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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report summarizes findings of a campus visit to consult on the establishment of a multicultural center at the University of Delaware. Observations and recommendations offered here are based on a series of meetings conducted on October 15-17, 2017, as well as careful review of artifacts that were furnished prior to, during, and following our campus visit.

Focus of the Review

The focus of the review is based on questions suggested by Dr. Carol Henderson and Trevor Dawes:

1. What are some of the key needs underlying the establishment of a Multicultural Center?
2. What are some of the major concerns among campus constituents regarding the establishment of a Multicultural Center?
3. What opportunities exist to ensure that the establishment of a Multicultural Center will be successful and sustainable?
4. What challenges and cautions should be considered in the establishment of a Multicultural Center?
5. What general observations regarding the overall campus climate and institutional context should be considered in the establishment of a Multicultural Center?

In addition to these questions, we were encouraged to also think about:

1. How the Multicultural Center aligns with the goals of the recent Inclusive Excellence Diversity Action Plan at UD?
2. What can be gleaned from the data that has been collected?
3. How can information from the “diversity inventory” be used to advise the Multicultural Center?
4. How should the Multicultural Center be student focused, yet engage faculty and staff across the University?

For each question, we list our collective observations as a consultant team and later in the report, share a proposed set of recommendations we believe will contribute to and provide further guidance for the establishment of a multicultural center at the University of Delaware.

Limitations

The constituents with whom we spoke were invested in the creation of a multicultural center. However, we did not have an opportunity to connect with students and other groups who do not typically engage with multicultural and diversity-related resources at UD. Hearing from those least likely to engage, might have yielded important considerations for crafting a center that would ensure their engagement. In addition, constituents mentioned a host of diverse needs, some spanning beyond the scope of a traditional multicultural center. We broadly captured the sentiments expressed, but also realized the variation of needs stemmed from the absence of a clearly articulated purpose and vision regarding a multicultural center. For
example, based upon our observations, it was difficult to discern which populations the multicultural center would serve. Would the center appeal most to undergraduate students? Graduate students? Would the center specifically address the needs of international students? LGBTQ students? Although multiple and diverse groups of people were mentioned in our various conversations, more often participants stressed the need for the center and noted various issues that could be addressed through the center. However, sentiments were not consistently connected to a particular population on campus. Finally, we did not have an opportunity to engage with members of the community surrounding UD to gain a sense of their connections to the institution and possibilities for collaborative efforts/partnerships that might stem from establishing a multicultural center.

**General Findings and Recommendations**

The major findings of this report indicate that most constituents positively view the establishment of a multicultural center or at minimum, believed the conversation about establishing one was significant and necessary. The process of engaging diverse groups in the conversation about the multicultural center was greatly appreciated, but also connected to constituents expressing the lack of transparency in the process and the slow pace of change on campus. At numerous points during our conversations, constituents mentioned that the idea for a multicultural center had been circulating for years, but never prioritized until now. While the conversations were taking place, some constituents expressed doubts about forward movement in a timely fashion. Moreover, some constituents explained that more student voices should be involved in the process.

Although general sentiments about establishing a multicultural center were positive, constituents lacked clarity about its purpose and questioned the needs that such a center will fulfill. Moreover, most constituents were unclear about the overall vision for a multicultural center. Questions regarding space, center type, location, and naming consistently emerged. More importantly, questions with regard to funding, board of trustee approval, and institutional support of a multicultural center were frequently mentioned as concern for having a multicultural center.

Campus constituents, with whom we spoke, overwhelmingly agreed that UD has clear issues with regard to its campus climate, facilitating the need for a cultural center. Various groups expressed feelings of isolation, marginality and exclusion. They also expressed that having a multicultural center might be able to address a number of the diverse concerns they raised. However, a multicultural center would only be a minimal effort if issues in the larger campus climate (see Question #5 below) were continuously ignored by the administration.

Although various initiatives were described in terms of addressing diverse needs on campus, constituents repeatedly referenced the importance of the Center for Black Culture as a space that not only served Black students, but a wide range of students who sought assistance there. The CBC was also referenced as a model for a new multicultural center.
Based upon our collective insights, the team agreed that a multicultural center should be established and offered **SIX** broad recommendations for moving forward. First, given the tremendous lack of clarity around the center, we recommend that UD identify a set of community needs (what are constituents varying needs and why does UD need a multicultural center?), principles (what guiding principles will be used to frame each stage of developing the multicultural center?) and outcomes (what outcomes does having a multicultural center produce?) to guide the development of a multicultural center. We also recommend that the process of developing the center be rooted in campus-wide conversations to promote transparency and input from students, faculty, staff and administrators and community members. We recommend that UD identify specific outcomes that should be gained as a result of various interactions with a multicultural center. In other words, we are conceptualizing “outcomes” in two different ways. First, the outcomes of a multicultural center at UD and second, the outcomes that occur as a result of interactions in the center.

As consultants, we believe that UD is in a unique position to create a center that looks different from other centers and possibly serves as a model for other institutions. We recommend UD consider a range of models for implementing a multicultural center and offer examples of existing models to promote conversations about what amenities and structures would work best given the institutional mission, vision, and goals (See Appendix A-E). Alongside continued conversations about a multicultural center, we recommend UD spend considerable time with reconfiguring and refocusing its diversity agenda and infrastructure to address concerns about the campus climate and to determine how a multicultural center would assist in meeting the diverse needs on campus. Lastly, UD must make a strong case for a multicultural center that involves the center’s infrastructure and how its various components align with the business and funding models of the institution.
This report is based on a series of meetings conducted over 1.5 days, as well as careful reviews of artifacts that were furnished prior to, during, and following my campus visit. Following are the various constituent groups with whom we met to gain insights:

**Sunday, October 15, 2017**

4:00 pm  
Campus Tour (William “Gil” Johnson)

6:00 pm  
Dinner with Multicultural Working Group

**Monday, October 16, 2017**

8:00-9:15 am  
Breakfast with President and First Lady Eleni Assanis and campus administrators

9:30-10:15 am  
Meeting with Students of the “Representative Caucus of Diverse Identities and Cultures”

10:30-11:15 am  
Meeting with UD Senior Administration

11:30 am-12:30 pm  
Lunch with Deans and Deputy Deans

1:00-1:45 pm  
Meeting with Select Directors

1:45-2:30 pm  
Meeting with Chief Diversity Advocates

2:30-3:30 pm  
Meeting with Student Life Leaders

4:00-5:30 pm  
Open Forum

6:00-7:30 pm  
Dinner with Student Leaders; SOLAR Council

**Tuesday, October 17, 2017**

9:00 am  
Wrap up with Drs. Carol Henderson and José-Luis Riera
In addition to information and insights collected through face-to-face interviews and focus groups, this report is also based on the following documents and materials:

1. University of Delaware Website
2. Center for the Study of Diversity, Experiencing Diversity at UD: Race/Ethnicity (Volume 1) (Executive Summary)
3. Center for the Study of Diversity, Experiencing Diversity at UD: Race/Ethnicity (Volume 1) (Full Report)
5. UD Multicultural Center Gathering Document
6. UDAILY Articles
7. Inventory of Diversity Initiatives from the Office of the Vice Provost for Diversity
8. *Inclusive Excellence: An Action Plan for Diversity at UD*
9. Access to a database of feedback offered to the Multicultural Center Working Group

We also examined the current diversity initiatives and desire for a multicultural center from an institutional and historical context to guide our observations and recommendations.
UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

During his 2016 inauguration speech, President Dennis Assanis asserted, “diversity, equity and inclusion are absolutely core to our institutional character and our educational mission at the University of Delaware (UD). Our students must know how to live and work in a society that is increasingly more diverse.” He continued by describing the ways in which UD will cultivate these concepts into our core values. Specifically, he defined his framework for diversity as holistic, discussed its value when leveraged appropriately, and shared the actions—advancing a multicultural curriculum, increasing resources towards diversity related initiatives, and recruiting and retaining diverse representation in student body, faculty, and staff—he viewed as necessary for creating a more inclusive climate at UD. Though timely and well received, this framework and call to action was hardly inaugural when considering the institutional context of UD.

