Hours,” 12 large “Friday Lecture Series,” 24 “Engaged Citizenship Workshops,” 1 “Movie Premiere” of *Hidden Figures* (in partnership with Women in Engineering, Candy95, Boys & Girls Club, Af-Am Professional Organization, and the Black Pearls Reading Group), 1 conference on “Gender & Citizenship,” 1 “Black Lives Matter” speaker, and 4 “DebateWatch” events. There were approximately 2200 participants. Summary impact data for the “Friday Lecture Series” (41 respondents) included: 84% agreed that the presentations had real-world relevance; 85% agreed that their ability to recognize diverse economic/political/cultural/religious opinions had increased; 90% agreed that they were likely to reflect on their responsibility for community or social issues. Summary impact data for the “Wednesday Workshops” (18 respondents) included: 77% agreed that they gained a greater sense of personal responsibility from the event; 94% agreed that they were now more confident in their ability to evaluate information from a variety of sources; and 61% agreed that they were more likely to act on community or social issues. Considerations moving forward include: 1) increasing survey participation since it is difficult to assess impact from so few respondents to the survey; 2) recognizing that while AA was well-attended, attendance alone is an indirect measure and weak; 3) constructing a survey that captures attendee type (e.g., faculty, community member, etc.); 4) developing a new survey tool, longitudinal in nature and that goes beyond in-the-moment sentiment to investigate impact more robustly (perhaps working more closely with OIEE). **#Special Events:** Depts. engaged in various climate-improving events for faculty, staff, and students. HISP’s film series in 2016 gathered 500 students and it created a scholarship award for Best Diversity Essay (one in Spanish and one in English) that reflected on diversity in the Hispanic world as it was portrayed or addressed in one of those films. PHIL hosted the 2016 annual meeting of the Philosophy Born of Struggle that included a conference on Africana Philosophy, and brought 47 participants to campus for 26 presentations. Several depts., including COMM and PERF, held Green Dot training for 5 faculty and staff, and 15 faculty and staff, respectively; other depts., such as ANTH, now have 30 faculty, grads, and staff identified as Aggie Allies. Considerations moving forward include following HISP’s lead to tie a measurable outcome to an event to measure its impact directly. At the very least demographic data is needed for campus-wide events to know if participants were graduate students, undergrads, staff, faculty, and/or community members.

**Students. #Diversity lessons in the classroom:** ENGL constructed a diversity statement for course syllabi. In fall ’16 that statement, or similar language, was adopted by instructors in courses such as 104 (53%), 203 (53%), 210 (14%), and 35% of literature courses. Depts. with similar statements need to address how to increase the number of instructors agreeing to include such statements, and survey students as to the significance they place on the statement. ANTH 370-Cultural Diversity and Ethics (approx. 100-300 students/semester) has had difficulty in making concepts such as inclusion and learned ignorance meaningful to engineering students. Prior to this fall 2017, the class survey results to the question about those diversity concepts, “What has been your most favorite, thought provoking or interesting module so far?”, had been below 10%. The reconfiguration of the course to direct collaboration with peers via class-wide discussions has helped those students learn how to apply key anthropological concepts to the real-life ethical dilemmas that they might experience as engineers working in a culturally diverse workplace. Survey results to that same question in fall 2017, 100 registered students, showed it having the highest rating out of all assignments used in class (38%) related to those

topics. Adopting this method in other classes proves to be challenging as the training needed to prepare an instructor to facilitate such charged conversations is extensive. Incentivizing such training could increase the number of faculty willing to undertake it. *##Try One Initiative:* Immediately before fall 2017 semester began, 750 post-it pads were delivered to CLLA faculty. Each page of a pad had a different, easy-to-engage tip for instructors to use in making their classroom more inclusive. Examples included, “Never assume that students have the financial resources to purchase course materials,” “I make sure to tell my class on the first day that if they have a childcare emergency that they should feel free to bring their kids to class,” “Create group assignments so that everyone can be feel included,” etc. These pads were developed for faculty who don’t tend to think about issues of inclusion, or don’t know how to engage it effectively, or just curious to consider trying one because the tips seemed simple enough to adopt; we also hoped that these pads acted as a catalyst for departmental conversations about inclusion to occur. Unsolicited and anecdotal evidence showed some success: 4 faculty directly mentioned the pads were helpful; 6 different faculty directly mentioned they planned to use a tip; 1 faculty mentioned that the pads led to a dept.-wide conversation about inclusion in the classroom; based on the CLLA idea, the VP for Human Resources plans to create something similar university-wide for staff. Moving forward, we would need a more systematic means to assess the impact (i.e., use by faculty), and the effect (i.e., gathering baseline CLLA student data related to their feeling of inclusiveness before use of the tips, and collecting student data after pad use—perhaps via end-of-term student evaluations).

