

Thursday

September 17, 2020

Stetson University

Special President's Weekly Update: Campus Climate Report

4:00 PM-5:00 PM

CART provided by A La CARTe Connection, LLC.

CART Disclaimer: This rough edit transcript, which may contain missing, misspelled or paraphrased words, is only provided for your immediate review and is not certified as verbatim and is not to be cited in any way.

[Captioner standing by]

[The broadcast is now started, all attendees are in listen-only mode.]

>> PRESIDENT CHRISTOPHER F. ROELLKE: Good afternoon, Stetson University. I'm delighted to be here with you this afternoon as we are here to discuss our Campus Climate Survey results. I want to thank you in advance for your engagement in this very, very important work. We have a number of people that are with us here today, including Dr. Lua Hancock, our Vice President for Campus Life and Student Success, Dean Michele Alexandre from the College of Law, Angela Henderson who is our Executive Director of Institutional Research and I serve as Stetson University's President. I'll

introduce our Researcher in a moment, John Pryor.

But I did want to make a few introductory remarks about the very important work we are about to do together. When I interviewed here to become Stetson's President, I certainly was asked an awful lot of questions about diversity and inclusion. And I shared with the Search Committee and in ensuing conversations with the community how I think about a University campus, in our case, University campuses, needs to address issues of inclusion and diversity and that is we want to strive to meet the certain needs of certain communities. So meet the needs of particular subsets of our community as robustly as we can.

We certainly in an educational environment want to provide as ample, ample, ample opportunities for multi-cultural exchange and certainly we want to have an environment of respect and ultimately achieve what we like to call engaged pluralism. I think those are important goals and certainly within an educational context are goals that make good sense.

So I want to thank you everyone that is on the call today for your engagement. I also want to thank all of the various participants throughout this process. As you probably know, this is the second iteration of the campus climate survey. In 2016, Stetson set out to do a comprehensive Campus Climate Survey. The community communicated the desire to have the data handled externally to better ensure confidentiality and the University at that time choose to work with Dr. Sue Rankin. Just for the record, I had an opportunity to work closely with Dr. Rankin in similar work during my time at Vassar College.

In 2020 there were some changes that were made to the survey based on some feedback, but we predominantly stayed with the same survey to allow for comparison and to also do some longitudinal work over the past four years.

Again, a focus on Stetson not collecting or holding the data was an important component of our approach.

The Presidential Cabinet, including various groups on campus, selected John Pryor assist with data collection, analysis, and summarization. Pryor is a Higher Education Professional with over 25 years of experience in using research findings to help improve the college experience. Pryor served as the Director of Student Affairs Assessment, Evaluation, and Research at Dartmouth from 1992-2005, and he became the Director of the Cooperative Instructional Research Program for the Higher Education Research Institute, known as HERI, for close to a decade. Following that role, he served as Senior Research Scientist from Gallup and is the Principal Consultant for his own firm, Pryor Educational Insights. He has a myriad of publications and is a frequent national and international speaker with a reputation for insight and clarity.

Let me just talk briefly about campus climate. When we say "campus" oftentimes you look at that definition, that means the buildings and the grounds. When you think about climate, you think about the weather. That's certainly not what we're engaged in here today and in ensuing conversation.

Rankin previously describes Campus Climate work as follows: The current attitudes, behaviors, and standards of faculty, staff, Administrators,

and students concerning the level of respect for individual's needs, abilities and potential. So that is the frame that's going to move us forward.

Another frame that I hope will move us forward are the themes, in fact, that we have been discussing throughout the semester. And those are the themes of kindness, empathy, and agency. I firmly believe those qualities are critical to us as we move forward and will often be difficult conversations about our campus climate. We want to be able to have the agency to build not only on our strengths, but also on the things that are revealed to us in terms of some challenges that we have that lie ahead.

I do hope those themes certainly apply to our work together when we discuss these Campus Climate Surveys. I'm going to turn off my screen in a moment, but it is my pleasure to introduce to you John Pryor, who is going to carry us through our discussion of the data.

And John, thank you in advance for all of the work you have done for Stetson University. I know this is going to be an important tool for us in moving our community forward, so thank you.

>> JOHN PRYOR: Thanks very much, Chris, I appreciate the introduction.

What I'm going to do now is take about 45 minutes to go very quickly through a whole lot of slides that are just a summary of the report that I put together for Stetson on the Campus Climate Survey.

This is just a summary. The report is in much more detail, so I hope that you would go through there and find sections that you are interested in and find more information out there.

When I started this project, I wanted to talk with a number of people at the DeLand campus and at the College of Law about how the last administration of the Campus Climate Survey went. As Chris mentioned, Sue Rankin's firm. And what I heard from a lot of people was it was a lot of information, it was kind of overwhelming. And if you look at the reports they put together, they were 400-500 page reports and people got a lot of information, but then not so much information on how -- on what to do with that.

So in my approach to this, as I always take, I try to take a practical approach. What is actionable information here? What is useful information to know? And how can I help summarize that in an effective way?

I know there's been some discussion on some listservs about access to the data. As Chris mentioned, I was brought in as an outside person because there were a lot of concerns from people who might respond to the survey about how the information was going to be used.

This is typical in a Campus Climate Survey or Diversity Survey that you have people who are, you know, this is very emotional information to people. These are things that have happened to people that they wish had not happened. They are seeing this as an outlet, a way to describe what has happened to them, and they take us very seriously, as I do, about keeping their information confidential. So that's why the data has not been -- the raw data is not put out there, either in the quantitative phase or in the qualitative phase.

In going through this, I tried very hard to make sure that no information

was inadvertently put out there that might lead someone to speculate as to who might answered that way or said that in a particular way, and that means sometimes I'm not going to be telling you about how some groups responded.

For instance, there's not much in there about, you know, Asian women faculty because it's a very small number and if I came out and say, hey, an Asian woman on the faculty said this, you know, you might be able to make some speculation about who that might be and that is -- that's not fair and it's against the guidelines that we put forth in this project.

I've tried to summarize the comments as best I can. There's certainly a lot more information about comments in the actual report, so, again, I refer you to that.

One of the things I do need to own up to is I had a typo in the original documents for this with the Latinx, spelling is not my strong suit and so I apologize to people that I didn't catch that and it just got populated throughout by mistake.

And another mistake, I also spelled my name wrong on the report, so, you know, as I said, I'm not a very good speller. So hopefully we've got all that fixed.

I'm going to go on now to talk about some of the results. I'll say one more thing and that is something you are probably used to know, when you are on all these, you know, Zoom calls or GoToMeeting now, you are dealing in a different atmosphere than you usually would.