Like most educational institutions, UD has a complicated history with diversity, equity and inclusion. From legal disenfranchisement, mandated integration, and today’s context of increasing student diversity, the accessibility and welcoming climate at UD has, and continues to be, characterized as problematic.

Founded in 1743, the free school that served an all-white and all-male student body in Rev. Dr. Francis Alison’s home has undergone various waves to create a more accessible and inclusive environment. The first wave, to diversify the course offerings, took place before 1834 when NewArk College (later renamed Delaware College) opened as a degree-granting institution. The next wave didn’t begin for another 50 years when between 1872-1875, the college attempted female education, however this was not formalized until 1914 with the creation of a women’s college and the eventual enactment of a full co-educational policy in 1945.

The University faced a third wave of change in 1950 when the class action suit Parker V. the University of Delaware confirmed that the trustee’s decision to refuse to consider black students’ applications violated the Equal Protection Clause of the United States Constitution. This decision prompted the desegregation of the University of Delaware. While these decisions granted access to the university and changed the demographic makeup of campus, issues of support for diverse student needs and lack of representation have and continue to promulgate a negative campus climate for students of color, as well as other disenfranchised groups.

In the fall of 1968, then university president, President Edward Trabant, initiated strategic working groups to examine the experiences of students of color on the UD campus. These groups proposed various interventions to respond to their concerns and subsequently founded a minority center. This minority center, established in 1976, later became the Center for Black Culture. The Center for Black Culture (CBC), affectionately coined “a home away of from home” for many students of color, continues to serve as the only cultural center on UD’s campus. Situated on a campus of almost 23,000 students, and within UD’s Student Life division, the CBC has three exempt staff positions and one administrative assistant.
Despite some institutional efforts, including the CBC and an Affirmative Action Office that made attempts to facilitate diversity work, students from racially minoritized groups continued to experience the UD climate as isolating, unwelcoming and resistant to change. These perspectives have helped advance the institution’s mission towards diversity, equity and inclusion. However, Delaware’s decentralized approach to diversity, equity and inclusion work has limited its progress. Such a context indicates that UD’s goals toward diversity, equity, and inclusion, span beyond the scope of a traditional multicultural center.

**Changes in Administration:**
In May of 2008, President Patrick Harker unveiled the Path to Prominence, a strategic plan which charted five university priorities. Among these priorities was diversity. Immediately following the unveiling of the Path to Prominence, President Harker appointed a Diversity Task Force which recommended numerous initiatives to enhance diversity, equity and inclusion at UD. A Diversity Action Council was then appointed to begin the implementation of these initiatives. As a result, the Office of Equity and Inclusion was created, and two equity commissions merged to create the Diversity and Equity Commission.  

The Commission produced a report that displayed the results of a Campus Climate Survey and provided recommendations for President Harker moving forward. Included in this list of recommendations were: increased transparency of commitment to diversity, better systems of reporting and management of bias related events, and increased recruitment and retention of diverse faculty and staff.

To advance this work, Maggie Anderson, the executive director of the President’s Diversity Initiative, served as the interim VP of Faculty Affairs and Diversity until 2014 when a new position, the Vice Provost for Diversity, was created and filled. Dr. Carol Henderson was appointed Vice Provost for Diversity and was “charged with advancing the University's academic mission and goals in the areas of diversity, equity, inclusion by leading efforts to define, assess and cultivate diversity as both an institutional value and an academic priority.”

While Dr. Henderson’s responsibility was clear, the urgency of her charge increased during the fall of 2015, when Acting President Nancy Targett prioritized an institutional response to student concerns of racial conflict and exclusion. In December of 2015, Vice Provost for Diversity, Dr. Henderson, released a draft of “INCLUSIVE EXCELLENCE: An Action Plan for Diversity at UD” which outlined the University’s plan to address issues of diversity and inclusion. In the Spring of 2016 this plan was discussed across campus.

Though acting President Targett left UD before the plan was actualized, President Assanis was elected in November of 2015 and became acquainted with Inclusive Excellence and the campus conversations surrounding the action plan. When he formally began at the University of Delaware in June of 2016, his own priorities for the university aligned perfectly with the values of the plan. His priorities, which he communicated to trustees in February of 2017 include enhancing students’ success, investing in intellectual and physical capital, fostering a spirit of
innovation and entrepreneurship, building an environment of inclusive excellence, and strengthening interdisciplinary and global programs.  

Throughout each administration, diversity at the university has been prioritized in conversation, but the campus has been waiting for visible markers of this priority. The multicultural center, in this regard, plays a key role in the optics of the university’s commitment to inclusive excellence and the progress being made towards its advancement.

**Student Success:**

Another visual marker of success is campus diversity representation. Demographically, University enrollment does not and has not reflected the broader Delaware community (despite gains). According to census data the state of Delaware is about 22% black, while the University is only about 5% black. This statistic sits in contrast to other minoritized groups who state to campus representation gap is much smaller. For example, Hispanic groups comprise 9.2% of the state of Delaware populations and 7.27% at UD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race and Hispanic Origin</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White alone, percent, July 1, 2016, (V2016)</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone, percent, July 1, 2016, (V2016)</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native alone, percent, July 1, 2016, (V2016)</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone, percent, July 1, 2016, (V2016)</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone, percent, July 1, 2016, (V2016)</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races, percent, July 1, 2016, (V2016)</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino, percent, July 1, 2016, (V2016)</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White alone, not Hispanic or Latino, percent, July 1, 2016, (V2016)</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1: Census Quick Facts**


These numbers have been criticized by community leaders, and in June of 2015 lawmakers added more pressure for UD to increase diversity. They stated that many students in Delaware cannot attend their state school. “When you look at their numbers, it is clear that they are vacillating along a line that’s simply unacceptable in this day and age,” state Sen. Harris McDowell, co-chair of Joint Finance Committee. “I don’t want to de-emphasize that it’s a difficult issue. But we just have to get those diversity numbers up.”

Despite pressure, as Sen. Harris McDowell suggests, this issue is more nuanced and a broad sweeping institutional fix to close gaps may not be feasible. In fact, the public education system in the State of Delaware is struggling to meet college ready benchmarks.
According to SAT data from the Delaware Department of Education only 13% of black students have a thorough or proficient understanding (PL 3/4) of college ready math and only 35% of Black students have a thorough or proficient understanding (PL 3/4) of college-ready reading and writing. This data displays the difficulty of recruiting Delawarean students.
Despite these difficulties, UD has implemented a series of services to help Delawareans attend the University and to support them in their success upon enrollment.

