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Introduction

Purposes of this Initial Campus Climate Report

The purpose of both this Executive Summary and the complete 2005 Campus Climate Report is to stimulate awareness, discussion, further study, and action about racism at Metropolitan State University. The full report is offered as a preliminary assessment of campus climate to inform and deepen the community-wide conversation begun last year about racism in the university. However, since dialogue without action will lead many to disillusionment and frustration without seeing real change, this report also encourages members of the university to take strategic steps toward eliminating institutional and interpersonal forms of racism. With this in mind, and as the university begins the effort to clarify its mission, the campus climate report and this summary aim to help Metropolitan State remain accountable to serving communities of color and other historically underserved groups living in the Twin Cities area. Finally, the report is intended to contribute to the continuous self-study and improvement of the university through its current Academic Quality Improvement Project (AQIP) accreditation process by helping to identify areas of improvement and establish baseline data for further study and assessment.

Context and Background

Metropolitan State is a comprehensive urban university with a mission to “...provide accessible, high quality liberal arts and professional education to the citizens and communities of the metropolitan area, with continued emphasis on underserved groups, including adults and communities of color.”

With approximately 25 percent students of color, 25 percent full-time faculty of color, and 22 percent staff/administrators of color, Metropolitan State is the most diverse university in Minnesota. Most members of the university community appreciate this diversity. However, as data in this report also confirm, the picture of inclusiveness covers a deeper reality of institutional racism embedded throughout the fabric of the university that limits our capacity to accomplish our mission. If we are committed to our mission, we must draw on the strength of our diversity and be compelled to act against racism.

Currently, the university’s anti-racism initiative is led by the Anti-Racism Leadership Team (ARLT). In January 2003, President Bradshaw appointed nearly twenty faculty, staff, and administrators to the ARLT based on applications submitted and recommendations by their bargaining units. The ARLT has been involved with the following main activities:

1) Working with the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity to see that three “Undoing Racism” workshops were offered from the fall of 2003 through the spring of 2005. To date, more than 120 faculty, staff, and students have participated in such training.

2) Hosting five Community Conversations about racism at Metropolitan State during the 2004-2005 academic year. These conversations gave more than 150 people the opportunity in a variety of formats to express and listen to various views and experiences.

3) Working with the Office of Institutional Research at the university to administer a campus climate survey in April 2005 to all full-time employees and a sampling of students enrolled that semester.
While these three accomplishments are modest in terms of the goals of the Anti-Racism Leadership Team (ARLT) and the needs and expectations both of university community members and President Bradshaw, these efforts have nonetheless raised awareness and stimulated public and private discussions about racism. How well the institution is doing in addressing racism is clearly a matter of perspective, and a wide range of perceptions exist across the university about the anti-racism initiative and the Anti-Racism Leadership Team. Whereas some people are critical of the ARLT for not speaking up forcefully on specific issues and taking action to combat racism, others believe that the ARLT is creating a confrontational and divisive campus climate. In our view it is a positive and healthy thing for an institution of higher learning to put race and racism on the table for public dialogue, especially given the persistence of racism in society and the general difficulty in talking openly, honestly, and deeply about it as an issue that both transcends and intersects so many other social issues.

The campus climate survey affirmed that most faculty, staff and students across racial/ethnic groups share a positive view of the university and campus climate. However, as was expressed by various individuals during “Undoing Racism” trainings and during the five Community Conversations, the campus climate survey also affirmed that a continuum of perspectives exists regarding the extent and significance of institutional and interpersonal forms of racism. For those with the courage to look beneath perspectives and beyond the good intentions of individuals, evidence of racism is reflected in data that comprise this report.

Data and Methods

Data used to write this report primarily come from the 35-item Survey of Campus Climate administered in April 2005 to students and full-time employees by the Office of Institutional Research. Administration of the survey was endorsed by the President and leadership of various employee unions as well as the Student Senate. Four hundred thirty-six (436) students completed the survey in sampled classes or through the mail, which represents 6.7% of all students (6,305) attending the university in the spring of 2005. Completed surveys were returned to the Office of Institutional Research, and all surveys were anonymous. At the end of the survey instrument, respondents were asked to identify their race/ethnicity, gender and age range. Of all students who identified their race/ethnicity, 61% identified as White/European American, 13% identified as Asian American/Pacific Islander, 11% as Black/African/African American, 5% as American Indian/Native American, 5% as Latino/Hispanic/Chicano, and 4% as Other.