I would usually love to have, you know, people that I can see that I'm

talking to. But, also, there's going to be noise here. At some point, probably a fire engine is going to go through and that's just the way that we are in life these days.

So I'm going to, like I said, I'm going to take about 45 minutes, I've already taken five, to go through this. Then there's going to be time for questions from me about the report summary. And after that, we'll move on to people from the DeLand community talking about what the next steps are.

So I'm going to take myself off camera here and let's go.

Here we go.

All right, so as Chris mentioned, the 2020 Administration was using the Rankin & Associates survey, that was developed in 2016 with a few tweaks. We did ask a few questions towards the end of the instrument about how things are going for the last four years in terms of you as a respondent saying whether you were aware of certain things or participated in certain programs.

I meant to say earlier that I really want to thank all of the respondents that took so much time and effort into responding to this survey. As you can see we had a higher response rate in 2020, 35% of the total population, which is pretty good. And thank you all for doing such a good job with that.

In terms of this looking at this by position, which is mostly what I tried to do in terms of looking at the responses here as opposed to a general response from everybody because everybody's experiences are so different.

We had -- kudos to the faculty, 57%, that was the top response rate here. Staff/administration, not too far behind that at 51%. Undergraduates, 30%, which is typically what we see as a good response usually for an

Undergraduate survey. The Graduate student population with a lower number and also, there just aren't that many graduate students. So I did not feel comfortable breaking out Graduate students as a group by themselves in this, but when I refer to the full population, their results are certainly in there.

I'm not going to go through and read everything on every slide because that would be really boring, but I'll try and hit the highlights. You, obviously, can see just as well as I.

Here are figures on what the population looked during the time period of the survey and what the various different groups had in terms of response rate. That basically tells you how representative the results are if you were trying to reflect back on those to the full population.

As you can see, you know, it's not exact, but it's pretty good. So I was pleased with how things worked out there. In terms of sex, we always see more responses in the female population than male population in surveys, whether that's in academic circles or outside. This was no different. And it's also similar to what happened with the Rankin Survey.

So let's started out with some general campus climate questions that asked people about how comfortable they were with the campus climate, if they were very comfortable, very uncomfortable. This is a summary of people that were very comfortable or comfortable with campus climate.

As you can see, students were the ones that were most comfortable with that. So 87% of the undergraduate student population said they were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate. And faculty and staff was about basically about two-thirds who said they were comfortable/very

comfortable and about the same population.

There's more information, as I said, again, in the full report that will show you more about how those other figures came together.

In terms of differences from 2016 to 2020, there's really no significant difference between those groups. You see they are very similar. Not statistically significant in terms of how people felt about campus climate in 2016 to 2020.

The next question had to do with the climate in their department and that was just asked of faculty and staff. And you can see the results are very similar to faculty and staff in terms of very comfortable or comfortable.

We also saw some significant racial group differences here. Black respondents much less likely than White, Latinx, and Asian students to be very comfortable with their departmental climate. That's kind of a theme we will see throughout here.

Why is that not going forward? Oops, sorry.

In terms of the classroom, now we're just asking faculty and students about this and they were about the same in terms of that, although if I just looked at the very comfortable group, the fact they were more likely than the Undergraduates to say they were very comfortable with campus climate.

And, again, we saw some racial differences there in terms of Black respondents being much less more likely than other groups to be very comfortable with campus climate.

The next question on the survey had to do with if you had ever seriously considered leaving Stetson. And a number of people had. 40% of

the Undergraduates, 53% of staff, and 56% of faculty had said that had seriously considering leaving. Now, obviously, none of them did because they were there to complete the survey, right?

All of these people are still here, but had at some point seriously considered leaving. Many did so because they said the campus was not welcoming or comfortable.

Faculty and staff were more likely to think that finances were an issue. We'll get into that further on, but as you can see the quote on the right -- lower right-hand side, one of the respondent says, "Our wages are below the national average. I see the average recent graduate with a Bachelor's Degree makes more than positions, including mine, at Stetson for Master's Degree holders."

In terms of the climate, a student said, "I wanted to leave Stetson my first semester and even applied to transfer to several schools, but what helped me decide to stay was getting involved."

That's a pretty common reason to stay, getting involved, you know, getting students involved is a key aspect of retention and graduation.

And one of the staff or faculty said, "The toxic culture inside my department is so thick you can almost see it in the air."

The next set of questions had to do with exclusionary behavior. Have you personally experienced any exclusionary behavior, and that definition in the survey was whether you were shunned, ignored, intimidated and/or hostile, bullied or harassed, all of those come under the definition of exclusionary behavior.

Overall, there was no change from people who had said they had experienced that from 2016, 23% both times. We had 30% for faculty, 23% for staff, and 21% for Undergraduates.

Here is a quote that was illustrative of this this, "In this day and age in our country, I am more sensitive to microaggressive and racist behavior. I've had people ignore my instructions, not reply to e-mails, say rude things to me, et cetera. Sometimes I ignore it. Sometimes I confront them about it. Unfortunately, that is life as an African-American women."

So although we saw no difference in people reporting that kind of behavior was something they had experienced, one of the more positive things in the report is there was a 50% increase in reporting such behavior from 21% in 2016 to 30% in 2020. I was pleased to see that change.

That could be due to a number of different factors, including understanding the mechanics of reporting more, having the stigma of reporting being reduced from what it might have been four years ago, or an increased belief that reporting would be acted upon appropriately.

There's also a section about observing this kind of behavior and if you had seen this kind of behavior taking place where somebody else was experiencing exclusionary behavior. And you can see the figures there, about 28% had observed that. Again, these are very similar to what was seen in 2016.

The survey went on to talk more about specific types of behavior, unwanted sexual contact, unwanted sexually-related experiences, relationship violence, and stalking. And you can see that while many people

did not experience this, obviously, it's a traumatic experience for those people who did experience this. And most often that's happening in the student population as compared to the faculty or staff.

The report goes into more detail about this, but in terms of time, I'm not going to go into more detail about that.

Workplace climate, so a number of issues here if we look at staff, 22% reported that they strongly agree that Stetson is a good place to work. Another 64% agreed.

As far as faculty goes, 82% thought Stetson was a good place to work and 26% strongly agreed with that statement.

Another question was how staff opinions were valued by Stetson faculty and administration and fewer than half agreed that those were -- that their opinions were valued by the faculty and administration.

Over half disagreed that Stetson provided adequate resources to help them have a work/life balance. 81% disagreed that staff salaries were competitive, as we saw a little bit about earlier.

38% were unable to complete assigned duties during work hours.