In 2014, the University created and filled the role of Vice President for Enrollment management, a position responsible for identifying, attracting, yielding, funding and ensuring the success of UD’s undergraduate students. Chris Lucier, the VP for Enrollment Management has direct oversight of Admissions, the Registrar, Student Financial Services and the University Tutoring Center. During his tenure he has piloted SAT Optional Admissions—a four-year pilot program in which Delaware students will be able to choose whether or not to submit their SAT or ACT test scores for first-year admission to the University. Additionally, his team created the Blue Hen Success Collaborative, a platform that streamlines communication about students between advisors, faculty and staff. This platform enables appropriate resources to intervene in a timely manner to ensure student success. In addition to the efforts by enrollment management, the UD has maintained and bolstered its Commitment to Delawareans, an initiative which launched in 2006. Commitment to Delawareans provides a pathway to students from Delaware who have taken their general course requirements and have earned satisfactory grades. Additionally, the University pledges to meet 100% of the financial need of Delawarean students.

Climate:
Despite these efforts towards supporting student success, the climate at the University of Delaware does not seem to have changed in terms of its inclusivity. According to the 2011 Middle States Report, “UD is not diverse in either absolute or relative terms. With few exceptions, ... the university trails its peers in every measure of diversity in every constituency of the institution.” To continue to evaluate the campus climate and institutional change, the Office of the Vice Provost for Diversity (VPD), the Office of Equity and Inclusion (OEI) and the Center for the Study of Diversity (CSD) administered the Diverse Learning Environments (DLE). The DLE revealed many findings about the climate for underrepresented students, and researchers offered a list of recommendations moving forward. Some key findings include that underrepresented minorities reported more negative cross racial interactions, more frequent experiences of discrimination and bias, and weaker belief in UD’s commitment to diversity than White students. Additionally, the campus climate is not as positive for them as for White students. These perceptions, negatively affect sense of belonging among underrepresented minority students. The following are a few recommendations that were provided by researchers in this report:

- Increase opportunities for students to have positive cross-racial interactions and discussions across differences.
- Enhance the Multicultural requirement, and co-curricular opportunities to expand knowledge and exposure to diversity and assess both student participation and outcomes through exit surveys.
- Engage students more directly in diversity inspired activities.
Student Activism:
Ultimately, a multicultural center and its programming could address some of the climate issues at UD, particularly around student engagement. Most people see the value of the Center for Black Culture, but also desire programming and services for Asian and Latinx communities since the CBC space had not specifically been created for them. This example reveals that institutional response to diversity needs have been important in some ways, but perhaps miss the mark in other ways. Overall students desire and deserve a voice at the table.

This legacy of student advocacy has led to the creation of resources at the University of Delaware. The LGBT Program Coordinator, a position which was created and filled in 2015 was the result of student leadership and advocacy. While student advocacy has long been the driving force behind change at the UD, students are tired and exhausted. Such fatigue coupled with a lack of visible markers of progress contributes to a sense of urgency. Ultimately, the University of Delaware has a unique opportunity to respond to its diversity needs with a fresh slate, and a new model toward diversity, equity and inclusion. Whether this be a brick and mortar project or a more centralized approach, the campus is ready and in desperate need for a change.

FOOTNOTES
2. http://www.udel.edu/about/history/
10. https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/DE
11. http://ire.udel.edu/diversity-dashboard/
KEY QUESTIONS AND CONSULTANT OBSERVATIONS

QUESTION 1
What are some of the key needs underlying the establishment of a Multicultural Center?

1. Addressing the Campus Climate
   a. Constituents expressed a range of sentiments regarding the campus climate at UD. For example, they noted frequent racially charged incidents that occurred on campus. Some events were prompted by peers (e.g., 2015 campus gathering), while others were triggered by controversial speakers (e.g. Milo Yiannopoulos) or larger social issues (e.g. the recent presidential election). Overall, several diverse groups with whom we spoke described instances where the campus climate was hostile, unwelcoming, and neutral.

   b. Constituents also noted that interactions between minoritized students and their peers was often negative due to the problematic mindset enacted by students who were privileged by their race, social class, heterosexual and gender-conforming identities. Examples included the lack of diversity among the Student Government Association, which was described as an organization for white, affluent, cisgender men.

2. Institutional Leadership
   a. Concerns were also raised about how the institutional leaders respond to diversity issues indicating:
      i. Institutional leaders offer verbal statements with no follow up or action.
      ii. The University’s stance on controversial issues is unclear.
      iii. Actions of institutional leaders feel performative rather than substantive.
      iv. Issues have to get to a breaking point before action is taken.
      v. Perceived disconnect between administration’s perspective and students’ experiences and perspectives.
      vi. Oftentimes institutional actions pacify rather than substantively address the issue.
      vii. Participants noted that the administration was “behind the ball” in terms of diversity efforts and addressing issues on campus.

3. Institutional Policies and Practices
   a. Concerns were raised about institutional policies and practices such as:
      i. Lack of health and wellness options for trans* students.
      ii. Lack of proper pronoun usage in the classroom and broadly.
      iii. Failure to be transparent about the institution’s stance on DACA.
      iv. Lack of safety on campus for trans students.
v. Displacement of student groups (e.g. graduate and international students removed from the space which now holds the Biden Institute).

4. The Center for Black Culture (CBC)
   a. The CBC repeatedly emerged in our conversations as the primary campus entity doing the lion’s share of work around diversity and inclusion, thus the establishment of a multicultural center might help alleviate the substantial demands being placed on the CBC.
   
   b. The CBC is overburdened with mentoring, financial aid advising, academic and personal advising, and helping students navigate UD. These are all roles that existing campus entities should be addressing, but students go to the CBC because they get answers, and staff members take time and offer a welcoming environment. Students experienced other spaces as dismissive and where they were subjected to unwarranted scrutiny.

5. General Need for a Multicultural Center (MC)
   a. During our visit, the needs associated with developing a multicultural center were greatly varied and did not represent a shared overall vision. Segments of the UD community expressed dissonance about the purpose of a multicultural center, while others described the need for a physical space for coordinating inclusion-related activities. Despite the lack of a shared purpose statement for a multicultural center, the various groups we met with raised significant issues and concerns about UD not meeting the diversity-related needs of its student body and addressing other institutional associated issues (e.g., hiring diverse faculty and staff). While having a clear purpose for developing an MC is critical, the extent of the UD diversity-related issues described throughout this report as shared by students, faculty, and staff, highlights the important role that a center might play in helping address some, but not all the institutional needs requiring attention.
   
   b. Based upon the collective conversations, campus constituents discussed a range of needs that could be met by the establishment of a multicultural center. We list them below, yet stress again that the needs greatly varied. We do not recommend the establishment of a center to address each of these functions. Instead, it might prove more efficient and effective to examine what existing offices and departments are doing and the extent to which they need to adopt or to actually enact these responsibilities based on their respective office or departmental mission.
   