**Faculty. *Training:*** Most depts. sponsored varied training workshops for faculty, including Aggie Ally, QPR, Green Dot, Title IX, Conflict Management, FASIT, Cassandra Project (women historians raising awareness of sexual harassment), and ADVANCE-STRIDE. While a few depts. report attendance at some events, most do not. Considerations moving forward include better recordkeeping of attendance and survey data to understand perceptions of impact by participants before and after training.

**Staff. *##CLLA-level:*** Initiatives included appreciation events (logo wear, lunch, and a certified massage therapist brought on-site); recognition events (welcome breakfasts for new employees, receptions for departing and retiring staff); professional development (on campus and off-site conferences); certificate programs that enhanced staff skills (paid for by CLLA, 6 of 11 registered staff participated FY17); awards (Superior Service Award winners are recognized each December at the annual staff appreciation luncheon—four winners FY17). Staff survey data is needed to understand impact on climate by these efforts.

#### **4. EQUITY (All new initiatives are marked with a \*. Initiatives unique to TAMU are marked with a #.)**

**Multiple Groups. *Course instruction:*** IT area supports the teaching mission through provision of classroom equipment as well as training experiences for faculty and grads in the area of on-line course methods. In 2016, IT updated the online course creation guide and provided introductory workshops for creating online and flipped courses. Additionally, it provided support for the creation of closed captioned videos for college online courses. Senior Instructional Designer Shweta Kailani has created an accessible Blackboard course template for use by all Texas A&M System universities. Survey data needed from faculty and students to understand the increased use of such technology and its impact on learning.

**Students. *##CLLA 100% Need-Based Undergraduate Scholarship:*** All differential scholarship monies, same as last year, were directed to incoming first-time-in-college students based on need (646 out of 908 students in entering class). A total of 515 students had \$5,000 or more in unmet need; of the 515 students, 250 were first-gen, with 232 (93%) of them having the same unmet need. CLLA awarded 117 scholarships of \$1,500 from the differential tuition fund working our way down from the highest unmet need. The College is not meeting the need of many of its students, particularly first-gen, regarding scholarships—either in total funding amount or in length of funding (differential tuition scholarship funds for one year only). Moving forward, the College Development team can work on attaining endowed scholarships that focus on funding first-gen/students of color. *##Cluster Advancement and Success Award (CASA):* Provided funds for activities that address the needs of graduates across multiple departments. Over 90% of the submitted proposals have been supported with most proposing skill based activities (e.g., coding/collection methods). Assoc. dean of research and graduate programs met individually with the grad student representatives of each dept. and encouraged them to initiate proposals in collaboration with graduate directors (i.e., bringing needs to their attention that might not have been recognized), including quality of life/climate based activities. Data needs to be generated to see impact on enhancing climate for graduate students and stimulating broader community engagement.

**Faculty. *Equity Adjustments:*** The Dean’s Office approved equity increases for 14 faculty (\$54,345—5 male and 9 female) during the FY18 budget cycle. In addition it also allocated one-time merit to faculty (\$250,700—29 male and 32 female). CLLA will continue to assess salary compression issues and other discrepancies in compensation.

**Staff. *CLLA Equity Requests:*** The Dean’s Office approved equity increases for 11 staff during the FY17 budget cycle. Budget restrictions prevented doing more. Moving forward considerations can include one-time merit raises and reviewing staff positions where duties have increased to adjust the pay level accordingly.