And 45% reported their workload was permanently increased without additional compensation due to other staff departures. We are starting to see some concerns about people in the workplace, about their compensation, about their workload, and how they feel they are treated by others.

On the faculty side, I already talked about the good place to work piece. About two-thirds disagree that Stetson helped them with resources to manage a work-life balance. Very similar to what we saw with staff. And

thought that people who have children or elder care are burdened with balancing work and family responsibilities.

This particular question on the survey was served out differently to tenure-track faculty and non-tenure-track faculty. For tenure-track faculty, more in 2020 felt that their opinions were valued within Stetson University Committees as compared to 2016. That was a big difference, 66% to 31%.

There was a downturn, however, in the percentage of faculties who believe that faculty opinions were taken seriously by the Senior Administration. This was a rift we saw in a number of areas between faculty and Senior Administration. Only 48% thought that in 2016 and that really plummeted to 27% in 2020.

Male faculty were more likely than female faculty to strongly agree that criteria for tenure was clear, big difference there, 51% versus 18%. And female faculty were also more likely than male faculty to believe that the tenure standards are applied equality to faculty in their academic unit.

As far as non-tenure-track faculty go, they did feel their teaching was valued in the academic unit in which they work, that their expectations and responsibilities were clear. Less felt that the criteria used for contract renewal was clear. And only about half felt that non-tenure-track faculty opinions were taken seriously by Senior Administrators.

In terms of hiring practices, a number of people thought they had seen unjust hiring practices, and the survey described what those would be. As you can see, there's a significant difference by racial group here in terms of observing those experiences, in terms of hiring practices, and in terms of

unjust promotion practices.

There was a question about accessibility here, which I'm just very much summarizing. There was a lot of information in this one question about various different barriers. I'm just showing some of the top ones here.

18% indicated that they had a condition or disability that influences their learning, working, or living activity. Again, more information in the report.

Some of the barriers that people saw at Stetson, parking and transportation, not being able to get into campus buildings easily, residence halls, construction going on, and then things about doors and elevators that were not helping people to get around.

Okay, so dimensions of campus climate, this was a section here asking about various different types of campus climate. In general, the campus was seen as welcoming, friendly, inclusive, and improving. All those are things that were on the positive side.

There definitely was an issue with socioeconomic status and the perception of Stetson as being positive for people of high socioeconomic status was rated most highly of any of these at 58%. And the most negatively rated for all of these was for people of low socioeconomic status, only 10% thought that was the case.

The climate for people of various political affiliations was also seen as less positive. We've got two big issues here also coming out in various areas, socioeconomic status and political affiliation.

People were also more likely to rate the climate more positive for men

than they were for women.

Female faculty were much more likely than male faculty to say the climate was much more positive for men than negative for men. 56% in that far left category, number one, very positive, versus 27% of that -- that should say female faculty, not male faculty.

When asked about the climate being positive or negative for women, male faculty were much more likely to say very positive than female faculty at 18%.

And similar issues for looking at issues of high socioeconomic status.

So there was a question that came in earlier from ways in which people put in that asked for an explanation of why I put this slide in this particular way.

So in this question you are asking from one to five about racism, ethnocentrism, transphobism, all of these different aspects of the way the campus could be seen.

As we saw on the last slide, 1 is completely free and then, you know, 5 is, like, this is, you know, this just always raises them all the time.

The question about this was, why did I depict this set of responses in this particular way as opposed to in the opposite direction? Looking at it from a point of oppression really.

And the reason is because this is where -- this slide is talking about differences between 2016 and 2020. In the report, all of the information is in there about whether somebody answered -- what percentage said 1, what percentage said 2, said 3, et cetera. But in this particular slide I was looking at

the differences from 2016 to 2020 and this is where the differences were.

If we look at the, for instance, racism, so are you constantly encountering racism would be in the 5 category. Only 2% said that.

All of the other answers here are in the 2, 1, 3%. There's really -- there's nowhere to go in terms of showing any difference from 2016 to 2020 in there. So that's why this information was depicted in this way, because it shows the change.

As I said, if you want the full information, that is in the report.

So as we saw in some of the earlier pieces that I talked about, we've got some issues about classism. Only 23% in 2020 and 22% in 2016 felt that Stetson was not classist with respect to socioeconomic status.

And there was also a question about being classist with respect to position on campus, that is, are you faculty? Are you Administrator? Are you student? And that was also no difference, 29% 2020 and 24% in 2016. In both these years, these were the lowest areas when ranked the results by that first column of answers.

Another question was on students issues of feeling valued and appreciated. And a lot of these have to do, like I was talking earlier, about involvement. These are all issues that have to do with retention and student success. If you're not feeling valued and appreciated on campus then you are more likely to not be successful and to leave.

Students were more likely to strongly agree they felt valued by Stetson faculty than staff. The Undergraduates were more likely and the faculty and staff to believe the campus climate encourages free and open discussion of

difficult topics.

In terms of racial/ethnic differences, we saw that there was a difference between Asian students and Black students strongly agreeing Stetson is a good place to go to college, compared to 40% of Latinx and 43% of White students. We saw Asian students and Black students, again, were less likely to strongly agree that the faculty perceived them as role models -- or they had faculty they perceived as role models. This compared to a much larger number of Latinx and White students.

And then Asian students and Black students were less likely to strongly agree that they had staff that they perceived as role models compared to Latinx and White students.

So many of the staff at Stetson feel valued by their co-workers and supervisors, although fewer felt similarly valued by Stetson students. Again, all of these figures are in the report.

They are much less likely to feel valued by Stetson Senior Administration and faculty. Only 14% of the staff strongly agreed that they felt value by Stetson faculty.

There was mixed agreement when asked if Stetson encourages free and open discussion of difficult topics. Only 18% strongly agreeing that and 10% strongly disagreeing about that. We had a difference between male and female in terms of strongly agreeing to feeling valued by Stetson Senior Administrators, whereas 29% of men felt that way and only 9% of female staff felt -- or strongly agreed that they were valued by Stetson Senior Administrators.

In terms of the difference between 2016 and 2020, we had staff replies in here feeling valued by co-workers outside of their department dropped from 31% to 21% from 2016 to 2020. Everything else is fairly similar across both those years.

Faculty ratings on feeling valued and appreciated, many Stetson faculty felt valued by most people at Stetson, but one-third disagreed they are valued by Senior Administrators. That figure was similar about feeling appreciated by Senior Administration. So it's basically the same question except one said "appreciated," the other used the word "valued."

So male faculty members were much more likely than the female faculty members to strongly agree that they felt valued by faculty in their department, felt valued by their department or Program Chair, felt valued by other faculty at Stetson, felt valued by staff at Stetson and were less likely to strongly agree that their teaching was valued at Stetson.