The survey was also distributed via campus mail to all full-time faculty, staff and administrators. The response rate for full-time employees was 38% (126 of 331), and members of the Anti-Racism Leadership Team did not complete the survey. Of the employees who identified their race/ethnicity, 76% identified themselves as White/European American, 10% identified as Latino/Hispanic/Chicano, 4% as Black/African/African American, 4% as American Indian/Native American, 3% as Asian American/Pacific Islander, and 3% as Other.

The Office of Institutional Research provided the authors of this report with raw data for both surveys that was aggregated by racial group affiliation (i.e., white, non-white, and unknown) and by gender. Initial data analysis revealed various degrees of commonality and difference in perceptions across racial groups. A threshold of 10% difference between respondents of color and white respondents was then established as being significant for further analysis and reporting. The Office of Institutional Research also provided student survey results disaggregated
by particular racial/ethnic group, but consistent patterns were hard to determine and the relatively small sample sizes of each group prohibited careful conclusions from being made.\(^1\)

In addition to the Survey of Campus Climate, other data about the campus climate and the anti-racism initiative were gathered and analyzed for this report. Included in separate sections of this report are insights gleaned from 1) five Community Conversations about racism at Metropolitan State held between October 2004 and April 2005; 2) an external report on the status of the Ethnic Studies program the university; and 3) responses to an April 2005 survey of all past participants in university-sponsored “Undoing Racism” training sessions.

### Summary Analysis of Faculty/Staff Responses to Climate Survey

**Faculty/Staff Perceptions about Whether or Not Racism is a Problem**

In order to put their perceptions about racism at Metropolitan State into context, faculty/staff were asked whether racism is a problem in the Twin Cities metropolitan area. Clear majorities of faculty/staff of color (72\%) and white faculty/staff (66\%) agreed that racism is a problem in the Twin Cities. In additional items summarized in Table 1 below, faculty/staff were also asked whether unintentional racism, interpersonal racism, and institutional racism are problems here at the university.\(^2\)

Overall, faculty/staff perceive racism as a lesser problem at Metropolitan State than in the Twin Cities metropolitan area. Yet, an urban institution with an explicit mission to serve communities of color should not demonstrate tolerance for any amount or form of racism. In terms of racism at the university, more faculty/staff across racial groups agreed that unintentional racism is a problem compared to the number of respondents who agreed that interpersonal or institutional racism are problems. However, whereas nearly 50\% of all faculty/staff respondents agreed that unintentional racism is a problem, Table 1 shows that there were significant differences in perception between racial groups about interpersonal and institutional racism being problems at the university.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#16: Racism is a problem in the Twin Cities</th>
<th>Faculty/Staff of Color</th>
<th>Strongly Agree/Agree</th>
<th>Faculty/Staff of Color</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree/Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Faculty/Staff</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#17: Unintentional racism is a problem at Metropolitan State</th>
<th>Faculty/Staff of Color</th>
<th>52%</th>
<th>22%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Faculty/Staff</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#25: Interpersonal racism is a problem at Metropolitan State</th>
<th>Faculty/Staff of Color</th>
<th>34%</th>
<th>52%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Faculty/Staff</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#26: Institutional racism is a problem at Metropolitan State</th>
<th>Faculty/Staff of Color</th>
<th>38%</th>
<th>38%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Faculty/Staff</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^1\) All raw data tables are provided for review in the Appendices of the full Campus Climate Report. While noticeable differences in perceptions existed among various student groups of color, consistent patterns of differences between particular racial/ethnic groups were unable to be detected. Significant differences in perceptions between female and male faculty/staff existed for one-third of the survey items, but significant differences in perceptions between female and male students only existed for two items.

\(^2\) In the survey, interpersonal racism was defined as “discrimination of individuals of color by White individuals,” and institutional racism was defined as “discrimination of people of color due to structures, policies and culture of the institution.”
Faculty/staff of color were three times more likely than white faculty/staff to agree that interpersonal and institutional racism are problems at Metropolitan State. Conversely, nearly two-thirds of white faculty/staff disagreed about interpersonal racism being a problem, while half of faculty/staff of color disagreed. An even larger gap in perception was identified between white faculty/staff (59%) who disagreed that institutional racism is a problem at the university and faculty/staff of color (38%) who also disagreed.