   c. Multicultural Center Needs
      i. A space to offer resources for addressing hate speech.
      ii. A space to house student caucuses, allowing them to meet and discuss needed policy changes.
iii. A space to house a student elected caucus group to advise administration.
iv. A space to support identity affirmation.
v. A space to help students not only survive but thrive at UD.
vi. A space to address equity gaps throughout campus.
vii. A space that provides a forum to address difficult and challenging topics or foster civil dialogue, particularly among opposing groups.
viii. A space to foster community engagement initiatives.
ix. A space to help improve the optics of the campus and shift perceptions toward viewing UD as a genuinely diverse and inclusive institution.
x. A space for substantive cross-cultural interactions/engagement.
xi. A space to study.
xii. A space for reporting bias incidents.
xiii. A space intricately connected to the academic mission.
xiv. A space that brings people together and disrupts the fragmented campus that is often perceived by students.
xv. A space for students to commune.
xvi. A space with staff resources (e.g. an advisor for Latinx students).
xvii. A space for faculty to interact with students.
xviii. A space for individual groups that also promotes cross cultural collaboration.
xix. A space that promotes retention.
xx. A space for engagement around diversity, social justice, antiracism and homophobia.
xxi. A space for advocacy.
xxii. A discussion space to grapple with difficult dialogues.
xxiii. The campus needs a unifying mechanism and the MC can serve in that capacity.
xxiv. A coventional/collaborative space.
xxv. A place for ally training.
xxvi. A place with offices for AAPI, Latinx/LGBTQIA groups, international students, alumni.
xxvii. A space that houses student organizations.
xxviii. A space for programming, socializing and education.
xxix. A space for grappling with difficult dialogues.
xxx. A space for offering a common course on diversity that all students should take.
QUESTION 2
What are some of the major concerns among campus constituents regarding the establishment of a multicultural center? What challenges and cautions should be considered in the establishment of a multicultural center? What opportunities exist to ensure the establishment of a multicultural center will be successful and sustainable?

1. Concerns and Challenges
   a. As noted, the CBC was consistently mentioned as an integral part of the diversity and inclusion efforts on campus. However, constituents expressed concerns that a multicultural center might sideline or diminish CBC efforts. The CBC was referenced as the default multicultural center and a unit that everyone uses (not just black students).

   b. More than concerns, most participants offered a range of questions as they sought clarity on the purpose of a multicultural center and the role it would play at UD:
      i. What qualities from the CBC operations can be used to frame a successful MC?
      ii. Will the MC be tokenized and used to undermine the CBC?
      iii. Should the MC focus on individual groups or should there be individual centers around campus to serve various groups and not be “bunched” into the MC?
      iv. Can the MC effectively address race and diversity rather than sugarcoat the issue?
      v. Should the center be a repurposed space or newly created?
      vi. Should the MC be one space or multiple spaces throughout campus?
      vii. Would the MC have the necessary visibility and stature?
      viii. Would the MC have the necessary resource allocation to accomplish its many expectations?
      ix. How will the MC’s visibility be situated to ensure that those, beyond minoritized students, faculty and staff, know it exists and view it as a critical resource?
      x. Will the MC simply serve as a symbol or will it actually have a substantive function?
      xi. Will the MC actually be called the MC? The “multicultural” language is problematic and outdated.
      xii. Is the creation of the MC just another “band-aid” or “window-dressing” approach? If it’s created, how does this address lingering issues in the large campus milieu?
      xiii. What mechanisms will be implemented in the short term while the MC is being established?
c. Participants noted that a major concern for establishing an MC was its usage and associated outcomes. For example, some noted there was no formalized curriculum for students to learn about diversity and social justice or ways to formally engage in conversations about antiracism and homophobia. Others explained that Resident Assistants seemed to be the only students pushed to have difficult dialogues rather than making this a campus-wide effort. The concern seemed to be that participants wanted efforts directed toward educating the campus on diversity issues and ensuring that the outcomes moved beyond “preaching to the choir” towards substantive engagement. Questions surfaced around whether a MC would and should address this concern.

d. Another major concern was associated with who the MC would serve. Throughout our conversations, a range of student populations were explicitly named as feeling isolated, excluded, and invisible, feeling a lack of support, and desiring a space. For these respective groups participants share that staff and students are often overworked in terms of providing support and that the counseling staff either lacked experience or expertise in working with some of the groups mentioned. We list these groups below in no particular order:
   i. Minoritized students often feel isolated like “the only one” in classroom environments.
   ii. Rural/urban students.
   iii. Students from Delaware public schools.
   iv. Religious minorities.
   v. DACA students.
   vi. International students.
   vii. Domestic Asian American students.
   viii. LGBTQ student groups.
   ix. Grad Students.

2. Opportunities for a multicultural center
   a. Overwhelmingly, the participants with whom we spoke, expressed a positive outlook regarding the idea of a multicultural center and saw it as one opportunity to address climate issues at UD.
   b. Administrators with whom we spoke share that existing facilities could be options for housing a center.
   c. Participants shared connections they saw between the MC and other campus entities as possible collaborative opportunities.
   d. The fact that the UD president and institutional leaders saw the multicultural center as an important effort was mentioned several times as an opportunity to move forward; although tempered with the length of time it has taken for the institution to move forward with implementation.
   e. The CBC was referenced as a model for conceptualizing a new center on campus.
QUESTION 3-5
What general observations regarding the overall campus climate and institutional context should be considered in the establishment of a multicultural center?

1. Participants shared considerable feedback regarding the overall campus climate and institutional context. There is a cultural mindset on campus that is problematic and unwilling to deal with difficult issues.
2. There was general consensus that the UD campus does well at serving white, affluent students, but does not do an equally effective job at serving minoritized groups. Underrepresented and underserved groups were described as having a negative perception of UD.
3. Similarly, participants commented on the need for UD to work on enhancing its relationships with and treatment of minoritized groups. Some commented on structural diversity and increasing representation of minoritized groups in decision making roles (e.g. diversifying board of trustees). Others commented that UD needs to foster a stronger relationship with teachers, schools and superintendents to address a failing k-12 system in locally and state-wide.
4. Participants indicated a need for more collaborative opportunities across diverse groups and across campus. The language used was “intentional intersections across work that promoted trust collaboration and content knowledge.” While many saw the MC as one facilitator of such opportunities, we recommend that larger efforts geared toward collaboration be implemented.
5. UD promulgates a culture of fear, where individuals are afraid to speak and be honest due to repercussions; the culture does not promote risk-taking for the sake of moving conversations and efforts forward. For example, participants discussed people’s apprehension to say “white” in conversations and instead opted for coded language to describe different groups (e.g. multicultural = race). An example of this apprehension was exhibited during the open forum as participants used the word “majority” to reference “white people”.
6. Students expressed feeling a substantial amount of pressure to do the work of diversity and social justice with no compensation or acknowledgement. UD must identify a way to recognize the critical role that students play in advancing an inclusion agenda and to appropriately partner with students in these efforts. UD should consider the creation of a campus ambassadors group that supports students whose commitment to social justice and diversity span beyond general student involvement. Support could include financial resources or other benefits that demonstrate the institutions commitment to the students and these values. If compensation is not an option, UD should identify alternatives such as certificates or end of year acknowledgement of students who have worked above and beyond to promote social justice, diversity and inclusion on campus. UD should also foster concrete partnerships with students that involve listening and collective action.
7. Although the conversations with participants centered on the MC, the general consensus was that a shift in the campus climate and culture is needed more than an
MC. Some indicated a building isn’t needed. Instead, competent, thoughtful and caring people are needed.

8. While participants primarily viewed the MC as a positive effort, they also expressed concerns that the MC should not exist to “let others off the hook.” Similarly, participants were clear that the MC would not solve all of the problems looming on campus. Attempts to make the MC a panacea would ultimately lead to its failure; hence the need for an identified infrastructure to grapple with issues that span beyond the scope of an MC.