There were no differences between the 2016 and 2020 responses for faculty. The most important piece here in these faculty results were the vast differences in how male faculty and female faculty felt.

Question about institutional priorities, we asked about whether you felt as a respondent that this was the highest priority, a high priority, medium priority, et cetera. So just looking at the groups that said this was the highest priority, we had promoting student success equally for all Stetson students as a fairly high rate of highest priority amongst all those groups in terms of looking at all these other different priorities. That was the one that had the most agreement about it.

Similarly, providing adequate institutional resources to ensure student success for all students, although faculty were less likely to say that they thought that was the highest priority than were Undergraduates and staff.

Drop down to the bottom here, promoting gender diversity and faculty administration, you can see that varies, but is also fairly low. 18% of faculty thought that was highest priority and 25% thought promoting racial and ethnic diversity in the faculty administration was the highest priority.

Interestingly enough, there was a big difference there with staff, which were much more likely to say that was a high priority of the institution.

There are some questions there about the way that people viewed the surrounding community. This was a write-in question which basically is, are your experiences on campus different from those you have experienced in the community surrounding the campus? And this was a question that was asked on the Rankin Survey, I'm assuming that this came out of all of the lengthy discussions, focus groups, and interviews that the Rankin staff had with people at Stetson finding this was an issue.

And certainly, it did come through that many people thought it was relatively unsafe environment off campus. Many people described negative interactions with an off campus population that they viewed as less diverse and actively hostile to people who that were different themselves.

On the other hand, there are also Stetson members that are part of that surround community that felt that their conservative values were dismissed by those at Stetson and not treated with the same kind of tolerance that they think other groups are.

In contrast as to feeling more at home, expressing their conservative views in the community versus -- in the surrounding community, not the campus community.

Here's some quotes about that, "DeLand is a historic city and has not progressed much in their ways of thinking. I've seen a lot of religious intolerance and homophobia. There are people that stand in downtown DeLand condemning people with signs. I think campus is a safer and more inclusive place in comparison."

Another person said, "DeLand has a Stetson bubble meaning that the Stetson's campus is much different than the surround DeLand area. Going to DeLand high school, I never encountered Stetson until I became a student here. DeLand could definitely benefit from more involved outreach from Stetson since there's a pretty large socioeconomic disparity between the University and the town it's part of."

One person said, "I feel a lot safer on campus than off. When I'm out with friends, I feel uncomfortable and unsafe. When I was out with friends, I have been honked at on multiple occasions and have approached by strangers."

Here's some more on DeLand, "I sometimes feel unsafe due to the strong presence of residents who are Trump supporters and have Confederate flags."

Then another person says, "On campus I feel safe and free to walk around by myself, but off campus I do not feel that way and do not plan to any time soon."

Contrarily, another person says, "I not feel the most comfortable" -- I'm sorry, "I do not feel most comfortable in the DeLand community and make it a point to always travel with others."

You can read that as well as I can. This is where I thought I was going here. Another point of view, although less prominent, has to do with Stetson not being seen as welcoming to conservative viewpoints. One person writing, "Campus is totally liberal and not open to conservative ideas, speakers, or conversations."

Another person said, "This University is a bad place to be a conservative person. Anywhere else outside Stetson you can freely speak of your political and economic views. Here, you can't."

So you can see that diversion there. We've seen in some of the other comments about this, you know, most people feel uncomfortable with others expressing their liberal point of view or their conservative point of view and they feel there's a lot of tension there.

Another question asked for recommendations from various different groups. Do you have any specific recommendations for improving the climate at Stetson?

Now a lot of the answers here just kind of reiterated things that I heard before and weren't actually recommendations, but I tried to pull out some the common themes here.

In terms of students, it was most about affordability. They see tuition being too expensive. They see housing being too expensive.

Some people suggested having more scholarship money. One

specifically mentioned increasing Financial Aid for study abroad, pointing out the more affluent students from able to do study abroad, where the less affluent students were not able to take advantage of it that.

Other recommendation, to have more and better training for everyone at Stetson in terms of diversity. Increased awareness of programs that are offered. And generally to be more inclusive.

Now some students wanted less of a focus on diversity and more on academics. Some wanted there to be more of focus on understanding and providing aid for people with mental health issues at Stetson and was that as an issue with diversity that was not often discussed.

Also, commuter students felt they were really not included in many things that might increase a positive campus climate for that.

So this just illustrates what I was just talking about. In the interest of time, I'll just going to let you read that at a later time.

Here, again, just more of what I just described. Focus on supporting students and raising the graduation rate. Want more focus placed on academic, not painting the grass green, et cetera.

So in terms of staff, the staff echoed a lot of points that had been made previously. There was tension and mistrust between various groups at Stetson. Upper Administration and faculty was often described, others talked about communication issues that was more in their own particular department.

A point that came up multiple times, there was a perception that there were Stetson policies that sometimes were not followed or actively broken

and there was really no -- it was perceived as really no effort to enforce those policies.

You see a quote down there, "I would like to see the rift between upper administration and faculty be healed." That was one that I heard a number of times.

Here's a larger quote, "Many students, staff, and faculty have told me that there is great toxicity within certain offices and departments here on campus and it's often due to lack of communication, failure to understand difference, unconscious, or conscious, bias, and times, a total shunning of ethical workplace practices."

I'm not going to read all the rest of that, you can read that just as well, but you can see the flavor of that person's concerns.

"My biggest frustration is having a policy or procedure that doesn't have a consequence if it's not followed."

Another person said, "Improve communication, remove roadblocks and barriers, outline expectations and standards and hold staff accountable to those standards. I think Stetson is very siloed and fearful to share their resources."

This is another person who says that, "I believe we need to make structural changes. The interpersonal climate issues will remain or not based on the changing faces and personalities of our students, faculty, and staff. While it's important to address those issues, the prior for the institution should be to focus on increasing representational diversity, particularly of decision-makers at the institution, both faculty and staff, implementing more

socially just support structures for students financial, social, and academic, targeted to combat inequality, implement clear and meaningful rewards and punishments in the hiring and administration process that demonstrate the commitment that representational diversity inter-cultural competence."

In terms of faculty, there were two major themes that came out of recommendations for faculty. Again, we're talking about communication. It's a big issue between faculty and administration, faculty and staff, faculty and adjuncts, and faculty to faculty.

The tenure-track faculty tended to think there were too many adjuncts were being used instead of more tenure-track faculty and there were too many Administrators."

"Faculty feel disenfranchised, quality of education and support for teaching seems to not be of importance. We are administration heavy which doesn't seem to best serve our needs."