**Faculty/Staff Response to Questions about Respect, Treatment, Services and Recommending Metropolitan State to Others**

Faculty/staff of color responses to whether they and students of color are respected reveal significant differences compared to responses by white colleagues. Approximately half (53%) of faculty/staff of color indicated that faculty, staff, and students of color are respected at the university, while approximately one-third (28%) faculty/staff of color disagreed that people of color are respected. In sharp contrast, 82% of white faculty/staff agreed that both students and faculty/staff of color are respected while only 5% disagreed that people of color are respected. Why such different aggregated perceptions exist may reflect different experiences with how people of color are treated.

Significant differences exist between responses from faculty/staff of color (76%) compared to white faculty/staff (52%) who agreed that a student has embarrassed, patronized, or treated them negatively because of their race or ethnic origin. More faculty/staff of color (41%) have also observed a student being treated negatively than white faculty/staff (19%). Furthermore, although approximately 17% of all faculty/staff respondents agreed that they have been treated negatively by colleagues because of their race or ethnic origin, more faculty/staff of color agreed (45%) that they have observed other faculty/staff being treated negatively due to race or ethnicity than white faculty/staff (28%) who agreed to have observed such negative treatment. Such treatment may explain faculty/staff responses to whether they feel a need to minimize various aspects of their racial/ethnic culture in order to be able to “fit in” at Metropolitan State. It is disturbing that 64% percent of faculty/staff of color indicated they feel they can’t fit in at the university without minimizing some portion of their culture, and that 53% of whites indicated the same.

Responses also reveal that very significant percentages of both faculty/staff of color and white faculty/staff have observed others being treated badly or differently because of gender, sexual orientation, or language. As with other survey items, a greater percentage of faculty/staff of color and women faculty/staff were aware of such discrimination compared to their white peers and male peers.

When asked if the university provides adequate programs and services to promote the success of faculty/staff and students of color, 33% of faculty/staff of color disagreed that such support was offered. In contrast, only 13% of white faculty/staff disagreed that adequate programs and services are provided to their colleagues of color, and only 16% disagreed that adequate programs and services are provided to students of color.

Finally, when faculty/staff were asked if they would recommend Metropolitan State University as a supportive place for people of color to study and work, differences in respondent groups follow a similar pattern. Faculty/staff of color were less likely than white faculty/staff (61% vs 85%) to recommend Metropolitan State University to students of color. While 14% of
faculty/staff of color would not recommend the university to students of color, just 2% of white faculty/staff would not provide such a recommendation. As for recommending the university as a supportive place to work for people of color, 21% of faculty/staff of color would not make such a recommendation, while only 4% of white faculty/staff would not recommend the university to prospective colleagues of color.

**Perceptions about What is Being Done and What Should Be Done to Address Racism**

Faculty/staff of color and white faculty/staff also had significantly different responses to four of five items which asked about what is being done and what should be done to address racism at the university. A majority of faculty/staff of color agreed that Metropolitan State is doing the right things to address racism, and that the university should strengthen its commitment and actions towards being an anti-racist institution. In contrast, a clear majority of white faculty/staff respondents disagreed that the university is taking the necessary measures to address racism, and nearly half disagreed that the university should strengthen its commitment and actions towards being an anti-racist institution. Furthermore, there were more faculty/staff of color who disagreed (39%) than those of color who agreed (36%) with a statement that faculty, staff and administrators are actively working to undo White privilege. In contrast, 51% of white respondents agreed that faculty, staff and administrators actively work to undo White privilege, while only 14% of white respondents disagreed.

Such stark differences in perception between racial groups beg for data where there was strong, positive agreement between groups, and two survey items provide such reason for hope that at least three-fourths of employees can unite to improve the campus climate. In addition to 76% of faculty/staff of color and 72% of white faculty/staff agreeing that they are more understanding of racial/ethnic differences since coming to the university, 78% of faculty/staff of color and 72% of white faculty/staff agree that “all students should be required to complete at least one course that includes multicultural/anti-racist knowledge and skills.”

In sum, there continues to be a striking divergence of experience, perception, and/or opinion among faculty, staff, and administrators regarding the existence of racism on campus, the various forms it takes, and what should be done about it. Faculty/staff’s written comments in many ways reflect but deepen the understanding of selected responses summarized above. It is recognized that the assembled data for this report provides a snapshot in time of Metropolitan State campus climate. This data should be leveraged to formulate focus group questions that solicit real life examples which can clarify the complex reasons and meanings imbedded in the survey responses.