9. Some participants expressed concerns regarding resource allocation and the intended purpose, outcomes and scope of the center. However, their concerns were couched in problematic language reflective of common misunderstandings about multicultural centers which included:

   a. Unclear understandings of the difference between segregation and separation in relation to MCs.
   b. The use of “ghettoization” language to describe MCs.
   c. The use of safety and comfort to describe what MCs should provide.
   d. Assertions/fears that if one group has a cultural center, then centers would have to be provided for any group that requests one, placing a strain on institutional resources.
MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Consideration for developing a multicultural center (MC) should be driven by a set of identified community needs, principles, and outcomes. Each of these will assist with developing a purpose statement and outline that will drive discussion about the types of programs/services, organizational structures, physical facility types, and resource requirements needed to realize the hopes and aspirations of students and the University of Delaware (UD) community. We recommend that UD constituents collectively work to identify a clear set of principles about diversity and inclusion to guide the development of a multicultural center. The UD Inclusive Excellence Action Plan states: “Our University is committed to embracing a diverse and inclusive campus that reflects our collective views, experiences, capabilities, cultures, aspirations, and ultimately our commitment to excellence. Educational communities are enriched by the contributions and full participation of people from different backgrounds.” In the first sentence, UD unequivocally states its commitment to fostering a diverse and inclusive campus. Secondly, UD states clearly the important roles diversity and inclusion play in an educational setting. These two principles (a commitment to... and acknowledgment of the importance of...) along with other principles identified as part of a shared process should be used to inform the overall purpose for a multicultural center.

2. Campus-wide conversations or forms of communication should be used to invite feedback from students, faculty, staff and administrators. This could occur as open forums, surveys, crowdsourcing for feedback and any other method that would engage multiple constituents. All of the conversations need to be framed using language appropriate for heightening broad understanding of a multicultural center and dispelling myths and misconceptions. It will be important to steer away from the notion of “safe space” to reference the MC as such language can be deceptive. Ng (1993) stated, “To speak of safety and comfort is to speak from a position of privilege...For those who have existed too long on the margins, life has never been safe or comfortable (p. 201). Moreover, Srivastava (1994) noted that comments regarding safe spaces and the belief that everyone can feel safe “don’t acknowledge that people of colour cannot be safe... They do not acknowledge that white people...are generally safer, and that these different levels of danger are based on the power relations of racism. These statements also create an impression that the feelings of unsafeness are not systemic problems but rather individual problems that can be overcome” (p. 106). Similarly, Patton (2006) argues that such centers promote neither ghettoization, segregation, or separation, each of which are forced conditions structurally imposed on students due to racist and other discriminatory systems. Instead, students often see them as spaces of retreat to avoid feelings of isolation experienced within the larger campus context. Yet, retreat does not ensure safety.

3. Upon establishing an overall purpose for a multicultural center, we recommend that UD constituents identify specific outcomes that should be gained as a result of various interactions with the multicultural center. Knowing the desired outcomes for interacting
in a multicultural center will ultimately inform the services provided, the organizational structure needed, the facility type, and required resources. The UD Inclusive Excellence plan outlines achieving the following outcomes:

- Increasing the racial and cultural diversity of students, faculty, and staff.
- Creating a climate that expects and encourages all members of the University community to respect and appreciate individual and cultural differences.
- Promoting equity for people of different backgrounds throughout all areas of University life.
- Developing organizational practices that include the participation and perspectives of these groups.
- Enhancing the curriculum by including the contributions and perspectives of different races, cultures, and gender.

These outcomes could be used as a springboard for conceptualizing particular outcomes for the multicultural center. Certainly, a highly functioning multicultural center can play a critical role in the diversification of students, faculty, and staff as well as offer programs and services that cultivate a campus environment where individuals and cultural differences are valued and respected. Moreover, the multicultural center can play a pivotal role in facilitating cross-cultural engagement. The multicultural center can be a starting place from which advocacy for equity across a host of issues can occur as well as a resource for campus-wide education on equity and social justice issues. The multicultural center with appropriate mission and resources can contribute greatly to an educational curriculum that is reflective of “the contributions and perspectives of different races, cultures, and gender.” To be sure, a multicultural center can do all of these things and much more, the prevailing question however, is should its role be comprised of these multiple responsibilities? This is a conversation that must be centered in the process; that is, the UD community must decide what the primary focus of multicultural center is and once determined, how does UD avoid the trend of placing too heavy expectations on the multicultural center and too few expectations on other campus entities that should be partnering to ensure the facilitation of inclusive excellence.

4. Consider the range of models for implementing a multicultural center along with staffing structures (See Appendix A-E). The models presented in the appendix are based upon our collective observations and additional information gathered by the consulting team. They also reflect the UD context in addition to models at other institutions. UD has several choices to consider in moving forward with a center as outlined below. First, we present the options as expressed by the various audiences with whom we spoke, along with considerations for staffing, organizational, and programming models. Then we share UD specific multicultural center model options.

   a. **GENERAL OPTIONS (Appendix A)**
      i. **No multicultural center**: Although participants expressed general positivity about a center, not all with whom we spoke thought a center was necessary. Some mentioned the possibility of restructuring current
offices and services in a way that reflected the synergies that are often generated through the existence of a multicultural center.

ii. **Construct a new multicultural center:** Some participants discussed the symbolism a new center would convey about UD’s diversity commitment. Moreover, a new center could help address pressing issues around campus diversity while also being attractive to external donors who could possibly contribute to a capital campaign around diversity, institutional excellence and prominence at UD.

iii. **Create a Multicultural Center within an Existing Facility:** Another option mentioned among participants was the use of an existing facility to house a multicultural center. Such an option might contribute to cost savings and can still reflect UD’s commitment to diversity. Facilities mentioned included the Perkins Student Center and Kent Dining Complex.

iv. **Aligning and Connecting Existing Services and Programs:** A fourth option was to better align and connect existing key services and programs. Numerous programs exist under various units and were implemented to address identified issues on the UD campus (e.g. NUCLEUS program, RISE program, TRIO programs, CBC). Perhaps greater alignment among these various programs and services could operate as a collective strategy to address student success and issues of inclusion and diversity.

v. **Build a New Student Center:** The final option was to construct a new student center to address multiple needs in one facility, that would include a multicultural programs office or center. This option might attract a broader range of constituents and allow access to multiple funding sources.