More faculty responses, "Increase interaction between Senior Administration and faculty and staff. We're all striving to make the place a better one and when ideas are listened to with intentionality and good faith, we can move mountains rather than getting hung up on molehills."

"There needs to be more openness as well as respect between faculty and administration. The faculty seem to want more openness from the administration, while the administration seem to yield much pushback from the faculty. Also, not all faculty agree, but are hesitant to speak out in disagreement with the more outspoken faculty for fear of it negatively influencing the tenure process."

In the interest of time, I'm not going to read all of this. "The school has so much administrative bloat that I'm certain one day it will collapse under its own weight." That's one.

So in terms of conclusions and recommendations here, these are my thoughts. I've spent a lot of time with this survey, a lot of time reading all these comments, reflecting on the comments, trying to value the work that people put forward in making these comments on the survey. But these are mine.

All the information in there, all of the information is in the report for you to make your own recommendations. Yes, not every single comment is in there, not every single data is sliced and diced in every particular way that it could be, but, again, when I talked with people about what was not helpful before, was that there was there was too much information in there. There wasn't enough guidance as to what to do next. So I thought really, as a major part of my job, was to pull out the underlining themes here and making sure those were -- that those were definitely seen.

You know, we didn't see a lot of change with respect to campus climate at Stetson. There were a couple of things I pulled out in this presentation and some more in the report were there some differences there, but overall, if look at the overall picture, the 2020 results are similar to those from 2016.

What seemed very clear to me was there is a crisis of communication and respect at Stetson. Time after time respondents told us about a toxic culture at Stetson. They described faculty who belittled them, staff who seemed to go out of their way to create chaos. Upper level Administrators

who did not respect or value the opinions and students who were not at all interested in the life of [indiscernible].

I saw a very strong rift between conservatives and liberals at Stetson. It seems to pre-date the current similar rift in the United States because it also was reflected in 2016. But it's not just at Stetson, but is mirrored in the issues people have with surrounding community.

On the other hand, despite these incidents, people stayed and tried to make Stetson a better place. And a lot of people were really, you know, the way I took a lot of their comments was that they did have a lot of strong feelings, positive feelings about Stetson, but these things were in the way of them having a better job, having a better career, students having a better academic experience. They believe in the good Stetson can do, despite the promise of jobs and careers elsewhere, and they stayed because they hope for and work for a better day.

Here are my recommendations. I know that you're going to be spending a lot of time talking over the next year talking about the results of this survey of your other experiences that have to do with campus climate. These are not recommendations coming down from the -- from anybody at Stetson. This is my view, having done this work for a while and spent a lot of time with this information.

So as I said, there's been a lot of concern about communication and respect. So my first recommendation was that Stetson DeLand should embark upon a year-long consideration of communication and respect for others in the University community.

I think this should be the fundamental focus of every community-wide event, speaker, Faculty Senate meeting, department meeting, and other opportunities to interact. Obviously, not the only thing, but this was a major thing, a major reason why people were really struggling with being at Stetson.

I really feel that once faculty, staff, and students at DeLand are better able to communicate with respect, many of the issues of concern in this report will likely improve. That's why I really felt this was an important thing to take on because you can go into all of the aspects of several of these different questions and look at, well, we should improve access to this building, you know, which is not to say that shouldn't happen, but I think that you really need to focus on this core issue brought up time and time again about communication and respect.

Number two, definitely acknowledge the accomplishments that you have seen in the past four years. The reporting of the exclusionary conduct was up 50%. That's a positive change. One of the things I didn't really talk about was DeLand Undergraduates being more likely to positive views of their academic experiences than in 2016. So there are positive things in there. Don't just focus on the stuff that's really problematic and hard, but, you know, pat yourself on the back for some of the things that have been a change for the better.

There was a summary very, kind of, problematic question in here, it didn't quite make it into the summary about initiatives that people already have at Stetson. It was something that was developed by the Rankin Group. A number of people in the comments pointed out at the end of the survey that

this is a really tough question to answer, and I agreed with them.

But what definitely popped out is there's a lot going on at Stetson that people don't know about. There's a lot of things that, programs that are in place that people just didn't say, oh, that program is here and it's not any good, but people were just, yeah, I didn't even know that was here.

I would want people who are in charge of those initiatives to really look at how they can promote what they are doing because most of the people at Stetson, who are asked about these programs said, yeah, if this were here, in many cases it was, that would improve campus climate. So definitely promote that.

Economic importance was really an issue here. Faculty, staff, and students were all concerned about finances. Many people felt that they are compensated less at Stetson than their peers. Some people are look can elsewhere for employment. A primary complaint was lack of assistance from Stetson with childcare. It came on and on and there's much more in the report about this. I would urge Stetson to look at increasing the ability to have childcare, as well as engage upon a salary study.

Obviously, there's huge problems right now with economic viable at every institution of Higher Education in the country, but that's an even greater time in which your people are hurting. So I would urge you to put a salary study together.

And then finally, I would suggest you review the Assessment Plan for campus climate. I'm trying to get my screen -- oh, there we go. Oops, now I lost the slide. [Laughter]

The final recommendation there was to review the Assessment Plan. I don't think that doing the Rankin Survey again is going to be -- oh, thank you. I don't think doing the Rankin Survey is going to tell you very much. I would suggest you do a much more shorter series of pulse taking surveys that you do more frequently. There's always a way to look at existing data, even if it's not a Campus Climate Survey, there's always way a to look at results from that lens.

So those are my recommendations. Again, take those into account when you are thinking over the next year about what you want to do in terms of campus climate at Stetson.

You know, my views are not necessarily going to be the only ones that you should listen to. And, again, please read the full report and find out a lot more than I can tell you in 45 minutes. I actually went a little over. Sorry, Angela.

>> ANGELA HENDERSON: That's okay, there's plenty of time for questions now. [Laughter]

>> JOHN PRYOR: Okay.

>> ANGELA HENDERSON: We've had a couple of questions come in, so first and foremost, to give I guess a bit of framework and to inform the understanding, these results are based solely on the number of people who, in fact, submitted a survey, correct?

>> JOHN PRYOR: Well, yeah. That's the only thing -- yeah, right. That was the scope of the project, to implement the survey and then to analyze that.

Definitely, like I was just saying, there are other ways of looking at campus climate. I understand that Angela just released the HERI Faculty Survey, which I used to run at UCLA, results that you guys looked at, there's plenty of issues of campus climate in there to look at. So, yes.

>> ANGELA HENDERSON: Okay. So there's a question about somewhat of a disparity between the overall ratings showing, I think it was slide 6, the overall ratings of very comfortable or comfortable being rather high, but then some of the comments having a disparity kind of being at odds with that. How do you address that?