**Summary Analysis of Student Responses to Campus Climate Survey**

**Students’ Perceptions about Whether or Not Racism is a Problem**

As is the case with faculty/staff perceptions, students across racial groups perceived racism as a lesser problem at Metropolitan State than in the Twin Cities metropolitan area. Table 2 reveals that students of color and white students had different perceptions about the extent to which racism is a problem at Metropolitan State. As for students of color, nearly 1 in 3 agreed that unintentional racism is a problem, 1 in 8 agreed that interpersonal racism is a problem, and 1 in 7 agreed that institutional racism is a problem at the university. In contrast, only 1 in 10 white students agreed that unintentional racism is a problem, 1 in 100 agreed that interpersonal racism is a problem, and 1 in 33 agreed that institutional racism is a problem at the university.
Such differential aggregated responses to these three items highlight part of the problem in addressing racism at Metropolitan State; namely, whites as a whole perceive much less racism than people of color. These differences in perception mirror other survey response patterns as well. Again, at a minimum, such data beg discussion around the question, “Why are there such differences in perception?” Part of the answer rests with the differences in direct experiences and observations between students of color and white students at the university.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree/</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#16: Racism is a problem in the Twin Cities</td>
<td>Students of Color 62%</td>
<td>Students of Color 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White Students 48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#17: Unintentional racism is a problem at Metropolitan State</td>
<td>Students of Color 29%</td>
<td>Students of Color 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White Students 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#25: Interpersonal racism is a problem at Metropolitan State</td>
<td>Students of Color 13%</td>
<td>Students of Color 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White Students 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#26: Institutional racism is a problem at Metropolitan State</td>
<td>Students of Color 15%</td>
<td>Students of Color 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White Students 3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students’ Perceptions about Their Experiences and Treatment at Metropolitan State

Questions that asked for perceptions of differential treatment on campus reveal a generally positive campus climate for most but not all students. Responses reveal that significant percentages of both students of color and white students have observed others being treated badly or differently because of race/ethnicity, language, gender, and sexual orientation. As with other survey items, a greater percentage of students of color were aware of such discrimination compared to their white peers.

Similarly, it is clear and positive that a large majority of all students (77% percent of students of color and 81 percent of white students) agreed they would recommend this university to prospective students of color. However, while 87% of white students agreed that students of color are respected at Metropolitan State, just 68% of students of color themselves agreed. Several other questions on the survey asked students about their experiences in class or with faculty and advisors. Again, these perceptions affirm that a positive campus climate exists for a large majority of all students as they engage in learning at Metropolitan State, and why a clear majority would recommend the university to students of color.

Nevertheless, these overall shared positive perceptions should not mask the fact that significant percentages of students of color did not agree that they feel respected, supported, and/or treated fairly at the university. The perceptions of students of color stand in contrast to those of white students about respectful treatment and the suitability of the university for students of color. Similarly, responses to additional items show that while clear majorities of both whites and students of color were either neutral or unsure whether Metropolitan State is taking necessary steps to address racism and undo white privilege, twice as many students of color (55%) as whites (28%) feel the university should do more to strengthen its anti-racism efforts.

In general, students’ written comments to two questions at the end of the survey were consistent with their responses to various statements asking for their agreement or disagreement. One of the most noticeable things about students’ written statements is how many students implied that racism only exists as a problem if they have seen or experienced it themselves. Such comments
marginalize the real experiences of those who have encountered racism, and ignore the often unseen yet significant ways that institutional racism impacts the university community. A more complete summary of students’ written comments are provided in the full report and Appendix.

To fully address the reasons for significantly different responses by students of color and white students to half of the survey items would be beyond the scope of both this Executive Summary and the complete Campus Climate Report. Yet, for Metropolitan State to achieve its mission as a comprehensive urban university serving historically underrepresented communities of color, the reasons for these differences in perception should become the focus of continued investigation and concerted action.

Insight from 2004-05 Community Conversations about Racism

Beginning in October 2004, the ARLT hosted five Community Conversations about racism at Metropolitan State. These public forums gave more than 150 people the opportunity in a variety of formats to express and listen to various views and experiences about racism on campus. The idea to hold Community Conversations about racism at the university germinated from the awareness that participants of various university-sponsored “Undoing Racism” training sessions had not been provided an opportunity to reassemble and discuss what they learned and how the training relates to their experiences and actions at Metropolitan State. Knowing that other faculty, staff, and students are concerned about racism but have not attended a training session, the ARLT decided to create a public space for the university to talk about issues of race.