In addition to these various options, how the multicultural center is positioned is equally important. Using a list of comparator institutions (Appendix B & F), we provide information in the appendix about the reporting line of a potential center based upon models at comparative schools. Similarly, we offer staffing and programming models to provide examples of structures at other institutions. For UD, decisions about the organizational, programming, and staffing models might be best addressed after responding to recommendation #4.

b. **UD SPECIFIC MULTICULTURAL CENTER OPTIONS (Appendix E)**

i. **Center for Black Culture and Community Inclusion:** This model honors and builds upon the history and legacy of the CBC (previously known as the “Minority Center”). It formally expands the role of the CBC and recognizes the role the CBC is already playing with other student groups on campus (e.g., Latino students). The current CBC location would not be suitable for this model.
ii. **Center for Community Inclusion and Black Culture**: This model embeds the CBC within the framework of an MC. In this model, the CBC could potentially remain in its current location or physically be embedded within a new facility. While a model like this would naturally raise questions regarding the structure, the historical context pertaining to the African American experience in Delaware, and UD justifies a special focus on students from the African Diaspora.

iii. **Center for Community Inclusion**: This model reflects a traditional MC which would allow the CBC to continue at its current or a new location (e.g., larger property). The MC would conduct outreach to the various student communities at UD and carry out its unique functions, but not duplicate efforts out of the CBC (e.g., existing mentoring program, annual Black History Month events, etc.). Certainly, there would be opportunities for strategic collaborations between these two entities. This model also allows for the two entities to report to one or two administrative divisions (e.g., CBC in Student Affairs and MC in Vice Provost for Diversity or vice versa).

iv. **New Student Center Model**: This model embeds “MC” like functions within the administrative structure of a new student center. Symbolically the entire student center becomes the MC. Throughout the student center community members are exposed to symbols, art, and artifacts that reflect the diverse cultures at UD and their histories. Retail food options and dining reflect both domestic and international diversity. Identified diverse student organizations have assigned spaces and shared meeting spaces to facilitate intentional and organic collaborations (e.g., rehearsal space, kitchen, meeting rooms, performance space, lounges, etc.). Center staff serve as advisors to student orgs, mentors to students, and collaborate on programming and outreach initiatives to the UD community. Other related diversity and inclusion programs and services can also be housed in the new student center (e.g., TRIO programs). The official naming of the new student center would reflect it being named after someone or something that reflects the values of community and inclusion.

5. Reconfigure and refocus UD’s diversity agenda and infrastructure to explicitly include the implementation of a multicultural center or “system” of centers to assist with addressing the diverse needs of campus constituents. As a result of our conversations, it became abundantly clear that various participants saw the value of a center. Yet, no one made a solid and comprehensive case for why the center should be established; who it would serve; nor had a clear case been made to the UD Board of Trustees and other decision-making bodies associated with the institution. Our recommendation is for the
multicultural workgroup and other relevant entities to not only consider the needs precipitating a center, but how having a center can and would be clearly linked to the mission and vision of UD as a public, flagship institution committed to inclusive excellence. In other words, how would a multicultural center promote inclusive excellence in ways that are not currently reflected on the UD campus? The response to this question should be driven by the observations shared above, the numerous resources derived from other data-gathering processes and consideration of four pillars of diversity as outlined below:

a. **Institutional Leadership & Commitment** - The clarity of expectations, investment in human and fiscal resources and accountability as demonstrated through the words and actions of UD and community leaders at all levels.

b. **Curricular and Co-curricular transformation** - The extent to which principles of multiculturalism, pluralism, equity and diversity are currently incorporated into what is taught at UD, how it’s taught, and the experiences UD provides to improve what it does. It is also about ongoing efforts to further these things into UD’s educational and community systems.

c. **Campus climate** - The degree to which the events, messages, symbols, values, etc., around the UD campus and community make it a welcoming and inclusive environment for all students, faculty, staff and members of the broader community.

d. **Representational diversity** - The degree to which the UD campus and community attracts, retains, and develops students, faculty, staff and businesses of color in alignment with the campus mission and service agendas.

Reflection on these four pillars might logically lead to a conversation about reconfiguring and refocusing UD’s diversity agenda and infrastructure. For example, as consultants, we wondered about the infrastructure currently in place for the chief diversity officer. Our sense was that diversity initiatives and the appropriate strategies for structuring them were still under development, which in some ways makes it challenging to establish a multicultural center without a fully solidified administrative structure for diversity.

6. In order to make a case for a multicultural center, the multicultural workgroup and other relevant entities, must identify the necessary components for the center’s infrastructure and consider how such components align with the business and funding models of UD. Below, we offer a set of bulleted points that can be used to guide this conversation along two primary focal points: justification for the center and overall scope for the center.

   a. **JUSTIFICATION FOR MULTICULTURAL CENTER**
      i. **Multicultural Center Business Model**
         • What existing business problem(s) are driving the need for a multicultural center? How were these issues determined?
• How will the center’s business model be constructed to address the identified issues?
• What are the fiscal conditions of UD to date that make a decision to have a multicultural center an immediate or long-term investment?
• What are EDP (Economic, Demographic and Political) trends that would help or hinder the case for a UD free-standing or consolidated center?
• What will be the multicultural center’s organizational framework? How will this framework ensure effectiveness and sustainability?
• What type of analysis will be used to determine the key modes of service that connect the multicultural center to other service and diversity-purposed units at UD?
• What will be the multicultural center’s transformative capacity? How will it be positioned to shift the UD status quo on issues of diversity and equity?
• What paradigm shifts among UD constituents would be facilitated as a result of establishing a multicultural center?
• What identifiable strengths and weaknesses about UD will the multicultural center expose? Address?
• How will the establishment of a multicultural center benefit constituents on campus? Which particular constituents might benefit the most from the center’s presence?
• How does the establishment of a center increase/decrease value to the UD campus in terms of fiscal resources, time, human resources?

b. SCOPE OF MULTICULTURAL CENTER
   i. Multicultural Center Scope
• Who does the center primarily serve? Who are secondary audiences? (Target group(s))? 
• Where is the center located? What spaces will it provide? (Primary and secondary functional space/s such as lecture halls, auditoriums, offices classrooms)?
• What is the timeframe of the multicultural center’s development to full functionality (specific start and finish per stage)? When will specific components be initiated first, second, etc.?
• What are the technology and usage needs of a multicultural center?
• Access to partner stakeholders (other diversity units, external partners, etc.).
• What budget will be allocated and/or additional funds needed for establishing and maintaining a multicultural center?
• What resources are required for success (staff, access to facilities, vendors, equipment, etc.)?$
• What will be the staff structure and what diversity competencies should they have? What additional knowledge and skills will they be expected to acquire? How will they be evaluated? What are the expectations for improvement?
• What clearly defined steps will center staff follow to ensure the center achieves transformative capacity objectives?
• How will data about the center, its programs, staff, usage, be collected? When will data will be collected, completed and analyzed? When will data be reported/presented to administration for an annual report?

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the University of Delaware is uniquely positioned to enact innovative approaches for establishing a multicultural center. The UD historical context coupled with repeated conversations regarding diversity, equity, and inclusion on campus, confirms that UD has the capacity to adapt over time. UD is capable of fostering the conditions necessary for not only creating a multicultural center, but also generating a solid infrastructure to address campus climate issues. Such efforts would bring UD closer to realizing advancement towards inclusive excellence. However, before ground is broken, UD should increase clarity and transparency about the aims and objectives of such projects. Currently, the lack of purpose and vision regarding the center has created goals far too broad and far too unrealistic to be attainable with one structure. Ultimately, the plan for a multicultural center should address student and institutional needs in a clear actionable manner. The center should function as a catalyst for promoting access, equity, and community-building on the UD campus.
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APPENDIX A

Multicultural Center Models and Considerations

Physical Models

**Model #1 - No Multicultural Center:** There were enough sentiments expressed by the various groups that we met with whether an MC was needed. Community members described using available resources to expand existing programs and services or directly addressing the broader issues contributing to an exclusive campus climate. This option may also be viable within the context of the need for a new student center. A larger student center could lead to providing an increase in the types of spaces already allocated to cultural organizations in the Trabant Student Center in addition to how those spaces can be placed in proximity to each other with accompanying supporting spaces (e.g., kitchen, larger meeting rooms, etc.). The proximity of such spaces to each other could lead to the types of synergies generated within an MC.