>> JOHN PRYOR: Well, there's certainly a large number of people who did not say they were very comfortable or comfortable.

In addition, you know, I don't put that much stock in the kind of overall -- overarching, what do you think of campus climate at Stetson? It's just, you know, it's a very complicated issue. And so, you know, whereas people might say, yeah, I'm comfortable, but then get into things later on once they are prompted to think about various difference things and they are like, yeah, that does bother me. Or get into specific things.

I mean, you could think the childcare, as many people do, the lack of childcare resources at Stetson as being a huge problem for you. But in the scheme of things you might still say, I'm comfortable with the campus climate.

So I don't put that much stock in those generic questions.

>> ANGELA HENDERSON: Great.

A question about the difference between 2016 and 2020 in the

exclusionary behavior where you had noted there wasn't a large change, do you have any insights on whether that's a positive or a negative or -- [laughter] any additional thoughts on that?

>> JOHN PRYOR: Those kinds of questions are always very complicated because you don't know what people thought of as being exclusionary behavior in 2016 versus 2020.

And definitely, I mean, there was a -- there was the definition there. Sometimes we see information and we see things go up and down because the way that people understand the issue is different than they did before. So, you know, it might be the same person answering in both years, but over four years they have come to understand that exclusionary behavior is a broader arena than they thought it would be.

So I think the really -- the most interesting and useful piece of information in that set of questions was about the reporting and the fact that more people -- they are just about the same number of incidences that were reported -- or that were seen, but the reporting of those was much higher, an increase of 50%.

>> ANGELA HENDERSON: Okay.

Another question has come in, so kind of a follow-up on your explanation for the chart showing the levels of the one to five, racism, sexism, homophobia, was there an intentional choice as to why you showed it in that way or can you clarify why you didn't show it from the inverse? A little more detail to show that the vast majority do not think we are free of those things?

And I think you touched on that, showing, if I understood correctly,

what you were demonstrating was the difference.

>> JOHN PRYOR: Yes, like I said, in the report, all those numbers are there. Here it is, right there. That's all of the table there. But if we look at the farther end of that, like I said, you've got 2% answering that they constantly encounter racism at Stetson. You've got 1% saying they constantly encounter xenophobia. So that's not where the difference was.

The different was from 2016 to 2020, which is all that slide is about. It has to do with those particular areas of that far-reaching behavior.

But like I said, all that information is in there for you to look at.

>> ANGELA HENDERSON: All right.

One question about the initiatives question that I know we found a little problematic. If an initiative exist, even if it's not well-known and the climate has not changed significantly from 2016, then that initiative is not likely to be improving the climate, despite perceptions that it might. Do you feel that is an accurate statement?

>> JOHN PRYOR: Can you say that again? I want to make sure that I understand exactly what you are saying.

>> ANGELA HENDERSON: I'm trying to read it carefully, too. If an initiative exists, even if it is lesser known, but the campus climate has not changed significantly from 2016 to 2020, then that initiative is not improving climate despite perceptions that it might. Is that correct?

>> JOHN PRYOR: Well, I think the issue here is about how many people are exposed to those particular initiatives because they don't know that they're going on. So you could have a really good program, but only ten

people, you know, were impacted by it because nobody else knew about it or, you know, took place in it.

So I don't think it necessarily has to reflect upon the utility of that program, but, I mean, it could. I think the issue is that a lot of these resources were available that people didn't know. And I think one of the good things to come out of that would be to get those a little bit more understood and known.

>> ANGELA HENDERSON: Okay.

Question about the increase in reporting that we saw and that you highlighted as well for the exclusionary behavior, do you recall if in the report there's more information about where people were reporting these occurrences and why perhaps they felt safe to do so?

>> JOHN PRYOR: Where they were reporting or where they were --

>> ANGELA HENDERSON: Where people were reporting and why perhaps they felt safer to report in 2020 as opposed to 2016?

>> JOHN PRYOR: That's a hard thing to pull out because there weren't a lot of people in the comment section saying, this happened to me in 2020 and didn't happen to me in 2016 or vice versa, so it's hard to tell the nature of the relationship between 2016 and 2020. In that, there's definitely more information about -- especially in comments, about how, you know, how people dealt with reporting and felt about reporting.

In some cases it was a success for them and in some cases it just was not. Again, yes, to get back to the first part of that question, was there more information in the report? Yes. The answer always is there's more

information in the report.

>> ANGELA HENDERSON: Right. [Laughter]

A question about the survey itself, for the faculty aspects, the survey focused heavily on teaching, not going into research, service, et cetera, I'm assuming that's because the survey was largely based on the survey that was done in 2016. Is that correct?

>> JOHN PRYOR: Yeah, probably I would say, you know, 97% of that survey was the survey that the Rankin Associates put together.

And as Chris said earlier on, that was a specific request of Stetson to not change too much. I had to kind of twist a few arms to get some questions added in there that I thought might be useful, but we tried not to -- I don't think we took anything out.

In fact, if there's anything that we did with the original questions was, you know, trying to maybe make them understood a little bit better by inserting definitions into the text that wasn't there before.

>> ANGELA HENDERSON: Okay.

Can you speak more about how those reported did or did not feel their reporting was acted on appropriately? I know that was one of the questions in the survey is whether the perception was that things were handled appropriately or not and whether there was a difference it would 2016 in that aspect.

>> JOHN PRYOR: I don't believe so, but I don't have that right at the top of my head. I know it's in the report, the report is over 50 pages long. So anything that is -- that we have in there about the nature of reporting would be

reflected in there. I would hesitate to speak about that right now.

>> ANGELA HENDERSON: Okay.

That seems to be most of what we have in the question queue. That's everything I think that we have not touched on in some way.

>> JOHN PRYOR: Okay.

>> ANGELA HENDERSON: So I think we're ready to kick it over to Lua and Michele if we are done with questions.

>> JOHN PRYOR: Thanks, Angela.

>> LUA HANCOCK: Hopefully Michele is coming, too.

>> DEAN MICHELE ALEXANDRE: I am. Hi!

Thank you, John, and thank you to everyone who helped us with this process. We know that the administration of the survey itself was made available with the help of many of you, the various diversity groups on the campuses, on all campuses, the students, the staff, we couldn't have done it without you.

Additionally, to harp back on John's general opinion and take-away, I think we have learned a lot about the importance of communicating with each other with respect, no matter what.

So I think that's what I'd like to start with, why the idea of the call for respect that John Pryor, an external individual, has put in front of us and what that means for us.

And second, the need to trust the process and collaborate with that effort of respect to see where it may lead us.