ARLT organizers were surprised that more than 100 people showed up and packed the large Ecolab Room at the new St. Paul campus library for the first Community Conversation. The strong showing gave clear evidence that members of the university community wanted and needed to talk about racism. Throughout the initial and four subsequent Conversations in November, January, March and April, various participants shared their experiences, observations, questions, frustrations, and recommendations regarding racism at the university. Overall, each of the five Conversations generated different ideas, emotions, and perceptions about what had occurred and what was said during the forums. People participating in the Conversations acknowledged feeling free, frustrated, excited, angry, hopeful, hopeless, heard or silenced depending on the format, focus, their individual perspective, past experience, tone and content of a particular Conversation. Not only were examples of racism described during the Conversations, but participants identified examples of racism occurring during the Conversations due to structure, content and process.

Throughout the year, efforts were made by the ARLT planning committee to be responsive to participant feedback regarding the format, questions, and timing of future Conversations. The ARLT also struggled with how to make the content of the Conversations available to the entire university community in a way that respected the voices of participants without compromising ground rules of confidentiality.

The Conversations were positive because various employees and students across racial/ethnic groups contributed their insights about racism. They also contributed strategies and solutions to take action against racism at our urban university rather than just talk about the problem. However, while the Conversations allowed for a wide variety of people to participate and led to additional conversation and dialogue about issues of race and racism at the university, the Conversations were not an effective vehicle for deciding what changes to implement. The
Conversations were time limited, they had different participants each gathering, and they were not effectively connected to the formal decision making process of the university.

**Insight from External Report on the Status of Ethnic Studies**

In the fall of 2004, Dr. Rose Brewer from the University of Minnesota was commissioned by the Office of the President to conduct an external review of the status and future of the Ethnic Studies program at Metropolitan State. Because in many ways Dr. Brewer’s report on the future of Ethnic Studies serves as an external review of the university’s campus climate as well, a brief summary of the report’s findings related to issues of racism is provided below and more fully in the complete *Campus Climate Report*.

In her introduction Dr. Brewer states, “Whether or not the department will flourish will be heavily dependent upon confronting some hard issues and making deep commitments to building the department. What is clear from the review is that from its very inception, the issue of department legitimacy has confronted the unit” (2). In reviewing the history of the Ethnic Studies Department, it is noted that previous faculty “charged institutional racism in the form of differential treatment of the department by the College of Arts and Sciences and in terms of their positions as faculty of color within the College.” Dr. Brewer’s knowledge of the history of Ethnic Studies as a contested academic field beyond Metropolitan State together with the information gained from people she interviewed led her to make the following warning:

“…unless a number of substantial steps are taken at multiple levels to stabilize the department in terms of faculty, curriculum, budget, and leadership, and the difficult issues of racial inequality on campus, the unit will not survive over the long haul”(3).

Since Dr. Brewer’s submission of her external report in December 2004 and the semi-public release of the report in the spring of 2005 to university faculty who requested a copy, the Ethnic Studies Department has conducted searches for three faculty positions. One resident tenure-track faculty member has been hired for Latino/Chicano Studies, one fixed-term, half-time faculty has been hired for Native American Studies, and two attempts to hire a resident tenure-track faculty member for African American Studies have failed to yield a successful candidate. As this report was being written, searches are in process for two full-time, resident faculty with expertise in either African American or Native American Studies. The department is also working on completing its own internal program review. However, it is worth noting that despite these efforts and in light of the university’s entire anti-racism initiative, the university has yet to convene a forum for the exchange of ideas and perspectives about Dr. Brewer’s external report and how to support the rebuilding of a strong and viable Ethnic Studies program that is central to the university’s mission.

**Summary of Results of Undoing Racism Training Participant Survey**

The university’s anti-racism initiative has also included sponsoring, since the fall of 2000, more than 120 university community members at 5 two-day “Undoing Racism” training sessions conducted by external facilitators from two different organizations. At the end of spring semester 2005, all participants from the five training sessions were asked to complete a survey about their training experience. Thirty-five people completed the survey for a response rate of 29%. To protect anonymity, respondents were not asked to identify their job category,
racial/ethnic group or gender. However, approximately 60% of all past participants are white and 40% persons of color. While it is clear that some respondents had a negative experience at the training, a clear majority of respondents were decidedly positive about their training experience. Overall, the data from this survey strongly challenge the perceptions of several vocal administrators, faculty, and staff that the sessions have not been well received and are not having a positive impact.