**Model #2 - Construct a New Multicultural Center:** Much was said during our visit about the symbolism a newly constructed MC would convey about UD’s commitment to diversity, inclusion, and social justice. Furthermore, there appeared to be an understanding among many of the individuals we spoke with that building a new MC was the preferred option for forging ahead. Such a facility could serve as a beacon of light for the UD community while being a center of convergence for issues of student access, inclusion, and success. While such a facility might prove difficult to pursue financially alongside other existing priorities, the construction of a new MC could be attractive to donors within the scope of a capital campaign that seeks to move UD towards institutional excellence and national prominence.
Model #3 - Create a Multicultural Center within an Existing Facility: Another viable option discussed during our visit was the creation of an MC within an existing facility on the UD campus. While this option does not quite live up to the same level of excitement associated with a ground-up construction project, it could prove to be a good use of existing infrastructure and limited resources while still conveying a strong commitment to the role that an MC can play with helping advance UD’s Inclusive Excellence agenda. Existing facilities mentioned during our visit include the upper-level of the Perkins Student Center where the Center for Counseling and Student Development will be moving from soon (5,000 square feet). Also mentioned was the Kent dining complex which is currently vacant and centrally located like the Perkins Student Center. One challenge with this model would be working within an existing footprint unless a new addition is part of the renovation project to increase the amount of square footage needed to meet program and service objectives.

![Image 3 Create a Multicultural Center within an Existing Facility]

Model #4 – Aligning and Connecting Existing Services and Programs: Another model that emerged during our visit was better aligning and connecting existing key services and programs to maximize the return on investments and positive impact on the UD student experience (with or without an MC). From our observations and data gathering, it was clear that numerous programs reside under different units and were started to address similar issues. For example, the NUCLEUS program was noted for increasing the retention of historically underrepresented students in the College of Arts and Sciences. Similarly, the RISE Program in the College of Engineering seeks to “recruit and encourage academically prepared students who are native-born African American, Hispanic American, and Native American, as well as others who, as a group, are underrepresented in engineering.” Other programs such as the TRIO programs, Center for Black Culture, LGBT Program, and Office of International Students and Scholars seek to contribute to student success and address issues of inclusion on the UD campus. What would it mean to align these programs under the same division or campus leadership? What could such an alignment do for coordination and responsiveness to student needs? What kind of organizational and financial efficiencies can be realized as a result of different alignments and connections?

![Image 4 Aligning and Connecting Existing Services and Programs]
Model #5 – Build a New Student Center: Building a new student center will allow UD to address multiple needs through one facility. Such a facility will provide the UD community with an appropriately sized student center given the age and limited footprints of the two existing student centers. Moreover, including an MC within a new student center would still allow for inception planning and integration of the two functions in ways that cannot happen within an existing student center. Another benefit from this option is the potential of attracting a broader audience to the facility and its programs because of its location within a student center. The diversity of such a project would also benefit from being able to tap into multiple funding sources (e.g., student fees, state capital funding, and private fundraising) whereas the state may not be interested in contributing capital funding to a stand-alone MC.
APPENDIX B

Organizational Models

The types of MCs vary across institutions and are informed by institutional history and current context. As noted previously, a community conversation about needs, guiding principles, and outcomes should inform what kind of an MC and where it is located within the university structure. More importantly, UD has an opportunity to be innovative and to “think outside of the box” given its lack of a history with an MC. While it is beyond the scope of this report to prescribe whether an MC should reside in a Division of Student Affairs or within the portfolio of a Chief Diversity Officer, a simple query of multicultural centers at comparator institutions provides insights into where an MC might be located organizationally at UD. See Table 1.

Table 1 Selected Comparative Institutions (See Appendix F for full list of comparative institutions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected comparative schools</th>
<th>Does the institution have a Multicultural Center?</th>
<th>MC Mission</th>
<th>Is MC a stand-alone building or within existing building?</th>
<th>What’s under Student Affairs</th>
<th>Is there a Chief Diversity Officer?</th>
<th>What’s under the Chief Diversity Officer?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University – Bloomington</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>LGBTQ Center, Disability Services, Veteran Support Services, Commission for Multicultural Understanding</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ethnic cultural centers (Black, Latino, Asian, Native)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The primary mission of the Multicultural Center is to develop a sense of community between students, staff, and faculty of color on the Iowa State University campus. The overall intent of the Center is to create an environment where awareness of one’s cultural identity and a deeper understanding and respect of others’ differences with respect to culture, are readily accepted and embraced.</td>
<td>In the Student Union</td>
<td>LGBTQIA, Women’s Center, International Students and Scholars, Student Disability Resources, Multicultural Student Affairs (Black Cultural Center and Multicultural Center)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Office of Equal Opportunity, Office of Diversity and Inclusion (Project Director and Hispanic/Latinx Affairs and Project Director and LGBTQ+ Initiatives), University Committees (e.g., on women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>To facilitate the inclusive shared learning experiences of students where all can engage in dialogue, challenge barriers and build collaborative relationships.</td>
<td>In the Student Union</td>
<td>Multicultural Center, Disability Services</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Black Cultural Center, Women’s Center, Latinx Center, Resource Center on the African American Male, Pre-collegiate programs/Upward Bound, Other programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Yes or No</td>
<td>In the Student Union (shared name)</td>
<td>In the Student Union (shared name)</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Yes or No</td>
<td>In the Student Union (shared name)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>Yes (started out as Black Cultural Center)</td>
<td>The Paul Robeson Cultural Center at The Pennsylvania State University is a unit within Student Affairs, which seeks to make true the mission of the institution by serving students in the development of character, conscience, and social responsibility through fostering identity development, social justice and inclusion.</td>
<td>-Paul Robeson Cultural Center -LGBTQ Resource Center -Gender Equity Center -Center for Spiritual and Ethical Development -Veteran Programs -Women’s Advocacy Programs</td>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers University-New Brunswick</td>
<td>No Future plans for an “intercultural center”</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-Black Cultural Center -Latino Cultural Center -Asian American Cultural Center -Center for Social Justice Education &amp; LGBT Communities</td>
<td>Stony Brook University</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The Office of Multicultural Affairs provides coordinates and oversees the UNITI Cultural Center (UCC), a multicultural center promoting diversity and inclusion within the Stony Brook community. The UCC was established in 1978 and is based upon its central mission, which is reflected by the acronym UNITI, for &quot;United Nationalities in Transcending Ideologies.&quot; The UCC has a conference room/multipurpose space that student organizations and campus departments can use for their meetings and cultural programs. There also is a comfortable, open lounge where students can relax while studying or where cultural events can be held. The UNITI Cultural Center is located at Room 169 of the Student Activities Center (First Floor).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Connecticut</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-Center for Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-African American Cultural Center -Asian American Cultural Center -Puerto Rican Latin American Cultural Center -Rainbow Center -Women’s Center -Native American Cultural Programs -Strategic Committees (e.g., Student Recruitment and Retention Committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Massachusetts-Amherst</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The Center for Multicultural Advancement and Student Success (CMASS) is a support center whose primary focus is on first generation, students of color and low-income students. We provide academic support, personal development, career and graduate school preparation, cultural enrichment programs and outreach to incoming students and alumni.</td>
<td>Stand Alone</td>
<td>-Center for Multicultural Advancement and Student Success -Latin American Cultural Center -Malcom X Cultural Center -Yuru Kochiyama Cultural Center -Josephine White Eagle Cultural Center -Center for Women and Community -Men and Masculinity Programs -Office of Religious and Spiritual Life -Stonewall Center -Upward Bound -Student Bridges -Veteran Student Services</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-Institutional Diversity Councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan-Ann Arbor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Established as a Black student cultural center in 1971, the Trotter Center is now a vibrant hub that welcomes and serves all members of the campus community. In the fall of 2018, the Trotter Center will move to a new, specially designed 20,000-square-foot building located at the heart of the University’s central campus. Its new location will be emblematic of the important role the Trotter Center plays in the life of the institution. The new Trotter Center will serve as an iconic and programmatic symbol for all students, as an open and inclusive facility that fosters intercultural engagement and strengthens connections between and among communities, as a supportive home and</td>
<td>Stand Alone</td>
<td>-Multicultural Center -International Center -Services for Students with Disabilities -Spectrum Center (LGBT)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-Center for Educational Outreach -Detroit Center -Office of Institutional Equity -Office of Academic Multicultural Initiatives -Wolverine Pathways</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
environment to those committed to social justice and diversity, and as a space that celebrates the tradition and history of the Trotter Center and the activism of students.