To that end, in our last few minutes that is exactly what we will talk

about, the process, and how it will depend on you, whether or not you can think of steps we could include in this process. Whether or not we all can help each other show up in our best ways to further the conversation about how to elevate the campus into a better form.

And one of the first things we are doing to engage in the year-long conversation we'll have on this is that Cabinet, members of Cabinet, will own this conversation as well. This will not be something that happens out of the body of Stetson University. It will be very much of its body, that means that the members of Cabinet will ask the very hard questions that every constituency at Stetson will ask.

And I know Lua will elaborate a bit further about the additional groups that will form and the timeline, et cetera, but I think it is a watershed moment at the University where we are asking ourselves the hard question that the leadership, from the President to everyone, will be asking the same similar questions.

Lua, do you want to take it up?

>> LUA HANCOCK: Yeah, I'll talk pragmatically for a few minutes about the timeline and what the next steps are and then I'll more about the deep questions we're asking ourselves because many of you have been turning in comments on the page where the Campus Climate is posted. I want to talk a little bit about those because I think that they are deep and important. Like Michele said, we both agree this is a watershed moment for Stetson to act at this time.

The timeline review, we'll go ahead and put the link in the chat where

you can see the timeline. I'm going to be posting different links. They all go back to where the main Campus Climate Survey is posted.

As you look at that timeline, you'll see that we spent a lot of time talking. Certainly you don't want talking to just end in talking, but you also don't want a checklist of action items that you feel like when we have checked those things off that we have completed campus climate. So it's a mixture of making sure that we spend the time that's needed.

Also, we felt like last year, maybe last time we didn't do a good enough job. I'll say I didn't do a good enough job in allowing for more spaces for members of the community to participate in the problem-solving, the idea generation, and the conclusion.

There were some committees for sure and I'm not downplaying the work of those committees. If you served on those committees, thank you so much. I think we have an opportunity to engage the community in a purposeful and robust way at this point and that takes time.

If you see on the recommendations, you'll see we thought first it was really important for us to just understand the data. We got a lot of questions about, what are you going to do now? We're going to talk about that. The first step is, what is the data telling us? And what if we actually just listen to it and believed it?

Didn't say -- now the questions about the data set are valid questions, the questions, we should ask those, but what I hope people don't do is to doubt other people's lived experience that is expressed in the data. The data is there, people are telling us our lived experience and we need to listen to

that. Sometimes I notice in community a tendency, oh, that wasn't my experience, I think -- no, no, no let's just assume they are correct in their own lived experience.

And then what do we do next after we better understand the data? So now on the website is available a comment section where you can start to suggest subgroups. And we want subgroups that are going to work on things.

I'll mention one, I'm not trying to influence the decision that's made, but I think we all saw a decent amount of difference in the lived experience of identifying male and female faculty and some of their opinions. So do we need to look at that? Do we need to look at the sex differences with some of the processes and satisfaction, for example? That might be one we want to look at. The political affiliations, whatever.

And we have experts in a lot of these areas. Both people who have lived expertise and also people who have studied expertise, academic expertise, who could come up with solutions. So you might be willing to say, I'd be willing to serve on those groups. I nominate myself or someone to serve on that group.

We're going to collect those groups. We're going to look at it, the Diversity and Inclusion Committee at the College of Law, the Brown Center, the EIG Group in DeLand, Cabinet, the Diversity and Inclusion Leadership Team are going to look at all of those recommendations and hone them down into a list of working groups.

Those working groups will be announced by October 5th and on that

date, you can go to the website and say I would like to work on this group and serve in this way.

The goal is as the subgroups work throughout the year, part of the reason we wanted to extend this is because we didn't want people to be work post-Thanksgiving if at all possible, so we kind of shortened the Fall semester if the groups start working in October.

We want to make sure there's some status, but also that there's a lot of transparency. We will be asking the group leaders to be posting on the web, the articles that their groups are reading, the studies their groups are reading, the recommendations that they're making, and asking for people to say to these recommendations, do these recommendations sound right to you? So hopefully we can end with a process that we're going to be using, a process that has been very successful at Stetson so far in pocket that a lot of people don't know we are using called Sustained Dialogue Process. That Sustained Dialogue Process was actually brought to us by students who requested that we spend more time in this dialogue.

So we will post an example of the dialogue guidelines that we're going to use and then we'll talk a little bit more about the Sustained Dialogue Process. So anybody who is in any of the groups will be trained a little bit in how do we do Sustained Dialogue?

The goal of Sustained Dialogue is dialogue that ends in measurable, concrete, purposeful action steps that are based on people's lived and studied experience.

We're excited about taking that action.

So that's kind of the process. And you can read about the rest about it about the timeline, et cetera. Michele and I are the co-chairs of the Diversity and Inclusion Leadership Team. We are happy to take any and all recommendations about process, ideas, groups, et cetera. I think that's really important.

I wanted to mention some questions that have already come in because now is going to be the time for Cabinet, every individual in this community to ask themselves hard questions, including Cabinet. Like Michele mentioned, we have been working with President Roellke for what it looks like for this parallel of groups working, Cabinet to also be owning this working and asking themselves the hard questions.

Here are questions that came in this the past few days. How do we up lift our students from historically marginalized communities?

How do we ensure that all levels of faculty and staff voices are centered while we do this work?

We typically see the same students, faculty, and staff serving on these committees and working groups, how can we ensure better representation in the post-survey subgroups?

Stetson history with diversity and inclusion has been a series of starts and stops, past efforts, assessments, and reports were ignored and consequently recurring themes and issues have been treated like they are new. Likewise, a 30 year history of diversity and inclusion and class cultural center reflects continued isolation and continues disturbing staffing pattern that is have resulted in repeatedly having to start from scratch. Institutional

memory gives us a little hope for change.

Why should we believe that changes will come from this survey when almost all of the same VPs are on staff during and after the 2016 survey and little was accomplished?

I wanted to say these out loud. These are comments that came in, some of them with names on them, some of them without, into our database. But unless we are transparent and honest about the hard questions, we're not going to be able to move forward. So these are questions that we're going to have to answer as a community and with each other with on-going transparency.

The process, the Diversity and Inclusion Leadership Team feels that the process is, I won't say equally important, but is a huge part of the value of this. How can we role model the things in this survey people are asking for? They are asking for more respect of each other, to feel they are more heard, to feel someone sees them. And how can we use this process as a way to teach ourselves how to better do this and also come up with outcomes that are there?

So I'll kick it over to Michele if she has any other closing comments.

And if you are a student, in a few minutes we'll post the Cultural Credit Survey and it will be open until the 28th. This is recorded, so we would encourage you to ask your peers to watch this.

Michele, do you have anything to add?