The following survey results suggest that the critics’ voices may have been heard over the voices of the “silent majority”—those who support continuing efforts to provide and encourage all university community members to participate in the “Undoing Racism” training. For instance, when asked how they rated the training at the time they experienced it, 46% said it was an “excellent experience” while 14% said it was “good,” 26% said it was “okay,” and 11% said it was a “bad experience.” Similarly, a clear majority of respondents had positive responses when asked if they would recommend the training to others, if the training has impacted the way they work with others, and if they wanted a follow-up training. Such data clearly suggests that the “Undoing Racism” training should continue to be offered to members of the university community.

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

One of the primary purposes of the April 2005 Campus Climate Survey was to ascertain to what degree racism exists at the university, and in which specific ways racism creates problems for Metropolitan State students, staff, and faculty. The survey results make it clear that racism does exist in various forms at the university. For an urban university that seeks to be diverse and serve the needs of underserved communities of color, the survey illuminates a persistent yet urgent problem that calls for a thoughtful, thorough, and united response. It is positive that most students and faculty/staff perceive Metropolitan State as a good and respectful place to learn and work. Yet, while many people of color and whites claim not to see or experience racism, significant numbers do have an awareness and experience with racism in this university. Any amount or degree of racism should be a concern at an institution of higher learning that is an equal opportunity educator and employer.

The survey results also make clear the significant differences between many people of color and whites on more than half of the statements about the climate at Metropolitan State. Many survey items reveal gaps of perception that should be cause for further study and dialogue. While these divergent experiences and perceptions of campus climate are not as stark as those encountered in New Orleans and reflected in recent polling of African Americans and whites in reference to the Hurricane Katrina catastrophe, they provide the university community with both a challenge and an opportunity to bridge understandings across racial groups.

Metropolitan State must have an anti-racist campus climate: one that fosters equity, respect, and success for each individual and group in our community. To this end, and to become fully accountable to historically underserved and underrepresented communities of color, the university must build on its assets such as the diversity of its students and employees to nurture a culture of openness, good intentions, and a will to respond, change and grow. Given the historic and systemic nature of racism in our society, such accountability to communities of color

---

3 According to a September 8, 2005 Pew Research Center poll asking if the government’s response to Hurricane Katrina would have been faster if most of the victims were White, only 17% of White respondents agreed compared to 66% of Black respondents.
requires that a focus be placed on dismantling institutional racism in and around the university rather than focusing on preventing individual acts of racism.

The following recommendations emerged from the survey data upon which this report is based, suggestions made by participants at various Community Conversations about racism held during the 2004-05 academic year, meetings of the Anti-Racism Leadership Team, and reviews of anti-racist activities at other universities. The recommendations are intended to help the university better understand and confront the problems of institutional and interpersonal racism, and to ensure that the campus climate is safe, respectful, and equitable for all its members. The authors of this Executive Summary and full report are hopeful that the university community, with all its strengths, will unite around these recommendations and act accordingly.

**Recommendations to Reduce Racism at Metropolitan State**

1. Hold annual or semi-annual anti-racism strategic planning summits.
2. Collect more data and continue further study.
3. Clarify and affirm the mission of the university.
4. Connect and integrate into AQIP.
5. Discuss how to support a strong and viable Ethnic Studies Department.
6. Increase awareness of proactive, positive things the university is doing to combat racism.
7. Develop a university anti-racism policy.
8. Implement a racial impact statement procedure.
9. Set and achieve goals for the enrollment/hiring, retention and success of students and faculty/staff of color.
10. Develop an anti-racism budget.
11. Continue sponsoring “Undoing Racism” training sessions.
12. Continue Community Conversations about issues of race and racism along with other forms of oppression.
13. Strengthen the Anti-Racism Leadership Team.
14. Clarify and coordinate the charges of existing university-wide committees with related interests (i.e. ARLT, IMAC, EMAC, Multicultural Education Committee of the IFO, etc.).
15. Find alternative ways other than those already employed to bring more people into the process of making the university an anti-racist institution.
16. Implement a racial issues course graduation requirement beginning in fall 2006.
17. Provide grants to strengthen anti-racist curriculum across departments.
18. Create “learning circles” and other opportunities for learning outside of the classroom.
19. Create a “Students Against Racism” organization.
20. Connect with civic engagement initiatives of the university.
21. Connect anti-racism work with the work combating other forms of oppression.