We believe that our students are the driving force of our work. As a result, we choose to enhance the quality of life and development of the entire campus community. Through our shared cultural exhibitions, we create an inclusive co-curricular space where we celebrate the diversities and similarities that connect us all.

The Trotter Multicultural Center has a two-fold purpose:

- To promote a campus and community environment in which all students can prosper academically and socially.
- To promote and provide services to build a supportive environment in which all students can develop a better understanding and appreciation for the Multicultural diversity represented at the University.
Staffing Models
Staffing models for multicultural centers (MC) differ from institution to institution and are dependent on the program’s mission, and resources made available through the institution and other sources of funding (e.g., grants, donor gifts, etc.). A community conversation that leads to the identification of community needs, guiding principles and program outcomes should inform the staffing model needed for an MC on the UD campus. While not recommended and not a best practice, some MCs are staffed by a lone administrator, while others are staffed with multiple professionals with different levels of experience and responsibility. A comprehensive MC will also have graduate and student staff leading and assisting with different functions (e.g., event planning, student organization advising, etc.). The four staffing models below are for illustrative purposes only and could be configured in a multitude of ways but serve to highlight the different types of staffing structures that could be considered for an MC at UD.
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## APPENDIX D

### Program Service Models

Multicultural Centers historically have provided a broad array of programs and services for students and the campus community. They have evolved from being places where students feel safe and at home to centers that provide academic skills training, social justice education, and study abroad programs. Again, the identified needs, guiding principles, and intended outcomes will drive what programs and services are housed with an MC. Below is a listing of the types of program and service offerings found at MCs at institutions across the country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multipurpose Rooms</td>
<td>Cultural/Educational Programming</td>
<td>Mezzo Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Lounges</td>
<td>Study Circles</td>
<td>Student Advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gathering/Social Lounges</td>
<td>Study Abroad Experience</td>
<td>Academic Advising/Skills Training/Tutoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Labs</td>
<td>Mentoring Programs</td>
<td>Organizational Advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Organization Offices/Storage</td>
<td>Community Service Programs</td>
<td>Diversity Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Rehearsal Spaces</td>
<td>Leadership Development Programs</td>
<td>Student/Graduate Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Galleries</td>
<td>Learning Communities</td>
<td>Scholarship Administration and Awarding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Libraries</td>
<td>Access/Pre-College/Bridge Programs</td>
<td>Assessment (e.g., Campus Climate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Gathering Spaces</td>
<td>Social Programming</td>
<td>Student/Group/Community Outreach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E
UD Specific MC Model Options

Whether building a new MC from the ground up or within a new facility (e.g., new student center), reallocating space within an existing facility (e.g., Perkins Student Center), or repurposing an existing facility (Kent Dining Center), the proposed UD specific models below can be adopted within any of aforementioned MC physical models and aligned with any of the shared sample staffing models above. Each of the models takes into account the existence of the Center for Black Culture (CBC) and would require an appropriate level of resources (i.e., staff and financial) to fulfill the intended purpose of the MC. For the models presented below “Inclusion Initiatives” refers to programmatic and outreach efforts that serve to include the broad UD community (e.g., white students, faculty, etc.). Similarly, “Other Underrepresented Communities” refers to student groups that an MC would traditionally serve (e.g., LGBTQ, Asian American, etc.). “Other” refers to any other functions that UD might deem important to be part of the MC (e.g., first-gen focus, access programs, etc.).

Model #1 - Center for Black Culture and Community Inclusion: This model honors and builds upon the history and legacy of the CBC. It formally expands the role of the CBC and recognizes the role the CBC is already playing with other student groups on campus (e.g., Latino students). The current CBC location would not be suitable for this model.
Model #2 - **Center for Community Inclusion and Black Culture**: This model embeds the CBC within the framework of an MC. In this model, the CBC could potentially remain in its current location or physically be embedded within a new facility. While a model like this would naturally raise questions regarding the structure, the historical context pertaining to the African American experience in Delaware and at UD justifies a special focus on students from the African Diaspora.
Model #3 – **Center for Community Inclusion**: This model reflects a traditional MC which would allow the CBC to continue at its current or a new location (e.g., larger property). The MC would conduct outreach to the various student communities at UD and carry out its unique functions, but not duplicate efforts out of the CBC (e.g., existing mentoring program, annual Black History Month events, etc.). Certainly, there would be opportunities for strategic collaborations between these two entities. This model also allows for the two entities to report to one or two administrative divisions (e.g., CBC in Student Affairs and MC in Vice Provost for Diversity or vice versa).
Model #4 – New Student Center Model: This model embeds “MC” like functions within the administrative structure of a new student center. Symbolically the entire student center becomes the MC. Throughout the student center community members are exposed to symbols, art, and artifacts that reflect the diverse cultures at UD and their histories. Retail food options and dining reflect both domestic and international diversity. Identified diverse student organizations have assigned spaces and shared meeting spaces to facilitate intentional and organic collaborations (e.g., rehearsal space, kitchen, meeting rooms, performance space, lounges, etc.). Center staff serve as advisors to student orgs, mentors to students, and collaborate on programming and outreach initiatives to the UD community. Other related diversity and inclusion programs and services can also be housed in the new student center (e.g., TRIO programs).
APPENDIX F

University of Delaware Comparator Institutions
As of September 2016

Boston University
Case Western Reserve University
Georgia Institute of Technology – Main Campus
Indiana University – Bloomington
Iowa State University
Michigan State University
North Carolina State University at Raleigh
Ohio State University – Main Campus
Pennsylvania State University – Main Campus
Purdue University – Main Campus
Rutgers University – New Brunswick
Stony Brook University
Texas A&M University – College Station
University of Arizona
University of Connecticut
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
University of Maryland – College Park
University of Massachusetts – Amherst
University of Michigan – Ann Arbor
University of Minnesota – Twin Cities
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
University of Pittsburgh
University of Utah
University of Virginia – Main Campus
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University