>> DEAN MICHELE ALEXANDRE: I think my last few comments is what I told in trying to get the College of Law to come to our webinar next week,

that you can't fight unless you are at the table. This is just a very, very general call from us to come to the table and fight with us.

At Thanksgiving, I know you are very familiar, we are looking at Thanksgiving coming up, you know that there's healing potential every time families get together. This is a family. I hear loud and clear that we may not have done a good job recording the healing process in the past. And we are committed to doing that this time so when we come back in the next four years, whatever that takes, maybe John is right, maybe it shouldn't be a Climate Study, but we will be doing this work [laughter] four years from now, 20 years from now, well beyond us, that people that come after us will have a record that we tried, that we pushed, and hopefully they will say we made this community better.

So please, we beg you, join us at the table and just take that one step and we'll meet you the rest of the way. All we are asking is respect and some defaulted trust. So I look forward to working with all of you. I really enjoy all of you.

Lua.

>> LUA HANCOCK: I completely agree. I would say if anything makes me hopeful, it is that I have done some hard work over the past six months with this community, with faculty, with staff, with students, with the Administration, with subgroups that are those where we have cut budgets, we've made super hard decision about the community's health, and I have been extremely impressed with the way that we have spoken to each other, the way we have worked together because at the end of the day, we wanted

the safest and most amazing community that respected learning and safety for our students, our faculty, our staff, our Administrators, our hourly employees as we could this semester. We made value-based decisions and we fought for it.

And there's going to be some critique to the decisions that we made, but as being a person who spends most of my day sitting at those table, I'm optimistic we can do this. We have done this for the past six months, we can do it again.

The pandemic of the issue of climate in the world, America, and Stetson are huge, but we can make some difference. We can make some difference. Now is the time.

The other reason why I'm optimistic is we have a lot of work to do, but I'm going to tell you, there was a few key piece that we really worked on from the last Climate Survey and one of them was students said that they wanted to feel more comfortable reporting things.

I'm going to take some agency here, I wasn't going to give my opinion, I'm going to give it for just a second since so many people asked about that data point.

We created a Bias Education Response Team and there was some push back to that, but we did it in the way students asked us to do it. We had a committee of faculty, staff and students who helped us put it together. We did the same thing with Title IX. We asked people in Title IX for students to know who they were. They wanted to know their faces. They wanted to know, who sees the reports I'm putting in? Who is getting those? I don't want to tell my

truth to who the heck knows who is getting them.

So we started to tell them, this is who is getting it, this is who the Bias Team is, this is who Title IX is. We had tables, we shared ourselves, and we told the community, the reporting is going to go up. It is going to look like there's an increase in cases because we're going to have the community trust us to tell us about what's happening.

And I feel very proud of that work and that was done by faculty, staff, and students, I'm not owning it, but that, to me, is an indicator. Some of the other stuff was harder to work on. The faculty administration stuff, it's a bear, we have to work on these things. But on the things we could move we made a difference for this community and we'll continue to do so.

So I am, you know, it doesn't really matter if I'm happy, sad, angry, concerned about doing this work, it's what has to happen. This is our time and this is the time that we need to work on this.

So next week we'll go back to a webinar about COVID and updates because people are ready for that and we will have some partners from Advent Health join us.

But I want to thank you all for being here today, for spending so much time think being this. This is just the kick-off. This is the beginning of deep conversations, so thank you so much for taking the time.

>> DEAN MICHELE ALEXANDRE: Lua, do you we have some specifics about who is participating in the webinar next week that we want to share?

>> LUA HANCOCK: I see the slide here that says "Upcoming Events" [laughter] so these are the different testing dates for antigen testing

and COVID coming up for the DeLand campus.

And we want to mention, there's been this wonderful series, if you have not participated in it, I have learned so much, it's been so amazing, "Race in the 21st Century" and so this is the next. Dr. Terri Witeck, if you have not heard her speak, and the Sullivan scholars are presenting.

I don't know if Chris is supposed to be doing this wrap-up. He is more eloquent than I.

>> PRESIDENT CHRISTOPHER F. ROELLKE: It isn't about eloquence, it's about wanting to reiterate many of the things that have been expressed today by our colleagues, by our External Researcher, by our Institutional Researcher.

And for all those that are watching and observing and engaging, a sincere thank you all around for the important work that we have ahead of us, the important work that has happened prior, many of our colleagues, students, and Alums.

And to keep Michele's theme going, we've got to stay at the table. We've got to stay at the table. We've got to stay at the table with openness, with honesty, with candor, and, again, with kindness and empathy. I believe if we practice those things and bring this disposition to this work, we will move this institution forward on some very important metrics on inclusivity and diversity. I believe that so strongly.

I am a new member of your community and I'm excited to be a part of this work. In fact, tomorrow I have a meeting with the EIG, the Equity and Inclusion Group. We need to keep our feet to the fire of this important work,

even in the context of a global pandemic. Right? We absolutely have to. Why? Because it's a huge part of Stetson's present and a huge part of huge part of Stetson's future.

So I editorialized there a little bit, but I also have a job here, which is to let you know we do have some exciting things coming up, including next week's Presidential weekly update. And I'm delighted to report that we will be re-visited by our expert partners in public health and in providing care, healthcare to our community, our partners from Advent Health, Lorenzo Brown and Dr. Joe Smith. We do think we're at the stage of this semester where having this re-visit of where we are in terms of the COVID-19 Pandemic and where we need to go and having expert help with us next week will be very, very helpful.

Please note the time change and that was in order to accommodate our partners' schedules, they're very generous to give us their time, so it's 1:00 to 2:00 PM next week. That also may be beneficial for some who have not been able to make the 4:00 to 5:00 time, but please rest assured that all of these webinars are, in fact, archived and you can revisit them at any time.

What else do we have, Julie? Are there any other things that we want to highlight for the community at this time?

Because I do not see another slide coming on to the screen, I'll assume that we can bring this very important and initial conversation to an end. Let's continue to keep our feet to the fire, let's continue to express empathy, kindness, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. There's a bright future that lies ahead of us if we work together and if we work with kindness and we work with

humility and we work with, again, our ears and eyes wide open.

So I thank everyone in this community for your engagement on this. Go Hatters!

>> DEAN MICHELE ALEXANDRE: Go us! Thank you. Thank you, everyone.

>> LUA HANCOCK: Thank you.

>> PRESIDENT CHRISTOPHER F. ROELLKE: Thank you, everyone.

[Webinar concluded]

CART Disclaimer: This rough edit transcript, which may contain missing, misspelled or paraphrased words, is only provided for your immediate review and is not certified as verbatim and is not to be cited in any way.